### Notice of Meeting

Meeting 6/2018 of the Academic Quality Committee will be held from 2:00pm – 4:00pm on Tuesday 30 October 2018 in the Level 5 Function Room, Administration Building F23. The Agenda for the meeting is below.

Dr Glenys Eddy  
Committee Officer

### Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Welcome and Apologies</strong></td>
<td>Welcome Rachael Weiss, new Academic Quality Manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Procedural Matters</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the Previous Meeting, 4 September 2018</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Action Schedule</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standing Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Report of the Chair</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Report of the Academic Board</td>
<td>Tony Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Report of the HDR Examinations Sub-Committee for:</td>
<td>Kathleen Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) 28 August (including Q2 statistics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) 25 September</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) 23 October (including Q3 statistics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Items for Action</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Course Review: Master of Science in Coaching Psychology</td>
<td>Pauline Ross / Sean O’Connor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Course Review: Master of Medicine / Master of Science in Medicine (Infection and Immunity)</td>
<td>Jim Manos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Course Review: Master of Medicine and Master of Science in Medicine (Psychotherapy)</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Course Monitoring outliers, v1</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>The measurement of academic performance</td>
<td>Colm Harmon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 Human/animal ethics for HDR students

4.7 Reforming the PhD Examination

4.8 Proposed changes to the HDR Rule – Completions

4.9 English Language Proficiency Requirements

5 ITEMS FOR NOTING

5.1 Graduate Outcomes Survey 2017 Addendum: Further Results by International/Domestic Student Status

5.2 Appeals Reporting 2017

6 OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 Any Other Business

Next meeting: 2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 5 February 2019
Level 5 Function Room, F23 Administration Building

Academic Quality Committee - Terms of Reference

PURPOSE

The Academic Quality Committee assists the Academic Board in ensuring the maintenance of the highest standards and quality in teaching, scholarship and research at the University of Sydney and, in this context, advises the Academic Board on receipt of reports on the quality of, and current standards in teaching, scholarship and research, in accordance with the University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017 and the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. To play an active role in assuring the quality of teaching, scholarship and research in the University and co-ordinate and maintain an overview of the academic activities of all academic units.

2. To monitor issues relating to quality in relation to undergraduate and postgraduate award courses, and to make recommendations to the Academic Board.

3. To monitor issues relating to quality in relation to research, and to make recommendations to the Academic Board.

4. To monitor issues relating to quality in relation to research training, including the assessment and examination of Higher Degree by Research candidates, and to make recommendations to the Academic Board.

5. To provide academic oversight in relation to domains 2.2, 5.2.2, 5.2.4, 5.3.1, 5.3.2, 5.3.3, 5.3.4, 5.3.5, 5.3.7, 5.4.2, 6.1.4, 6.3.1 (b) – (d), 6.3.2 (a), (c) – (h) inclusive of the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015.

6. In pursuit of the above objectives, to:

   6.1. request reports from, or refer matters to Faculties, University Schools, schools, departments, University Executive portfolios, etc., for consideration and action as required;

   6.2. consider and take action as required on reports or academic submissions from academic units

   6.3. initiate and oversee, in collaboration with the University Executive, a formal and regular program of review of academic activities of all academic units.

7. To ensure undergraduate and postgraduate coursework education are compliant with appropriate rules, policies and procedures, including, but not limited to the:
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8. To ensure that research training is compliant with appropriate rules, policies and procedures, including, but not limited to the:

- University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule
- Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013
- Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015
- Essential Resources for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2016
- Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Policy 2015
- Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Procedures 2015
- Cotutelle Scheme Policy
- Research Code of Conduct 2013
- Academic Honesty Procedures 2016.

9. To receive reports and recommendations from the Higher Degree by Research Examinations Subcommittee for comment and transmission to the Academic Board.

10. To receive reports from, and provide advice to, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), The Registrar and, where appropriate, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement) on quality assurance and other matters relating to coursework study.

11. To receive reports from, and provide advice to, appropriate portfolios on quality assurance and other matters relating to higher degree by research training in domain 4.1 of the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015.

12. To obtain information or reports from any faculty, school or department, the Library or other academic unit on academic matters relating to coursework or research training studies.

13. To provide regular reports on its activities under its terms of reference to the Academic Board.

14. To consider and report on any matter referred to it by the Academic Board, or its committees, the University Executive or the Vice-Chancellor.
MINUTES

ACADEMIC QUALITY COMMITTEE
2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 4 September 2018
Senate Room, Quadrangle (A14)

Members Present: Associate Professor Wendy Davis (Chair); Dr Tooran Alizadeh (Architecture, Design & Planning); Professor Matthew Conaglen (Law); Professor Rae Cooper (Business); Jane Currie (Nursing); Dr Mark Halaki (Health Sciences); Dr Christopher Hartney (Academic Board Representative); Weihong Liang (President, SUPRA); Associate Professor Tony Masters (Chair of Academic Board); Dr Slade Matthews (Academic Board Representative); Associate Professor Peter McCallum (Director, Educational Strategy) (for Professor Pip Pattison); Associate Professor Kathleen Nelson (Chair, HDRESC); Associate Professor Alyson Simpson (Arts & Social Sciences).

Attendees: Dr Matthew Charet (Executive Officer to Academic Board); Dr Glenys Eddy (Committee Officer, Secretariat); Tristan Enright (Manager, Educational Integrity) (for Item 4.1); Sally Pearce (Manager, Special Projects, IAP).

Apologies: Associate Professor Javid Atai (Engineering & IT); Kubra Chambers (Director, Institutional Analytics & Planning); Dr Betty Charr (Pharmacy); Associate Professor Ayman Ellakwa (Dentistry); Professor Mark Gorrell (Medicine); Professor Pip Pattison (Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)); Dr Carl Schneider (Academic Board Representative); Donald Tochukwu Azuatalam (PG Student).

5/2018

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

Apologies were noted as recorded above.

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

2.1 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 July 2018 were confirmed as a true record of that meeting.

Resolution AQC18/5-1

The Academic Quality Committee resolved that the minutes of meeting 3/2018, held on 10 July 2018, be confirmed as a true record of that meeting.
2.2 Action Schedule / Business Arising

The Committee noted the updates to the Action Schedule to date, and requested the following updates be made to the Action Schedule:

- **2/2018**: the HDR APR statistics are complete;
- **10/2018**: The Committee had approved the Master of Nutrition and Dietetics course review, but had asked the Faculty for more comment. Matthew Charet has sought and received advice from the Faculty, which will be circulated after it has been seen by the Chair. The Faculty responded that entrance is by merit and does not consider SES status of applicants. Possible changes to the way in which low SES is determined were discussed, including using the school that students attend as an indicator, instead of the practice of using the postcode. Classification of schools is currently according to their postcode, but could be done by Census data. The Chair requested Sally Pearce’s team to investigate and report back on the issue.
- **12/2018**: investigation of the possible correlation between HDR scholarships and timeliness of thesis submission is still pending;
- **13/2018**: the Chair is to convene a group to prepare guidance documentation for students on how to prepare appeals.

**Resolution AQC18/5-2**

*That the Academic Quality Committee noted the updates to the action schedule.*

3 STANDING ITEMS

3.1 Report of the Chair

The Chair reported that the Academic Board was continuing to work with the Risk Management Team to identify and manage risks to academic matters that are the responsibility of the Academic Board. When this work progresses further, it will be brought to the committee for review, consultation, and approval.

**Resolution AQC18/5-3**

*The Academic Quality Committee noted the report of the Chair.*

3.2 Report of the Academic Board

The Chair of Academic Board advised that he had nothing to add to the written report.

**Resolution AQC18/5-4**

*The Academic Quality Committee noted the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 12 June 2018.*

3.3 Report of the HDR Examinations Sub-Committee

A/Prof. Nelson reported that the quarterly statistics for the second quarter 2018 will be submitted to the next meeting.

Members expressed concern over the cases of plagiarism referred to in the report. The HDRESC Chair noted that these were relatively minor cases – of the sort that are typically referred back to the Associate Dean for remediation, and then reported back to the sub-committee.

A/Prof. McCallum observed that cases of plagiarism detected at the submission stage should be reported to the Integrity Office immediately. If a case does not constitute misconduct, then the student can be asked to show cause, to undergo another performance review, or to correct the thesis before submission. These cases should be reported to the HDRESC.

The Committee discussed several aspects of ethical practice in relation to HDR candidature, and requested information on the following:

1. It was established that not all theses need ethics approval, but some do; guidance is to be sought on how this is determined for individual theses. The Committee Officer will ask the Ethics Office about the existence of guidelines about which types of HDR theses need ethics clearance.
2. It was unclear whether Annual Progress Reviews (APRs) determine whether ethics approval is obtained as HDR students are progressing through their candidature. The Chair will attempt to establish whether this issue is being addressed at APRs.

3. There was discussion concerning which processes, if any, are in place to guarantee that ethical guidelines are being followed by HDR students. The Chair is to seek advice from the Research Office and from A/Prof. Coleman about this matter.

It was noted that nine modules are offered for HDR students, including Responsible Research Practice and some specifically on ethics, which faculties may insist that their HDR students complete. It was suggested that faculties in which many students conduct research with human participants could prescribe mandatory modules for their HDR students. Dr Hartney suggested that where coursework is included in research degrees, an ethics component could be included in the coursework.

**Resolution AQC18/5-5**

*The Academic Quality Committee noted the Report of the Higher Degree by Research (HDR) Examinations Subcommittee meeting of 31 July 2018, as presented.*

**Action 15/2018:** to seek advice from the Ethics Office concerning which types of HDR theses need ethics clearance and obtain guidelines, if available.

*Responsibility: Committee Officer. Timing: As soon as possible.*

**Action 16/2018:** to establish whether APRs address ethics approval.

*Responsibility: Chair. Timing: As soon as possible.*

**Action 17/2018:** to seek advice from the Research Office and/or A/Prof. Coleman concerning the nature of any processes in place to guarantee that ethical guidelines are being followed by HDR students.

*Responsibility: Chair. Timing: As soon as possible.*

### 3.4 2019 Meeting Dates

Matthew Charet advised the Committee that the Academic Board approved the meeting dates for 2019 at its last meeting. The Committee Officer will circulate the 2019 meeting invitations shortly.

**Resolution AQC18/5-6**

*The Academic Quality Committee noted the 2019 meeting schedule for the Academic Board and committees, as presented.*

### 4 ITEMS FOR ACTION

#### 4.1 Course Review - Psychotherapy

Due to the absence of Psychotherapy representative, this item was held over to the next meeting.

**Resolution AQC18/5-7**

*The Academic Quality Committee:*

1. noted the submission from the Sydney Medical School of the course review report for the Psychotherapy program; and
2. welcomed the presentation of this review at its next meeting on the 30th of October.

#### 4.2 Course Monitoring

The Chair reported that the Committee now has access to the Course Pulse Report dashboard, and requested that the Committee decide on the quantities and values that could serve as triggers for determining when communication with the relevant faculty was warranted.

Members suggested:

- when a large disparity between success and retention was observed;
- the Chair suggested WAM, very low and very high in the first instance;
- enrolment numbers: large numbers and large leaps in enrolment numbers have implications for resources; very small enrolment numbers are prone to data distortion, although this committee is concerned mainly with large numbers in the context of academic quality;
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- large changes in enrolment numbers
- the relative proportions of domestic and international students
- large growth in the number of enrolled international students.

Caution was advised when sharing course monitoring data with colleagues; A/Prof. Masters recommended sharing it “in confidence” with University colleagues, but not externally. Sally Pearce observed that, at present, it is shared between some staff in the DVC Education Portfolio and this committee.

The Chair expected the list of quantities to be iterative, and undertook to devise a list of quantities to aid discussion of the meaningfulness of the data at the next meeting.

**Resolution AQC18/5-8**

The Academic Quality Committee noted the update on course monitoring.

**Action 18/2018**: The Chair to devise a list of degree programs with outlying values for inclusion in the agenda for the next meeting. **Responsible**: Chair. **Timing**: for next meeting, 30 October.

### 4.3 Appeals Reporting 2017

The Chair noted that the Committee had received a number of reports for the previous meeting but was still waiting on more submissions to finalise the 2017 report.

The Committee made the following observations:

- The Chair noted significant variability in the number of appeals reported between faculties. She also noted that the comments submitted indicate widespread confusion on behalf of students about some matters, such as time limits and when it is appropriate to use the appeal process.
- The notable percentage of successful appeals can be taken as an indication of faculties’ willingness to consider the student’s circumstances and act accordingly;
- It was noted that deadlines for student appeals of attempts to show good cause are often during January, when many students are not actively engaged with the university.
- Related to the Committee’s discussion concerning the consistency of the application of the appeals process by the faculties, the Chair is to inquire with faculties, where responses were unclear about some procedural details of the “informal appeal” stage.

**Resolution AQC18/5-9**

The Academic Quality Committee noted the reports on 2017 Faculty-level appeals data, as presented.

**Action 19/2018**: the Chair is to make inquiries with faculties regarding informal appeal details and report back to the Committee. **Responsible**: the Chair. **Timing**: as soon as practical

### 4.4 Educational Integrity Trend Report, Semester 1 2018

A/Prof. McCallum commented on the increase in overall incidents of academic misconduct, and the increasing incidence of concerted targeting of students by external companies offering tutoring, but which are, in reality, channels into ghost writing. He reported that the proportion of cases involving international students was higher than for domestic students. Despite offering workshops for the former, the gap between the two is still large. However, the recidivism rate is low. A/Prof. McCallum noted that strategies have been implemented to deal with the intense amount of activity by these external companies. He intends to stress to students the risks inherent in using these services. For instance, cases of blackmail have been reported by other universities. Some of these companies present themselves in a manner that suggests a connection with the University. It was suggested that these companies might be reported to ASIC or the ATO. A/Prof. McCallum observed that the University needs to implement its own student support processes to counter the methods of academic dishonesty and contract cheating. However, it was reported that, throughout the University, problems encountered with the reporting system discouraged staff from reporting suspected cases. One suggestion was to create deep connections with the University’s international student communities through mentoring programs and other means.

It was noted that permitting students to engage editors had inherent risks. Editing might disguise students’ problems, such as poor writing skills, and some think it is better to receive a poorly written essay to assess a student’s performance and needs, rather than to receive a polished
one. The conditions under which editing was acceptable were considered. For instance, it is often assumed that HDR students use professional editors. Releasing Turnitin reports to students could have an educational function, but it could also make students dependent on the information contained in the reports, rather than learning how to create work appropriately.

The complexities of academic misconduct cases and the appeal process were noted. A/Prof. McCallum suggested that this area remain open for discussion, stating that he is not intending to change policy immediately.

Resolution AQC18/5-10
The Academic Quality Committee:
1. discussed and noted the Educational Integrity Trend Report for Semester 1 2018; and
2. recommended that the Academic Board note the report.

4.5 Student Experience Survey (SES): 2017 Results Summary
Items 4.5 and 5.1 were discussed together. Committee made the following comments concerning the 2017 Student Experience Survey results:
• low response rates: the Chair commented on the noteworthiness of low response rates, and observed that the perception exists that the surveys elicit the more polarized responses;
• data bias: the Committee had previously discussed checking student satisfaction data for bias, particularly as it relates to the gender of teachers. A/Prof. McCallum has communicated with Kathryn Bartimote-Aufflick about this and will follow this up. Sally Pearce suggested that this might be within the purview of new Vice-Provost;
• satisfaction vs quality: in interpreting the survey responses, the difference between student satisfaction and academic quality needs to be borne in mind;
• feedback: in the USS, feedback to students has been the worst performing item for some time. Action needs to be taken to educate students about what constitutes feedback. This has been done in FASS with good results.
• closing the loop: the ‘closing the loop’ average is very low; it might be that this is understood differently within the University;
• writing skills: the level of writing capacity exhibited by the University’s undergraduate students was seen as needing attention; the fact that minimal writing is required of some students in their undergraduate degree was noted; one suggestion was to develop an OLE on writing skills;
• A/Prof. McCallum observed that the AQ Committee can both make observations using data correlations between cohorts and specific recommendations to the DVC Education.

Resolution AQC18/5-11
The Academic Quality Committee discussed the Student Experience Survey (SES): 2017 Results summary report, as presented, making the observations recorded above.

Action 20/2018: the Chair to follow-up with Kathryn Bartimote-Aufflick and Professor Colm Harmon about potential bias in USS results. Responsible: the Chair. Timing: As soon as possible.

5 ITEMS FOR NOTING
5.1 Unit of Study Survey: 2018 Semester 1 Results Summary
Items 4.5 and 5.1 were discussed together (notes in 4.5).

Resolution AQC18/5-12
The Academic Quality Committee noted the report on Unit of Study Survey 2018 Semester 1 results.

6 OTHER BUSINESS
6.1 Any Other Business
There being no other business, the meeting concluded at 3.59 pm.

Next meeting: 2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 30 October 2018
F23 Level 5 Function Room
A full copy of the Academic Quality Committee agenda papers is available at:
### ACTION SCHEDULE

**Actions arising from meetings in 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Meeting date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible officer</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Progress report</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/2018</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>20/02/18</td>
<td>Circulate statistics on completion of Annual Progress Reviews.</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Next Meeting</td>
<td>27/03/18: Preliminary version tabled; further information requested.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2018</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>20/02/18</td>
<td>Inquire as to whether examinations data can differentiate between domestic and international students.</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Next Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2018</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>20/02/18</td>
<td>Follow up with Sydney Law School to provide an update on actions undertaken in response to the Faculty Review.</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>First meeting in 2019</td>
<td>09/04/18: Law School has agreed to provide update in early 2019.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2018</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>27/03/18</td>
<td>Advise Committee on what equity data is available in the student dashboard.</td>
<td>Director, IAP</td>
<td>Next Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2018</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>27/03/18</td>
<td>Contact OGC to determine range of complaints and mechanisms for resolution to determine whether any of these are of interest to the Academic Board.</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Next meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2018</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>27/03/18</td>
<td>Provide data on Educational Integrity cases referred to the Registrar in 2017 with time taken to resolve.</td>
<td>Director, Educational Strategy</td>
<td>Next meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2018</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>08/05/18</td>
<td>Request further information from the Faculty regarding the decrease in the proportion of low-SES students admitted, as well as support for such students.</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Before submission to the Academic Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2018</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>08/05/18</td>
<td>Clarify timing of surveys and potential bias in responses.</td>
<td>Director, Educational Strategy</td>
<td>Next meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2018</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10/07/18</td>
<td>Request the UE Research Education Committee to investigate possible correlation between HDR scholarships and timeliness of thesis submission.</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/2018</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>10/07/18</td>
<td>Set up working group to draft appeals guidelines.</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Completed Actions 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Meeting date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible officer</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Progress report</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/2018</td>
<td>2.1 Terms of Reference</td>
<td>20/02/18</td>
<td>Develop a work plan for the Committee.</td>
<td>Chair, Chair AB and Secretary</td>
<td>Next Meeting</td>
<td>27/03/18: On agenda as Item 2.4.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2018</td>
<td>2.4 Forward Plan</td>
<td>27/03/18</td>
<td>Template for reporting of faculty-level appeals to be developed and circulated to faculties, for return of data to a future meeting.</td>
<td>Chair / Secretary</td>
<td>Circulation, before next meeting; return of data, to be determined</td>
<td>28/05/18: Completed reports on agenda for 10 July meeting.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2018</td>
<td>4.2 Course Review; PG Nursing</td>
<td>08/05/18</td>
<td>Liaise with IAP to refine data collection and reporting.</td>
<td>Chair, Secretary</td>
<td>Next meeting</td>
<td>23/05/18: Meeting held with Chair, Chair AB, Director IAP, Associate Director, Institutional Analytics and Secretary.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Matthew Charet, Executive Officer to Academic Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer/Approver</td>
<td>Associate Professor Tony Masters, Chair of the Academic Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper title</td>
<td>Report of the Academic Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To advise the Committee of the outcomes of the Academic Board meeting held on 2 October 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Quality Committee note the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 2 October 2018.

REPORT OF ACADEMIC BOARD MEETING

Items related to the Academic Quality Committee
The Academic Board noted the report from the meeting of the Academic Quality Committee held on 4 September 2018 and:

- noted the Committee's discussion about course monitoring and its suggestions for quantities and values to be used to trigger additional investigation;
- noted the Committee's discussion of appeals reporting for 2017 and its observations about the process;
- noted the Committee's discussion of the Educational Integrity Trend Report for Semester 1 2018; and
- noted the Committee's discussion of the Student Experience Survey (SES): 2017 Results summary report, and its observations about the report.

Items related to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee
The Academic Board noted the report from the meeting of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee held on 11 September 2018 and:

- noted the Committee's review of the Academic Promotions Normative Criteria as expressed in the Academic Promotions Procedures 2015; and
- noted the Committee's review of the Educational Services Agreements Policy 2017 and the recommendations offered.

Items related to the Graduate Studies Committee
The Academic Board noted the report from meeting of the Graduate Studies Committee held on 11 September 2018 and:

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to introduce a new major in the Master of Engineering, the Master of Professional Engineering, and the Master of Professional Engineering (Accelerated) and amend unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;
- approved the proposal from the Sydney Conservatorium of Music to suspend entry to the Master of Music Studies (Conducting) for 2019 and agreed to recommend that Senate amend the Resolutions of the Senate arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2019;
- approved the proposal as amended from the School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Master of Philosophy (Architecture) and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2019;
- approved the proposal as amended from the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning to introduce resolutions of the University of Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning in relation to the Doctor of Philosophy and rescind the course resolutions for the Doctor of Philosophy, with effect from 1 January 2019;
- approved the introduction of the Research Training Program Scholarships Policy 2018; and
approved the proposal from the HDR Scholarship Sub-Committee to delay the award of HDR Enhanced Scholarships.

Items related to the Undergraduate Studies Committee
The Academic Board noted the report from meeting of the Undergraduate Studies Committee held on 4 September 2018 and:
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Veterinary Biology/Doctor of Veterinary Medicine and approved the amendment to the Course Resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2019;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours, approved the amendment of the Course Resolutions arising from the proposal with effect from 1 January 2019, and approved the amendment of the table of Units of Study arising from these proposals, with effect from Semester 1, 2020;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Applied Science (Diagnostic Radiography), Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise Physiology), Bachelor of Applied Science (Occupational Therapy), Bachelor of Applied Science (Physiotherapy) and Bachelor of Applied Science (Speech Pathology) and approved the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2019;
• approved the proposal from the Sydney Nursing School to amend the Bachelor of Nursing (Postregistration) and approved the amendment to the course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2019; and
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine and Health to amend the Bachelor of Pharmacy, Bachelor of Pharmacy (Honours), Bachelor of Pharmacy Management and Bachelor of Pharmacy Management (Honours) and approved the amendment to the course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2019.

Other matters
The Academic Board also:
• received a presentation from the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor and discussed the University’s principles for entering into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Ramsay Centre for Western Civilisation;
• approved amended 2019 meeting dates for the Academic Board and its committees;
• received and noted the Reports of the Chair and of the Vice-Chancellor;
• received and noted reports from the student members of the Academic Board;
• noted the membership of the 2018 Level D and E Central Promotions Committees;
• approved the amendment of the Resolutions of Faculty for the Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences; and
• approved the 2019 Academic Calendars for the Faculties of Arts & Social Sciences, Medicine & Health (Dentistry) and Science (Veterinary Science).

The agenda pack for the 2 October 2018 meeting of the Academic Board is available from:

Associate Professor Tony Masters
Chair, Academic Board
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Quality Committee note the report of the HDR Examinations Subcommittee of the meetings held on 28 August, 25 September and 23 October 2018.

REPORT OF THE HDR EXAMINATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE – 28 AUGUST 2018 MEETING

Report of the HDR Examinations Subcommittee meeting held on Tuesday, 28 August 2018 where there were present: Associate Professor Kathleen Nelson (Chair), Associate Professor Javid Atai (Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies & Deputy Chair), Professor Frank Lovicu (Faculty of Medicine and Health), Associate Professor Emily Crawford (Sydney Law School).

Also in attendance were: Professor Peter Harrowell (standing in for Professor Geoffrey Clarke)

Examination Cases considered by the Subcommittee

The Subcommittee considered the examiners’ reports and faculty recommendations with respect to two (2) candidates. The Subcommittee resolved:

- In one (1) case that the degree be awarded subject to corrections.
- In one (1) case that an examiner-as-assessor be appointed to examine the thesis and act as an assessor of the other examiner reports.

Cotutelle Cases

The Subcommittee approved the outcome of examination for one (1) cotutelle candidate.

Examination Cases considered by the Chair (or Nominee) out of Session

The Subcommittee noted that the Chair had considered the examiners’ reports, the faculty recommendations and supervisors’ reports, with respect to one (1) candidate. The Chair resolved that the students should be awarded the degree subject to completion of corrections.

The Chair also approved an extension request for one (1) candidate, allowing the candidate additional time to respond to an award outcome recommendation.
Appointment of Examiners

The Subcommittee noted that the Chair (or nominee) had endorsed the appointment of examiners for 49 candidates.

2019 Meeting Dates

Members resolved to note the meeting schedule for 2019.

Quarterly Statistics (Q2, 2018)

The HDRESC noted the report from the HDR Administrative Centre on PhD and other research doctorate award outcomes for the second-quarter 2018.

It was noted that:

- A table charting the breakdown of international and domestic students has been included in the report this quarter.
- A higher number of female HDR candidates in the Faculty of Science was bucking the trend for STEM disciplines.
- The statistics on the ‘length of time under award consideration’ were likely to include cases where a revise and resubmit award outcome had been recommended but was pending the student’s response.
- The time with the Faculty/Committee chart represents the time until the student is notified of the outcome of the examination, but does not include any subsequent period of corrections or revision.
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1. Awards Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AWARD OUTCOMES</th>
<th>Award with Corrections</th>
<th>Award without qualification</th>
<th>Revise and Resubmit</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Business School)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Tech.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (Sydney Medical School)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (Sydney Nursing School)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture, Design</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quarter 2, 2018 Statistics

2. Awards by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Business School)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (Sydney Medical School)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (Sydney Nursing School)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Examination Length (Months from Submission to Award Outcome)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAM LENGTH (Months)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10+</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Business School)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (Sydney Medical School)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (Sydney Nursing School)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. EFTSL By Faculty

#### EFTSL BY FACULTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Labels</th>
<th>&lt;=1.00</th>
<th>1.50</th>
<th>1.75</th>
<th>2.25</th>
<th>2.50</th>
<th>2.75</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>3.25</th>
<th>3.50</th>
<th>3.75</th>
<th>4.00</th>
<th>4.25</th>
<th>4.50</th>
<th>4.75</th>
<th>5.00</th>
<th>5.25</th>
<th>5.50</th>
<th>5.75</th>
<th>6.00</th>
<th>6.25</th>
<th>6.50</th>
<th>7.00</th>
<th>7.50</th>
<th>8.75</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Business School)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (Sydney Medical School)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (Sydney Nursing School)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Quarter 2, 2018 Statistics

#### 5. Time with Examiners (Months)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count of SID</th>
<th>Column Labels</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7+</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row Labels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Business School)</td>
<td>Business (Business School)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (Sydney Medical School)</td>
<td>Medicine (Sydney Medical School)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (Sydney Nursing School)</td>
<td>Nursing (Sydney Nursing School)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 6. Time Under Award Outcome Consideration (Weeks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME UNDER AWARD OUTCOME CONSIDERATION (Weeks)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7+</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Row Labels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Business School)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (Sydney Medical School)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (Sydney Nursing School)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 7. International/Domestic Breakdown

### INTERNATIONAL/DOMESTIC STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Labels</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award without qualification</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and Resubmit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Business School)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award without qualification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and Resubmit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (Sydney Medical School)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award without qualification</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and Resubmit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (Sydney Nursing School)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award without qualification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and Resubmit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award without qualification</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and Resubmit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and Resubmit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORT OF THE HDR EXAMINATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE – 25 SEPTEMBER 2018 MEETING

Report of the HDR Examinations Subcommittee meeting held on Tuesday, 25 September 2018 where there were present: Associate Professor Kathleen Nelson (Chair), Associate Professor Javid Atai (Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies, Deputy-Chair), Professor Geoffrey Clarke (Faculty of Science), Associate Professor Emily Crawford (Sydney Law School), Professor Frank Lovicu (Faculty of Medicine and Health), Dr Danijela Gnjidic (Sydney Pharmacy School)

Also in attendance was: Professor Ross Coleman (Director of Graduate Research) – for item 3.1

Proposed Changes to HDR Rule
The HDRESC discussed and resolved to support the proposed changes to the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011, with regard to ‘on-time’ completion requirements, effective from 1 January 2019.

Proposal to Amend the HDR Examiner’s Report on Thesis, Form
The HDRESC discussed the amendments proposed by the Faculty of Science to the HDR Examiner’s Report on Thesis form, and recommended further deliberation at the next meeting.

Examination Cases considered by the Subcommittee
The Subcommittee considered the examiners’ reports and faculty recommendations with respect to three candidates. The Subcommittee resolved that in two cases, the degree should be awarded subject to corrections. In the third case, the Subcommittee confirmed the original intention to permit the student to revise and resubmit the thesis following a further period of study, having considered the student’s response.

Cotutelle Cases
The Subcommittee approved the outcome of examination for one (1) cotutelle candidate.

Examination Cases considered by the Chair (or Nominee) out of Session
The Subcommittee noted that the Chair had considered the examiners’ reports, the faculty recommendations and supervisors’ reports, with respect to eight candidates.

Appointment of Examiners
The Subcommittee noted that the Chair (or nominee) had endorsed the appointment of examiners for 79 candidates.
REPORT OF THE HDR EXAMINATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE – 23 OCTOBER 2018 MEETING

Report of the HDR Examinations Subcommittee meeting held on Tuesday, 23 October 2018 where there were present: Associate Professor Kathleen Nelson (Chair), Professor Geoffrey Clarke (Faculty of Science), Professor Frank Lovicu (Faculty of Medicine and Health), Dr Danijela Gnjidic (Sydney Pharmacy School), Professor Tim Allender (Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences)

Reforming the PhD Examination

The Subcommittee discussed the report by the Director, Graduate Research on reforming the PhD examination. Whilst the use of oral presentations was in general supported, members noted the following:

- Further discussion and analysis is required on the timing of oral presentations including whether these should be scheduled before or after the submission of the thesis. Consideration should be given to holding presentations about six months before submission.
- A more detailed examination of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed oral examination is required.
- Greater clarity around who would be responsible for coordinating the oral presentation is needed.
- Further consideration needs to be given to the impact on students who are not as proficient in English and may be anxious about an oral presentation.
- It is still unclear as to how the option to move to two examiners plus an oral presentation would reduce overall examinations times.

Examination Cases considered by the Subcommittee

The Subcommittee considered the examiners’ reports and faculty recommendations with respect to five candidates. The Subcommittee resolved that:

- In two cases, the degree should be awarded subject to corrections;
- In two cases, a fourth examiner should be appointed as assessor
- In one case, the members formed the intention that the candidate should revise and resubmit the examination following a further period of study.

Cotutelle Cases

The Subcommittee approved the outcome of examination for one (1) cotutelle candidate.

Cases referred to the Subcommittee for Noting

The Subcommittee noted that in two cases, the faculty had recommended that a thesis be withdrawn from examination due to breaches of academic integrity such as evidence of plagiarism and poor referencing and citation. In both cases, the Subcommittee supported the faculty recommendation that the student make the appropriate changes to the thesis, prior to it being resubmitted for examination.

Examination Cases considered by the Chair (or Nominee) out of Session

The Subcommittee noted that the Chair had considered the examiners’ reports, the faculty recommendations and supervisors’ reports, with respect to six candidates and formed an intention.

Appointment of Examiners
Confidential

The Subcommittee noted that the Chair (or nominee) had endorsed the appointment of examiners for 65 candidates.

The Subcommittee also considered a case where two examiners from the same institution were recommended for appointment. The Subcommittee resolved that a replacement examiner was required in compliance with clause 15 of the Thesis and Examination 2015 Policy.

Quarterly Statistics (Q3, 2018)

The HDRESC noted the report from the HDR Administrative Centre on PhD and other research doctorate award outcomes for the third-quarter 2018.

Quarter 3, 2018 Statistics

1. Awards Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AWARD OUTCOMES</th>
<th>Count of SID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Labels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Business School)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (Sydney Medical School)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Awards by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row Labels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Business School)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (Sydney Medical School)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quarter 3, 2018 Statistics

3. Examination Length (Months from Submission to Award Outcome)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count of SID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10+</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Business School)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (Sydney Medical School)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quarter 3, 2018 Statistics

4. EFTLS By Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFTSL BY FACULTY</th>
<th>Count of SID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Labels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Business School)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (Sydney Medical School)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Quarter 3, 2018 Statistics

#### 5. Time with Examiners (Months)

**TIME WITH EXAMINERS (Months)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count of SID</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>6.0</th>
<th>7.0</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Business School)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (Sydney Medical School)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Time Under Award Consideration (Weeks)

**TIME UNDER AWARD OUTCOME CONSIDERATION (Weeks)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count of SID</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7+</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Business School)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (Sydney Medical School)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Quarter 3, 2018 Statistics

## 1. International/Domestic Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Labels</th>
<th>Count of SID</th>
<th>Column Labels</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic</strong></td>
<td><strong>International</strong></td>
<td>****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award without qualification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Business School)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and Resubmit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (Sydney Medical School)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award without qualification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award without qualification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award with Corrections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award without qualification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**END OF REPORT**
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Quality Committee endorse the options for improving the University’s PhD thesis examinations, in particular:

1. that faculties must encourage much greater use of oral examinations
2. if oral exams are utilised, only two examiners are needed
3. that this change be supported by greater investment in staff and student training

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The contribution of PhD students to the research and educational success of the University is important. Unlike the coursework student experience of a modularised curriculum and assessment regime, a PhD is subject to a single examination as a culmination of 3 to 4 years work. This reliance on a single examination means we have to be confident that the process assesses the components of learning we require and in a way that is relevant, efficient and positive for the candidate and the community.

At the University, the Director – Graduate Research is leading a remodelling of the PhD. This reform has, at its core, a need to focus on the student as a researcher and is based on a set of graduate qualities that encapsulate a Sydney PhD. This paper is part of that remodelling as we focus on the quality of the student experience and the need for assessments and examinations to be relevant, fair and appropriate.

A review of thesis examination times and mapping our examination system to international and local comparators as well as the academic literature has identified four main flaws with our current practices. First, our examinations take too long; secondly, the examination does not assess the right aspects of candidature; thirdly, we currently offer students a poor examination experience; and fourth, we have a significant exposure to integrity risks that we cannot properly control for.

There are two solutions proposed to meet these challenges. Each solution would be of assistance on its own, but the greatest benefit would be realised by implementing both together. The first option is to make much greater use of an oral component in the thesis examination, and the second is to reduce the number of required examiners from three to two. The first option, if used by faculties, would result in a better student experience, more appropriate examinations and faster completions. Such changes will need to be supported by training for staff and students, leading to gains to the institution beyond just examinations.
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Recommendations

Recommendation 1: There needs to be much greater use of oral components in PhD examinations

Faculties and Schools must make greater use of oral components for the examination of candidature. This will improve the relevance and fairness of examinations, enhance the student experience, more closely align with the Graduate Qualities and ultimately lead to shorter examination times.

Recommendation 1a: Provide training for Convenors of oral examinations

The role of convenor in an oral examination is critical to protect the interests of the students, the University and examiners as well as providing consistency and adherence to University policy. The Group of Eight universities utilising oral examinations for their HD our examinations of introducers training, and other examples are available from international universities. This training should be recognised as appropriate professional development for mid-career and experienced academics and may also contribute to Advance HE Fellowships. This will need to be done during 2019, so that skilled staff are available for PhD oral examinations in 2020.

Recommendation 1b: Provide training for the HDR students participating in oral examinations

Most institutions that require students to undergo an oral examination offer training for candidates. This can range from simply offering a practice examination prior to the real event through to a series of formalised workshops culminating in one or two practice examinations. The academic literature provides consistent evidence that offering training in the process of oral examinations dramatically improves student outcomes. International students make up approximately 20% of our HDR cohort are many of these come from non-English speaking countries, so prior exposure to oral examination conditions may be vital to reduce anxiety in these students. Since improving the student experience is a core part of faculty strategies then the development of these should be part of faculty strategies to improve HDR student experiences. Such courses will need to be available from January 2020.

Recommendation 2: Reduction in the number of examiners

When oral examinations are utilised, the timeliness of the PhD examination experience can be improved by reducing the number of examiners from three to two. This change can be effected from January 2020. Supervisors and Chairs of Examination may also propose a third reserve examiner although this is not essential.
1. Introduction

The University’s commitment to change in response to need and opportunity is demonstrated in the success of the University in transforming its undergraduate curriculum to fit the needs of a 21st century knowledge economy. The strategic plan 2016-20 (the Strategy) sets out a clear aspiration and vision for excellence in our educational offerings. For research education and higher degree by research (HDR) students, this vision is exemplified in a commitment to investing scholarships, produce a clear statement of the Graduate Qualities for the PhD and an intent to increase the extent and depth of engagement by HDR students. Aside from a different funding model, the core difference between coursework and research degrees is that the latter rely on a singular examination of one aspect of HDR candidature - the thesis. In that context, it is important to consider whether the current examination process for HDR, notably PhD, candidates can be improved.

The University is invested in re-defining the PhD for the 21st century. The premise put forward by the Director, Graduate Research is that we can substantially improve student experiences and outcomes by shifting our focus to developing the student as a researcher. The student can then maximise their own contribution to intellectual development, in addition to producing new knowledge for the discipline in which they sit, which then yields enhanced research capacity for the nation. The re-modelling process has the core principle that we will maximise success by directing our efforts at developing the individual as a student researcher. The re-visioning of the PhD experience is based on a clear articulation of the Graduate Qualities for the PhD, which defines a Sydney PhD. This paper explores how we can reform the student experience of the examination of their candidature, so we may better measure the success of the candidate in developing new knowledge.

Table 1. Identified issues with the Australian examination for the PhD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Possible Solutions</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focused on output not candidate</td>
<td>• Oral examination&lt;br&gt;• Supplementary examination experience/structured rubric for examiners</td>
<td>• ACOLA Review and refs loc cit&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;br&gt;• Paper to Academic Board on Graduate Qualities&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;br&gt;• Kiley et al 2018&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Student Experience – examination process anti-climatic and bureaucratic</td>
<td>• Oral examination&lt;br&gt;• Greater student involvement</td>
<td>• Papers to Academic Board and subcommittees&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;br&gt;• PREQ survey results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks to integrity – the thesis may not be the student’s own work</td>
<td>• Oral examination&lt;br&gt;• Turnitin (or equivalent) contract cheating tools</td>
<td>• Newspapers&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;br&gt;• Academic community and WWW&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration - the examinations take too long</td>
<td>• reduce the number of examiners&lt;br&gt;• mandate an oral examination</td>
<td>• Papers to Academic Board and subcommittees&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;br&gt;• Lovat et al 2015&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 The Australian 12 May 2018; The Times Higher Education 13 September 2018
5 http://thomaslancaster.co.uk/blog/can-you-really-buy-a-phd-online/
The examination for the PhD in Australia has been the subject of critical review over a number of years. A few key problems with the current practice have been identified; these are given above in table 1.

The current model for HDR thesis examination at the University is that a student, with guidance from supervisor(s), produces a thesis. The thesis is sent to three examiners for critical appraisal as to its contribution to knowledge. Each of the examiners consider the thesis, then present a recommendation to the University with that recommendation necessarily being supported by a detailed report and justification. The recommendations are then considered by the University and a determination of award made. The conduct and procedures of HDR thesis examinations are governed by policies of the Academic Board\(^8\) as required under a Rule and Delegation of Senate\(^9\).

---

\(^8\) Thesis And Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015
\(^9\) University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011; University of Sydney Delegations of Authority Academic Functions) Rule 2016
2. Context

The degree of Doctor of Philosophy is the University’s gold-standard educational offering. It has been argued that the presence of a vibrant and thriving research student cohort is an absolute necessity for the viability of a discipline and body of knowledge. This is exemplified by the fact that even non-degree awarding research institutions (e.g. Max Planck centres in Germany and Medical Research Institutes in Australia) pride themselves on the size and success of a PhD cohort.

Uniquely, most Australian universities do not routinely offer an oral examination alongside consideration of the thesis for the PhD. Instead, the current Australian thesis examination system depends entirely on external review by subject experts in a similar process to standard peer review of academic work. This reliance on external academic examination of a written thesis almost certainly arose because of our remoteness from Europe and North America during the expansion of our higher education sector post WW2, coupled with a relatively small academic community in Australia. So, in some ways, the current PhD examination system can be considered an artefact of the expansion of Australian academe in the latter half of the twentieth century, rather than a deliberate educational decision. The growth in air travel and the massive advances in communication technology means Australia is more connected to the world than ever before. Additionally, the quantity and quality of the Australian higher education research communities has improved significantly since the University of Sydney awarded its first PhD in 1951. There are now 43 Australian universities employing over 50,000 academics, with many institutions producing outstanding research; indeed seven out of the Group of Eight research-intensive universities are ranked in the top 100 of all universities globally. Australia is not, therefore, bereft of academic talent.

2.1 How are PhDs examined internationally?

In most countries in the world, the PhD is examined by a thesis meeting a given standard and an oral defence of the work done. This defence can be public as in the case of many European countries, or private as in the USA and UK. The composition of the examining panel also varies with international norms, ranging from multiple membership (USA - examining committee) to a single ‘opponent’ (e.g. in Sweden). In Australian universities, the requirement is for “two external expert examiners of international standing” for an AQF level 10 degree and for a degree awarded at level 9 of the AQF, one of the two examiners should be from outside of the awarding university.

The public defence of the PhD done in many European countries is often broadly ceremonial and based on tradition, with the academic quality of the thesis being validated by external publication prior to the award. A closed oral examination however, is actually a significant component of the examination process. The role of the oral examination in the UK ‘viva voce’ system is to allow examiners to consider the student in respect of:

“his or her research in the oral examination, and is expected to demonstrate deep knowledge and understanding of the field of study and originality of thought, either in the creation of new knowledge or in the novel application of existing knowledge”.

It is worth noting that this definition is almost identical to the University’s own description of the PhD examination, and yet the vast majority of our determinations of whether a candidate is worthy of the degree of PhD are done by the examiners only considering a thesis. Such a singular focus on the thesis
is counter to our understanding of the role of research education - to produce and develop researchers, and not just document research outputs\textsuperscript{15}.

There are three critical aspects of an oral examination\textsuperscript{16}. The first aspect is that of authenticity, where the examiners resolve whether the work presented is really that of the student. The second function is directed at the student’s capacity to defend the work done, with being ‘articulate under stress’\textsuperscript{17} seen as a key attribute of a professional researcher, although it is worth noting that this characteristic is not part of the AQF definition of a level 10 degree nor a criterion required by university policies. The third function is to allow students to clarify aspects of process and resolve confusions. Potter\textsuperscript{15} and Morley\textsuperscript{16} argue that this chance to clarify means that the thesis assessment incorporating an oral aspect is much fairer than a simple review of a written document, itself subject to ambiguity or real differences of opinion/interpretation.

Currently, the University offers an optional oral examination process for students and/or supervisors who would like to use one but very few examinations are done this way, with the notable exception of one School in the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies (FEIT). If the University were to switch to a mandatory oral examination for the PhD, then this would bring our practices into parity with international standards as well as allowing us to celebrate the success of our outstanding research graduates. Such a dramatic change of the thesis examination experience at Sydney may not be possible given the scale and complexity of the institution. Instead, faculties should direct students and supervisors to the option for an oral examination component, noting the significant benefits for the candidate and the faculty. It is entirely possible for a Dean to require that PhD examinations in a given faculty include an oral component.

2.2 The oral examination at Sydney

The policy framework at Sydney supports the use of oral examinations at the University. In fact, the stated intent of the oral examination at the University is consistent with our understanding of the benefits of the oral examination as given in the literature\textsuperscript{18}. The key area in policy\textsuperscript{19} is section 10;

“Oral examinations
(1) Oral examinations may be:
(a) recommended by the chair of examination; or
(b) requested by a student, except in relation to a resubmitted thesis.

Note: See also clauses 15 – 16 of the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015.
(2) Oral examinations will only be undertaken if approved by the chair of examination.
(3) Oral examinations may be conducted:
(a) as an integral part of the whole examination process; or
(b) as an in-person consultation with the student at the conclusion of the standard examination.


\textsuperscript{18} Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015
The purpose of an oral examination is to:
(a) reduce the potential length of the examination process;
(b) fit the convention of the discipline;
(c) test the student’s understanding of the knowledge described within the thesis;
(d) clarify points of principle or detail within the thesis; or
(e) assess the contribution made by the student to the content and presentation of
the thesis.

Oral examinations may only examine material that would be examined under a thesis-
only examination i.e. the complete thesis as specified in clause 8 of this policy.”

The associated procedures\(^{20}\) are much more detailed, but essence the process is identical to the other
research-intensive universities in Australia. The oral examination is scheduled as a period of time after
submission, the examiners consider the thesis and write a short report to be received by the university
not less than 7 days before the scheduled examination, and this report should include interim
recommendations. Oral examinations can be held in person or by video-conference. After the oral is
held, the Chair/Convener holds a meeting with the examiners to agree a recommendation, and a short
report with recommendations and details of necessary corrections is submitted a few days after. If a
recommendation cannot be reached, each examiner and the Convener submit separate reports and the
thesis reverts to a ‘thesis only’ route.

2.3 What is happening at other Group of Eight Universities?
Together, the Group of Eight (Go8) provide 50% of the HDR completions nationally\(^{21}\). In the Go8, only
Sydney requires more than two examiners for doctoral degrees (Table 1). In respect of oral
examinations, two other institutions in the Go8 have recently successfully implemented mandatory oral
examinations for HDR students.

Table 2: Number of examiners required for initial consideration of a doctoral thesis at Group of Eight
universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Number of Examiners</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>At least 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANU</td>
<td>At least 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monash</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Switched from 3 as part of the transition to incorporate oral examinations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University of Queensland (UQ) adopted its oral examination system in 2016, such that in 2017
students whose theses contained co-authored publications were required to take part in an oral
examination. From 2019, all HDR examinations will be done by a combination of thesis and oral
examinations. The model here is that the examiners receive the thesis, consider for a short period
(nominally a maximum of six weeks) before a scheduled oral examination. Prior to the oral
examination, examiners have to provide a short report on the recommendation of whether the oral
examination should proceed. At this point, an indicative recommendation of the type of award - award,
corrections, revise and resubmit, lesser degree or fail - is provided to the University. Subsequent to the
oral examination, examiners and examination Convener confer; and the Convener then produces a
synthetic consensus report incorporating a recommendation as to outcome. This report notes examiners
have changed the recommendations as a result of the oral examination. The size of the HDR cohort at

\(^{20}\) Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015
UQ is about the same as the University of Sydney, but with a much greater proportion of doctoral candidates than we.

The process at the University of Western Australia (UWA) is broadly similar. The major difference between UQ and UWA is that the latter did not use the interim phase of only requiring an oral examination of candidates whose theses contained co-authored work, and rolled the process out to all students in 2018. UWA allows slightly longer for the process to complete, as they schedule an examining committee (Graduate School Exam Board) prior to the oral examination.

Both institutions have reported a significant reduction in examination times. Each has also reported a notable reduction in non-award decisions (revise and resubmit, or fail/lesser degree).

The other Group of Eight institutions are at different stages along the path to implementing an oral examination. At the University of Sydney, we have well worked out policies, processes and procedures for delivering an oral examination, not that dissimilar from successful processes subsequently implemented at UQ and UWA.
3. Specific Issues

This section provides a critical consideration of the issues raised in table 1.

3.1 The student experience, avoiding bias and questions of language

3.1a The student experience

It is not sufficient that we think of HDR candidatures in terms of enrolments and completions; how HDR students experience the university will strongly influence progression, success and reputation. As the examination happens at the end of candidature, we have limited opportunities to analyse how students perceive the examination process. As part of the Graduate Outcomes Survey, the University runs the Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ) for HDR students that have graduated recently (< 12 months). Our performance in the PREQ item 2 "the thesis examination process was fair" is consistently lower than the Go8 average, and is trending downwards. In the PREQ, students have the opportunity to add open comments. Boxes 1 and 2 report all of the open comments made by respondents with respect to the examination process. We should consider though, that only a small proportion of our HDR graduates actually complete the PREQ questionnaires, and even fewer still leave open comments. So whilst the in boxes 1 and 2 may not represent the experiences of all HDR graduates, they do provide a lived, phenomenological perception of the examination process at Sydney.

As with any other community, the value of celebrations for building cohesion and collegiality should not be underestimated. At the University, subject to fiscal and financial constraints, we value celebrating...
success for the power that celebrations have in connecting people and building momentum towards
shared goals.

Box 2: All of the PREQ open comments in respect of “examination/thesis” for
survey year 2017

Areas for Improvement

- The chair of the department lost my thesis.
- Thesis examination: One examiner clearly had no grasp of my theoretical approach or subject matter
  and in my opinion should have excluded herself from being an examiner. But what to do about such a
  situation? Lack of funding and technical support. Part time post grads are clearly discriminated
  against. Confusing admin and constantly changing email styles.
- The supervision I received was pretty dreadful and the examination process after that was a complete
  shambles. Despite handing it in on time and with all relevant paperwork
- Intrusive feedback requests. Pathetic university coordination of the examination and graduation
  process. HDR Admin Centre.
- Examination * the University lost my thesis which set back the marking process a month.
- The timing of the examination (far too long!!); the admin process for examination (impersonal and
  alienating); communication with other institutions/funding bodies extremely poor and put me at a
disadvantage for further study.
- I was happy with everything.
- Ensuring examiner’s reports are received in a timely manner.
- There were considerable delays in my thesis examination process
- Information (thesis guidelines
- Guidelines as to what is required for the thesis. There was no guidance or resources available to assist
  with this.

Areas of Satisfaction

- The thesis - such a disciplined exercise and this proved a valuable process for me

As with other Australian universities, the completion of the examination phase of a PhD at Sydney is
marked solely by a communication from the delegated authority notifying the student. It seems awry
that a major event in a student’s life – completing the examination for one of the most prestigious
awards in the academic canon – is reduced to a bureaucratic experience. In institutions that utilise
public oral examinations, the ‘defence’ is often explicitly celebratory. Alternatively, if oral
examinations occur in camera, the post-viva celebration is part of the rite of passage - a student has
become a researcher. At UK and Irish universities, the post-viva event brings the discipline community
together. In Sydney, this would improve the student experience in that HDR students frequently report a
strong sense of isolation. Academic activities that bring the students together can go a long way to
resolving such isolation. Increasing the sense of community amongst our HDR students will also contribute
significantly to improving our achievement in the intellectual climate aspects of the PREQ and SREQ, an
area where the University consistently underperforms.

23 Crossouard, B. 2011. The doctoral viva voce as a cultural practice: the gendered production of academic
Quality and equality in British PhD assessment. Quality Assurance in Education 11:64-72; Powell, S., and H.
A key aspect of success in oral examinations is preparation and training\textsuperscript{25}. The University of Sydney has offered oral examination pathways for HDR theses since 2015, but very few students outside of FEIT have taken advantage of this opportunity. Anecdotal evidence from Post-Graduate Coordinators suggest that this is, at least partly, due to the students not feeling prepared and supported to undertake an oral examination. The academic literature describes a range of possible development opportunities to help students reach their potential in oral examinations (e.g.\textsuperscript{23}). In response to the reviews described above and the intervention of the Quality Assurance Agency, British universities have invested significantly in helping their candidates prepare for the viva. In almost all of the development activities, the training is focused on boosting student understanding of the aim of the viva and how best to present their candidature in a way that answers the examiners’ questions. Implementing such training here would also further help Sydney PhD candidates more clearly meet the graduate qualities (see section 3.4) as well as better prepare them for post-PhD instances in which oral exposition is a fundamental component.

3.1b Perceptions of bias

A strong theme of the Strategy is to improve the culture of the University, with a focus on respectful interactions and removing biases - explicit and subconscious. In considering reforms to any process, especially one as valued as the PhD examination, it is critical for us to consider whether bias may appear and how it may be countered. Whilst there is significant and substantial evidence that gender bias does exist in university employment decisions (e.g.\textsuperscript{26}), academic publishing (e.g.\textsuperscript{27}) and grant success (e.g.\textsuperscript{28}), there is no evidence in the literature for gender bias in respect of PhD examination outcomes. In the countries that have the greatest use of oral examinations e.g. the UK, increased emphasis on the quality of the examination and the significant work done in universities to remove gender bias (e.g Athena Swan) may mean that the extent of gender/identity-based discrimination is being reduced. Similarly for racial bias, there is no apparent evidence in the mainstream academic literature of any racial bias being a factor in oral examinations. As with any other activity of the University, a lack of tolerance for any form of discriminatory behaviour, a commitment to the cultural values of the University and support for our staff managing and sharing oral examinations will be likely to reduce the impact of any racial bias being present. Obviously, some cultural traditions lend themselves to oral examinations so preparing candidates from, or working in, such traditions may well be less challenging than those cultures where hierarchical structures are more rigidly enforced than in Australia. Again, the University is already making advances in embedding cultural sensitivities in consideration of changes to practice. The problem of bullying is more insidious. One person's 'robust dialogue' may be another's ‘verbal attack'. This issue has been addressed in reviews of the oral examination. Prior to the last few years of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, most British vivas were done with only an external and internal examiner; with the internal examiner filling the role of neutral chair as well as being an examiner. The older literature recounts student experiences of oral examinations that were clearly more domineering the necessary\textsuperscript{29}. This conflicted dimension of internal examiner and “manager” of the oral examination\textsuperscript{30} has largely been removed by the use of a neutral Chair/Convener to protect the student and examination, thus allowing the internal examiner to focus on performing the proper role of


examining the candidate. Leading universities overseas and the Go8 institutions utilising oral examinations have clearly identified policies for Chairs of Examination/Convenors to properly manage the examination with the intent of ensuring a respectful and appropriate examination procedure. Our existing Thesis and Examination Procedures require a neutral chair to run oral examinations.

Given the above, it is likely that a wider implementation of oral examinations is not likely to be discriminatory and the fact that Sydney is committed to improving our culture, means that delivering an oral examination for the PhD is not likely to lead to examination outcomes based on prejudice instead of academic excellence.

3.1c English as a Second Language
The expansion of universities in recent generations has been underpinned by internationalisation and the growth in numbers of international students. Research students are no different. For many of the students, the drivers for choosing a university to study for a PhD are the academic reputation of the institute concerned and the opportunity to be awarded a degree for work done at an English-speaking university. The academic literature exploring the issue of PhD students with English as a second language (ESL) in oral examinations is thin as best. Carter describe the experiences of students in a New Zealand University. The students reported increasing anxiety around the examination event, but did support the requirement for an oral examination

"endorsing it as a final confirmation of doctoral success in the English language."

As with other issues of potential bias in academic activities, the key means for minimising anxiety and simultaneously assuring the best quality of student experience is preparation of the student and proper training of the Chair/Convener. This is the strategy of leading UK and Irish universities, and it is worth noting that of the 112900 HDR enrolments in the UK in 2016, 43% were international (made up of 13% from the EU and 30% from non-EU) and all of these are examined using an oral. In the Group of Eight, Sydney has the smallest proportion of its HDR cohort being international (22%) with the rest of the group ranging between 30% (Adelaide) to 45% (Monash) of their HDR cohorts being international. With careful development of students and appropriate training of Chairs/Convenors, delivering quality oral examination experience to ESL students is achievable, especially if the ESL students can take advantage of training and mock oral examination as part of high-quality training programmes alongside high-quality supervision. Such an approach has been seen to be very valuable by ESL students in preparing for an oral examination, in addition to conference and seminar presentations helping them enhance communication skills.

At this point it is worth noting that our Graduate Qualities for the PhD explicitly state that our research graduates will have high levels of oral communication skills, and our medium of instruction is English. Conducting an oral examination of PhD candidates in English is not only possible, it is probably essential.

3.2 Integrity Issues
Increasingly, HDR students are publishing the work soon as they are able. This benefits the student as a first step on the 3-Ps (prestige, promotion and payment) pathway as well as helping the supervisor(s) and the University through enhanced publication exposure - the Faculty of Science at the University of

31 *Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015*
33 *Universities UK: Facts and Figures 2016*
35 for some HDR candidates in language disciplines, it may be appropriate for examination to be conducted at least in part, the language other than English (*Thesis and Examination Policy 2015*)
Sydney estimates that the vast majority of papers produced by the faculty have HDR student input. Our policies and procedures for HDR theses permit the incorporation of previously published material into theses and the Director – Graduate Research has produced guidelines and template attribution statements to help students fairly represent co-authored work in their theses. Some recent theses, currently under consideration by the Research Integrity Office at the University, illustrate that this process may not be enough in that theses are still being produced that contain plagiarised material. At the University, examiner’s reports have identified a desire to discuss issues around a student’s contribution to multi-authored paper(s) in conjunction with work presented in the thesis; our current examination process makes this cumbersome at best. Examiners usually articulate a need to critically discern the relationship between the thesis and papers, and in particular the student’s role in such papers. It is worth noting that these concerns are usually about clarification rather than raising an integrity risk. Denying that such integrity risks are currently minimised would however, be foolish and it would be remiss of the University not to explore ways of further reducing them. Allowing examiners to have a direct conversation with PhD candidates about publications incorporated into theses may well reduce the number of investigations or correctly identify issues worthy of deeper inquiry. In either eventuality, the integrity risks to the University are better managed. Moreover, the fact that students and supervisors will know they will face an oral examination where authorship and intellectual ownership will be discussed is likely to reduce the desire to engage in inappropriate behaviour – the possibility of being caught is usually a pretty good deterrent.

There is another integrity issue that the University must face. Whilst plagiarised work may well be detected using similarity checking software, the creation of de novo text in a thesis by parties other than the student may pose significant challenges for universities. Ghost writing, or contract cheating, in written assignments is a major concern globally. Whilst the issue of writing a thesis compared to an undergraduate essay mean that contract-cheating ‘essay mills’ do not focus on PhD theses, there are a few web-based providers willing to do so. Indeed, one investigator has identified entities in the Indian sub-continent advertising that a 75000 word thesis can be procured for as little as GB£750 (AUD1500) (Figure 1). A simple google search using the terms “thesis writing essay price” will prove illustrative as to the scale of the potential supplies of contract cheated material. The sheer size of the undergraduate cohorts and the need to support coursework at Sydney means that the more reliable techniques for foiling contract-cheating, i.e. wholly hand-written or oral final examinations, are not feasible; instead effort is being directed to technological solutions such as Turnitin. In the case of HDR theses, oral examinations can be both time efficient and accurate in determining the actual extent of the student’s contribution to the work presented in the thesis. The capacity for an examiner to engage the student in conversation on a deep intellectual level will quickly reveal the student’s ownership of the concepts and activity reported on the thesis.

The reputational risk to the University of some of our HDR students graduating on the basis of theses (or parts thereof) not written by them is potentially very large. The use of oral examination for all HDR candidatures will identify the students’ contribution to the work presented in the thesis and will significantly reduce our integrity risks.

---

37 Faculty of Science submission to the Research Scholarships Strategic Review Committee, May 2018.
38 https://sydney.edu.au/students/hdr-research-skills/theses-including-publications.html
Figure 1: How much does it does to buy a PhD? Infographic from tomlancaster.co.uk
(http://thomaslancaster.co.uk/blog/buy-an-phd-essay-mills-and-contract-cheating-pricing-infographic)
3.3 Identifying aspects of the graduate qualities
In August 2017, the Academic Board endorsed the Graduate Qualities for the PhD as an expression of what may be expected from our PhD graduates. For the sake of clarity, these graduate qualities are reproduced below in Table 3. Current thesis examination practices at the University focus exclusively on the work presented in the thesis, rather than the student that did the work and produced the thesis.

Fundamentally, there is no attempt to assess oral communication skills. The AQF defines, amongst the skills described as those of a PhD graduate

“...communication skills to explain and critique theoretical propositions, methodologies and conclusions * communication skills to present cogently a complex investigation of originality or original research for external examination against international standards and to communicate results to peers and the community”41

This definition means that we need to assess other avenues of communication, rather than just the thesis.

Table 3. Graduate Qualities for the PhD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PhD qualities</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deep expertise</td>
<td>To possess expert, world standard knowledge in an area of specialisation, a mastery of relevant research methods and the capability to contribute to scholarship and knowledge discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader skills:</td>
<td>To display high level capabilities in critical thinking and problem solving and a commitment to lifelong learning and discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Critical thinking and problem solving</td>
<td>To have excellent oral and written communication skills relevant to specialist and general audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communication (oral and written)</td>
<td>To evaluate and utilise contemporary digital tools, resources and technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Information/digital literacy</td>
<td>To be innovative and creative in response to novel problems, and to be willing to take risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inventiveness</td>
<td>To display high level capabilities in disseminating research, and build understanding of own research in a broader context by participating in engagement with end-users of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Engagement</td>
<td>To plan, manage and deliver research projects effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project planning and delivery</td>
<td>Cultural competence To display high levels of cultural competence and embody best practice with regard to cultural competence in research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary effectiveness</td>
<td>To work effectively in interdisciplinary settings to develop broader perspective, innovative vision and the capacity to work effectively within national and international research and innovation systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, ethical, personal identity</td>
<td>To exercise integrity, confidence and resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>To be professionally and socially responsible and make a positive contribution to society; Recognise the implications of own research in a broader societal context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By allowing examiners to challenge a candidate in an oral examination, we can be more confident that all parties will have a greater understanding of a PhD student’s performance in many more dimensions than our current practice.

3.4 Duration of examination times and number of examiners
In a detailed analysis by the Director - Graduate Research, the number of examiners was identified as a key challenge for the University in reducing the time taken examinations to lead to a successful

41 Australian Qualifications Framework 2013
conclusion. Whilst some of the difficulties in examination times may be resolved by staff and faculties exhibiting greater compliance with policies, this will not gain us that much time. There are two major problems with our current HDR thesis examination system. The first issue with our requirement for three examiners identified was that supervisors often struggle to identify a relevant third examiner, leading to delays in nominating examiners; this was proposed as a causal explanation for the observation that examination times lie outside the control of students, supervisors or faculties, thus making completion, with subsequent impact on research block grants and resource consumption. Importantly, examiners to discuss the thesis and the candidate, it may well be possible to reduce differences of opinion. In an analysis of examiners’ reports Golding et al. noted that examiners were more likely to give consistent recommendations in oral examinations, including non-award decisions, compared to the more standard Australian system. The skill of a Chair of Examination/Convener of an oral examination in remaining neutral but steering consideration through effective chairing of the discussion will be vital in helping examiners come to a consistent and coherent recommendation. The need for a third examiner to help resolve conflicting reports is therefore reduced and high-quality examination experiences can be delivered using two examiners if an oral examination is used.

The University of Sydney currently, and significantly, underperforms in its proportion of HDR candidates completing within the requisite time limits. Since the University switched from reporting completions as submission to reporting as award, examination times now contribute directly to counts of over-time completion, with subsequent impact on research block grants and resource consumption. Importantly, examination times lie outside the control of students, supervisors or faculties, thus making addressing examination times much less tractable than other challenges in candidature. Current policy asks examiners to return a report in six weeks and in theory, a recalcitrant examiner that has not submitted a report to reporting as award, examination times now contribute directly to counts of over-time completion, with subsequent impact on research block grants and resource consumption. Importantly, examination times lie outside the control of students, supervisors or faculties, thus making addressing examination times much less tractable than other challenges in candidature. Current policy asks examiners to return a report in six weeks and in theory, a recalcitrant examiner that has not submitted a report by 12 - 16 weeks should be replaced. The administrative unit responsible for management of thesis examinations commits significant personnel resources to following up with examiners but often to little avail. In an oral examination system, the examiner agrees to an examination date determined as X weeks after receipt of the examination; there should be no more than a few days post-examination to finalise an award recommendation. Implementation of an oral examination system would reduce examination times from a modal three months to 7 weeks - a near 50% reduction; a prediction borne out by experiences at UQ and UWA. Such a reduction in examination times will improve the student experience help with employment opportunities and provide significant efficiency dividends.

43 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences HDR Supervisors workshop, 8th June 2018.
44 Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015
46 Report to University Executive, 29th March 2018.
47 Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015
3.5 Logistical issues

3.5a In person or Video/Online conferencing

In most of the jurisdictions utilising oral examinations, viva voce or thesis defences, the examination process is done in person. This is often due to tradition, geographical proximity and/or a culture of external examining at all academic levels. Australian universities face two problems in attempting to use international examiners for oral examinations; those of distance and time differences. International travel to bring examiners to Sydney obviously has associated cost and carbon footprint issues and so should be avoided. The alternative option is to use video/online meeting tools, such as Zoom. Here, the technology is now reliable enough for us to consider using this technology for examinations, but the geographical issue of time zones is still present. Hong Kong University and the University of Auckland each have attempted to resolve these two problems by having examiners email in their questions for the oral. This is not efficient. The examiner cannot resolve his/her doubts or queries (see section 2) by talking to the student, but instead still has to prepare a significant discursive report as well as questions that will be asked by members of the examination committee. So, the examiner has to not only raise pertinent questions, but also has to produce a series of model answers that can guide the examining committee as to the usefulness of the candidate’s responses. So in the absence of bringing examiners in to do an examination in person, I recommend that we use Zoom as an alternative to flying examiners in to conduct in person examinations.
4. Options for Change

Here I consider the benefits and disadvantages of the key proposed changes compared to the alternative of continuing unchanged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Continue unchanged</td>
<td>Familiarity</td>
<td>Reduced opportunities for substantial reduction in examination times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal disruption</td>
<td>Reduced opportunities to assess graduate qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost structure not changed</td>
<td>No change in integrity risk, particularly for contract cheating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use an oral component in</td>
<td>Improved student performance through better guidance in examinations</td>
<td>Scheduling is more complex than current practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thesis examinations</td>
<td>Reputational gain by having leading experts interact / visit</td>
<td>Possibility for negative interactions among examination participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater development of communication skills</td>
<td>More investment in staff development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can identify authorship and integrity issues to much greater extent</td>
<td>Need to communicate changes to staff and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater participation of the student in the examination process, leading to better outcomes</td>
<td>More investment in preparing students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced extent of corrections</td>
<td>Budgetary and carbon impact of bringing examiners to Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced number of non-award recommendations arising from confusions rather than poor theses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can quickly resolve examiner disagreement (in most cases)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Much greater celebratory aspect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved community cohesion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral Chair of Examination means transparency of process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Much reduced examination times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faster completions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familiar process – fundamental part of Honours examinations at Sydney (not all faculties)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Change to two examiners</td>
<td>Reduced examination times</td>
<td>Without oral examination, it is possible that there may be insufficient evidence to guide award decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop and deliver training for staff and students in respect of oral examinations</td>
<td>Better practices in examination</td>
<td>Cost and staff resources in developing teaching materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better candidate preparation</td>
<td>Cultural change for staff and students to embrace training needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidates better aware of Graduate Qualities for the PhD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Quality Committee endorse changes to the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 to:

(1) require full-time PhD and other Doctorates by Research candidates to complete within 16 research periods and part-time candidates to complete within 32 research periods;
(2) require full-time PhD and other Doctorates by Research candidates to submit their thesis within 14 research periods and part-time candidates to submit their thesis within 28 research periods;
(3) require full-time Master’s by Research candidates to complete within eight research periods and part-time candidates to complete within 16 research periods;
(4) require full-time Master’s by Research candidates to submit their thesis within seven research periods and part-time candidates to submit their thesis within 14 research periods;
(5) establish an overall candidature time limit of 12 years; and
(6) remove reference to specific English Language Proficiency requirements and relocate to Admission Standards document.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Timely higher degree by research (HDR) completions are both a driver of funding efficiency success and a proxy for the quality of a university’s PhD program. An ‘on-time completion’ occurs when a candidate has satisfied the requirements of their degree and lodged a final copy of the thesis to the University Library within four years (16 research periods) for full-time doctorates and two years (eight research periods) for full-time master’s by research. Increasing the University’s share of on-time HDR completions is increasingly important due to Commonwealth funding and reporting requirement changes initiated in 2017 and 2018. While initiatives are being developed by the DVC (Education) Portfolio and the University Executive Research Education Committee to address this issue, the University’s policy framework could be better structured to support an increase in timely HDR completions. Despite the importance of on-time completions, the University does not formally require HDR candidates to complete their degree within 16 or eight research periods (for doctorates and master’s respectively). Rather, the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (HDR Rule) requires candidates to submit their thesis within this timeframe, which does not allow for the examination process, corrections, and resubmittals of the thesis. Therefore, amendments to the HDR Rule are proposed to ensure that a completions requirement is specified in the rule. If approved, these changes will take effect from 1 January 2019, applying to students who enrol after this date. Due to significant anticipated reductions in RTP funding in the 2020 and 2021 grant years (resulting from a reporting date realignment of 2018 completions figures), it is critical that these changes to the HDR Rule are implemented prior to research period 1 2019 to provide policy support for initiatives to increase on-time thesis submissions and HDR completions (to support an increase in the University’s share of RTP from 2022).

CONTEXT

The University of Sydney 2016-20 Strategic Plan highlights ‘improved completion rates’ as part of its KPI for the ‘attract and invest in the best PhD students’ initiative, reflecting the emerging challenge the University faces in ensuring HDR candidates complete on-time. Pressure to improve HDR completions has also been exacerbated by the Federal Government’s adjustments to higher education research funding policies, as
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annual RTP returns are impacted (the over-time completion will eventually contribute to the RTP completions share, but not until the following year). Additionally, a lag in the University’s completions reporting to the Commonwealth will be caused by a reporting realignment resulting from the introduction of two new Higher Education Information Management System (HEIMS) data reporting elements (591 and 592). The University will need to improve the timeliness of completions to potentially increase RTP funding following the two year completions reporting transition from submission date to award date (during this time it is anticipated that there will be a significant reduction in Commonwealth RTP receipts). This need to increase timely completions will be emphasised further as the Commonwealth’s transitional funding arrangements for RBG will cease from 2021.

The numbers of over-time HDR candidatures are quite significant. As of May 2018, 12% (517) of HDR candidates students were over-time, while an additional 25.8% (1113) were highly likely (85% confidence) to go over-time. The majority of over-time HDR students are over-time by two or less research periods, highlighting the importance of allowing sufficient examination time by moving the thesis submission date forward. For instance, the graphs in attachment 2 highlight that if the University were to improve the completion times by two research periods during the window identified, 365 additional HDR completions (290 PhD and 75 research master’s) would be gained.

There are three main costs to faculties in supporting over-time candidates: the first are the direct project/academic costs of supporting the supervision of a student (an average of approximately $20,000 per student in 2018 for candidates without a scholarship), the second are the opportunity costs arising from students not being supervised as over-time students are using some of the available supervisory capacity, and the third is the direct University Economic Model (UEM) charge ($4,600 per annum) for an enrolled HDR student. Whilst this casts the student-supervisor relationship in a purely financial frame, we need to accept that our investment in HDR activities should be sustainable. These impacts will be felt by faculties as the financial consequences of over-time completions are not funded centrally. Expenditure of RTP income on over-time students is not permitted under RTP requirements, as the maximum of four years for full-time doctorates and two years for full-time research masters as specified in 1.6.5 of the Commonwealth Scholarships Guidelines (Research) 2017. It should also be noted that HEPs, if asked by the Department of Education and Training, should be able to demonstrate that over-time candidates are not supported by RTP funds.

The HDR rule states that a full-time HDR thesis candidate must submit their thesis for examination after no more than 8 research periods of enrolled candidature for master’s (clause 2.20(2)) and 16 research periods for research doctorates (clauses 3.20(1)(a) and 4.19(2)). It is proposed that these clauses are amended from ‘submission’ to ‘completion’ to ensure the expectation of completing within four years (full time) is specified in the rule. This change is necessary to provide policy support for initiatives to improve completion times and to formalise the ‘on-time’ completion requirement of four years within the University’s HDR governance provisions. Additionally, a requirement that a thesis is submitted by seven or 14 research periods (for masters and doctorates respectively) should also be formalised in the rule to ensure a shift toward on-time completions. The requirement to submit earlier would be required to complement the introduction of a completion time-limit in the HDR rule to allow sufficient time for the examination process. This amendment would require an effective communications strategy to support a shift in the culture of research thesis submission by 14 research periods for full time students and 28 research periods for part time candidates. Furthermore, the HDR Rule does not specify a time limit for completing a research degree. It is recommended that a new subclause (1.7A) is inserted in the HDR Rule that mandates an overall candidature time limit of 12 years for all RTP funded degrees. This requirement aligns with the maximum time limit established in 4.2 of the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014, however it will be 12 rather than 10 years. This maximum time limit is considered to be appropriate as research is unlikely to be current after this period.

The amendments to the HDR rule complement work that is already in progress to increase the proportion of timely HDR completions across the University. The University Executive Research Education Committee is working on initiatives for increasing HDR completions and will develop a list of actions for each faculty to implement that is aimed at improving the rates of timely completions by HDR students. This will be achieved through focusing on the range of possible causes at a faculty level and how different interventions can be applied. IAP and the DVC (Education) portfolio have also delivered an HDR predictive model to faculties, which has a high confidence in identifying students with a probability of going over-time (with various risk levels). Resulting in a two-pronged approach – working with faculties to deliver cohort based improvements,
while empowering faculties to address individual cases through the provision of predictive HDR completions data.

Additionally, an HDR examination time paper that identifies delays in the examination process has also been provided to the UE Research Committee and the Academic Board (and its relevant committees). This paper identifies both significant delays in in the examiner approval process and explores turnaround times in the thesis examination. As such, initiatives to ensure supervisors submit an examiner nomination form at least a month prior to the thesis submission are required, as a thesis cannot be distributed until confirmation of all three examiners has been provided. Work to improve examination times will not only have a positive impact on the student experience (through a reduction of examination waiting times), but will also ensure earlier RTP returns in future as well as earlier realisation of capacity for further HDR enrolments.

Furthermore, it is proposed that English language proficiency requirements are removed from the rule and placed in an Admissions Standard (see ‘Report of the Admissions Working Party/English Language Proficiency Requirements’ paper). The criteria and wording established in clauses 7.1 and 7.2 would remain unchanged. This is proposed to provide a clear location for all English language admissions requirements at the University. Currently this information is listed (with various scores for the same test) in two parts of the Coursework Policy, the HDR Rule, the Admissions website, the Admissions Concordance Table document, and the Faculty-specific English Language Requirements document. This has resulted in discrepancies across documents. For instance, English Language Proficiency test score conversions are not aligned between the various documents detailing admissions requirements. The HDR Rule and postgraduate subclause of the Coursework Policy set the minimum IELTS score at 6.5 and specifies a TOEFL paper-based score of 577, the Admissions Concordance Table sets the equivalent of an IELTS 6.5 as a TOEFL paper-based score of 565, while the undergraduate admissions subclause of the Coursework Policy lists this equivalent TOEFL score as 550. As such, these three different scores will need to be aligned to ensure consistency across degree-types. Removing the test results from the rule would support administrative simplification by making test conversions a procedural matter, as these scores are subject to change. Under this process, approval of the Academic Board would still be required to adjust any test score, however a change to the rule would not be required. These amendments would be accompanied by similar changes to the Coursework Policy, to align all equivalent test scores. Faculties would still be able to set higher test scores as required. The Deans Waiver in clause 7.2 would also be moved to the Academic Board’s Admissions Standard under the heading ‘Exceptional circumstances’.

CONSULTATION

The proposal to realign the University’s submission and completion timeframes was included in the HDR Examination Times discussion paper that went to:

- HDR Examinations Subcommittee (1 May meeting);
- Academic Quality Committee (8 May meeting);
- University Executive Research Education Committee (9 May meeting);
- Graduate Studies Committee (22 May meeting);
- University Executive Committee (as an attachment to the Completions Reporting paper) (14 June meeting).

In addition to the Academic Quality Committee, the proposed amendments in attachment 1 have been provided to HDR Examinations Subcommittee, Admissions Subcommittee, and Graduate Studies Committee, where the changes were endorsed subject to minor amendments which have been incorporated in the version of the HDR Rule provided in this paper. At the 3 October University Executive Research Education Committee meeting, it was proposed that the HDR Rule establishes a requirement whereby full-time candidature for the PhD and other Doctorates by Research should be completed within 4.5 years, rather than the four year requirement currently proposed. The paper and amendments will be resubmitted to the 7 November Research Education Committee meeting for further review and consultation. Additionally, the changes will be also be provided to the University Executive Research Committee, Academic Standards and Policy Committee, Academic Board, University Executive, and the Senate.
Non-Confidential
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PART 1 PRELIMINARY

1.1 Name of Rule

This is the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011.

1.2 Commencement

This Rule commences on 25 March 2011.

1.3 Statement of intent

This Rule deals with all higher degrees by research offered at the University. These are:

(a) Master’s degrees by research;
(b) Doctorates by research; and
(c) Higher Doctorates by research.

Note: This Rule should be read in conjunction with, but not subject to, any course resolutions applying to the degree.

1.4 Interpretation

(1) In this Rule:

applicant means an applicant for admission as a candidate for a higher degree by research.

Associate Dean means the Associate Dean of a faculty with authority for matters relating to higher degrees by research within the faculty or the Deputy Chairperson of a Board of Studies or a person appointed by the Dean to have authority for matters relating to higher degrees by research within the faculty.

Board of Studies means an academic body with the same authority in relation to the supervision of an award course or courses as a faculty, except that it is headed by a Chair rather than a Dean.

candidate means a candidate for a higher degree by research.

completion occurs when:

- the faculty is satisfied that the final version of the thesis meets the requirements arising from the examination; and
- the candidate complies with any conditions to which certification is subject, including but not limited to the requirement to lodge a copy of the final thesis with the University Library.

Note: See Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015, particularly clause 23.
cotutelle agreement means an agreement between the University and another university or institution that:

(a) permits joint candidature in the Doctor of Philosophy; and
(b) allows a candidate to receive a doctorate from the University and from the other university or institution, each testamur acknowledging the circumstances under which the award was made.

course resolutions means resolutions made by the Academic Board in accordance with clauses 2.1 and 3.1

Note: The Doctor of Philosophy is offered by the University, not by individual faculties. Accordingly, there is no power for faculties or the Academic Board to make course resolutions for the Doctor of Philosophy.

Dean means the Dean of a Faculty, the Head of School and Dean (University school) of a University school or the Chair of a Board of Studies.

delegate means an officer, employee or committee of the University, or any other person or entity to whom or to which, Senate has made a delegation of power.

Doctorate by research means a degree with the word “doctor” in the title comprising a minimum of two-thirds research that is approved by the Academic Board.

Note: The Academic Board will not approve a Doctorate by research unless it complies with the Australian Qualifications Framework.

Faculty means the relevant Faculty, University school or Board of Studies.

full-time candidature means a candidature in which the student works on the requirements for the degree for a minimum of 35 – 40 hours per week for 48 weeks per year or as stipulated by the Faculty.

good cause means circumstances beyond the reasonable control of a student, which may include serious ill health or misadventure.

higher doctorate has the meaning given to it by clause 5.1 of this Rule.

Master’s by research means a degree with the word “Master” in the title comprising a minimum of two-thirds research that is approved by the Academic Board.

Note: The Academic Board will not approve a Master’s by research unless it complies with the Australian Qualifications Framework.

part-time candidature means a candidature in which the student works on the requirements for the degree for a proportion of the period specified for a full-time candidature over a proportionately longer time.
Postgraduate Coordinator means the member of academic staff with overall responsibility for the planning and coordination of postgraduate research studies within a faculty, school or University school.

Progress Policy means the *Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015*.

progress plan means a progress plan developed in accordance with the *Progress Policy*.

research period means an enrolment period set by the University and published on its website.

Note: Research periods are published on the University’s website at: [http://sydney.edu.au/study/study-dates.html](http://sydney.edu.au/study/study-dates.html)

Review Panel means a panel established in accordance with the *Progress Policy*.

school means the academic unit, however so called, responsible for a student’s higher degree by research candidature. It may be called a discipline within the University. School delegations may be exercised by faculties.

semester means a duration of time equal to any two research periods.

student means a person who is currently admitted to candidature in an award course of the University.

Supervisor means, in relation to a higher degree by research student, a person appointed to discharge the responsibilities set out in the *Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013*. For the purpose of this Rule, the generic term supervisor(s) will be used to include research supervisors, co-ordinating supervisors, or auxiliary supervisors.

thesis means the whole of the assessable work submitted by a student for examination as required by the *Thesis & Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015*.

(2) Unless the contrary appears, a provision in this Rule that specifies matters that are to be or may be considered in relation to a determination or other decision does not imply that they are the only matters to be considered.

(3) A delegate of the Senate is not authorised to sub-delegate (by way of an agency or in any other way) any or all of the delegate’s delegated functions to another person or group of persons.

(4) Delegates more senior in the lines of accountability to a delegate named in this Rule, may exercise a delegation conferred on that named delegate.

Example: A Dean may exercise a delegation conferred on an Associate Dean. An Associate Dean may exercise a delegation conferred on a Postgraduate Coordinator.

(5) A heading to a Part or Schedule is a provision of this Rule. Other headings are not provisions of this Rule, but the number of a section or subsection is a provision of this Rule even if it is in a heading.

(6) A note, marginal note, footnote or endnote is not a provision of this Rule.
(7) A reference to a policy or procedures includes a reference to that policy or those procedures as amended from time to time, and to any replacement policy or procedures which may be adopted in substitution for them.

(8) A reference to a committee includes a reference to any restructured or replacement committee to which the functions or responsibilities of the original committee are reassigned.

1.5 Authorities and responsibilities

(1) Authorities and responsibilities for the functions set out in this Rule are also defined in the *University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016*.

(2) The procedures for consideration of, and deadlines for submission of, proposals for new and amended award courses will be determined by the Academic Board.

1.6 University may change courses and units of study

(1) Despite any policy, or the course resolutions and any other provision of the agreement between a student and the University, the University:

(a) is not obliged to offer a particular course or unit of study in any academic year; and

(b) is not liable to a student for not offering a particular course or unit of study in a particular academic year.

1.7 Overall requirements

(1) The University will not admit a person to a course unless the person:

(a) is eligible for admission to the course;

(b) applies for admission in accordance with this Rule and the course resolutions;

(c) accepts an offer made by the University for admission to the course;

(d) completes, to the satisfaction of the University, all requirements for enrolment in the course; and

(e) meets the University’s English language requirements.

1.7A Time limits

A student must meet all the requirements for a course:

(a) within the times periods specified in this Rule; and

(b) in any event, within 12 years of their first enrolment in the course.

*Note:* See clause 2.18A in relation to Masters by Research, clause 3.18A in relation to doctorates other than the Doctor of Philosophy, and clause 4.17A in relation to the Doctor of Philosophy.
1.8 No right to admission

Nothing in this Rule confers a right on a person to be admitted to candidature for a higher degree by research or imposes a duty on the University to admit, or offer to admit, a person to candidature for a higher degree by research.

PART 2 MASTER’S BY RESEARCH

2.1 Course resolutions

(1) The Academic Board may, on the recommendation of the Faculty, prescribe for a Master’s degree by research, standards relating to:
   (a) admission requirements;
   (b) course requirements
   (c) candidature; and
   (d) examination.

2.2 Application of this Part

(1) This Part applies to:
   (a) the Master of Philosophy; and
   (b) other Master’s degrees with a research component of at least two thirds of the total student load for the degree.

2.3 Eligibility for admission to candidature

(1) Subject to sub-clauses 2.3(2) and (3) and to admission requirements specified in the course resolutions, to be eligible for admission by an Associate Dean to candidature for a Master's degree, an applicant must:
   (a) hold or have completed all the academic requirements for:
      (i) a Master’s degree by coursework or research; or
      (ii) a Bachelor's degree; or
      (iii) a qualification equivalent to a Bachelor's degree; and
   (b) meet other criteria for admission as specified in the course resolutions.

(2) An Associate Dean may admit to candidature an applicant who does not meet the requirements of sub-clause 2.3(1), provided that the applicant holds a qualification or qualifications that, in the opinion of the Faculty Graduate Studies Committee or relevant faculty committee, are equivalent to those prescribed in sub-clause 2.3(1).

(3) The Associate Dean may impose on a student admitted to candidature pursuant to sub-clause 2.3(2) such conditions as the Associate Dean considers appropriate.
2.4 Application for admission to candidature

(1) An applicant for admission to candidature for a Master's degree must submit to the relevant Faculty:

(a) if required by the course resolutions, a proposed course of advanced study and research, approved by the Associate Dean of the school in which the work is to be undertaken;

(b) satisfactory evidence of the applicant's eligibility for admission; and

(c) a statement certifying the applicant’s understanding that, subject to this Rule, if the candidature is successful, his or her thesis will be lodged with the Director, University Libraries and made available for use.

2.5 Probationary admission to candidature

(1) Where provision is made for probationary admission in the course resolutions, the Associate Dean may admit a student to candidature for a Master's degree on a probationary basis for a period not exceeding four research periods.

(2) On completion by the student of any probationary period imposed pursuant to sub-clause 2.5(1), the Postgraduate Coordinator will review the student’s work and recommend to the Associate Dean that:

(a) the student's candidature be confirmed; or

(b) the student be required to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

(3) After considering a recommendation made by the Postgraduate Coordinator in accordance with sub-clause 2.5(2), the Associate Dean may:

(a) confirm the student’s candidature; or

(b) require the student to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

Note: See clause 2.13 for details of the ‘show good cause’ process.

(4) The candidature of a student that is confirmed in accordance with subclause 2.5(3)(a) will be considered by the University to have commenced on the date of the student’s probationary admission to candidature.

2.6 Credit for previous studies

(1) Subject to sub-clause 2.6(2), a student who, at the date of admission to candidature, has completed at least two research periods as a candidate for a higher degree by research in any Faculty of the University may be permitted by the Associate Dean to receive credit for all or any part of the higher degree candidature.

(2) The Associate Dean may grant credit in accordance with sub-clause 2.6(1), provided that the student’s higher degree candidature was:

(a) a course of full-time or part-time advanced study and research;

(b) pursued by the student under the supervision of a supervisor appointed by the relevant Faculty, University school or Board of Studies;
(c) directly related to the student’s proposed course of advanced study for the Master’s degree; and

(d) the student has discontinued his or her candidature in the higher degree.

(3) Subject to sub-clause 2.6(4), and to the course resolutions, a student who, at the date of admission to candidature, has completed at least six months as a candidate for a higher degree at another university or institution may be permitted by the Associate Dean to receive credit for all or any part of the higher degree candidature.

(4) The Associate Dean may grant credit in accordance with sub-clause 2.6(3), provided that:

(a) at the time of admission to the higher degree by research at the other university or institution, the student held academic qualifications equivalent to those set out in clause 2.3;

(b) the higher degree candidature was:
   (i) a course of full-time or part-time advanced study and research;
   (ii) pursued by the student under the supervision of a supervisor appointed by the other university or institution; and
   (iii) directly related to the student’s proposed course of advanced study for the Master’s degree; and

(c) the student has discontinued his or her candidature in the higher degree at the other university or institution.

(5) Where the course resolutions specify the completion of coursework as part of the requirements of the award, and subject to the course resolutions and the Coursework Policy 2014, the Associate Dean may grant a student credit for previously completed coursework.

2.7 Limit on credit for previous studies

The amount of credit for previous studies that may be granted to a student in accordance with clause 2.6 is limited by the following requirements:

(a) the combined duration of the student’s previous higher degree candidature and the Master’s candidature must meet the requirements set out in clauses 2.18A, 2.19 and 2.20 of this Rule;

(b) any period of discontinued, suspended or lapsed candidature (as set out in clauses 2.14 to 2.16 of this Rule) must comply with this Rule and with standards set by the Academic Board; and

(c) no student who has been granted credit may present a thesis for examination less than:
   (i) six months, for a full-time student; or
   (ii) twelve months, for a part-time student;
   following admission to candidature at the University.
2.8 Control of candidature

(1) All candidates for a Master’s degree are required to undertake their candidature wholly under the control of the University.

(2) The Associate Dean may require a student to provide a statement from his or her employer acknowledging that the candidature is under the exclusive control of the University.

2.9 Other studies during candidature

(1) A student must satisfactorily complete any training required by the course resolutions, the Associate Dean, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) or Supervisor, including units of study, lectures, seminars, workshops, online modules, non-award courses, or practical work.

   Note: In accordance with this Rule, a Master’s degree must comprise a minimum of two-thirds research.

(2) Failure to satisfactorily complete training documented in the student’s progress plan satisfactorily may be considered as evidence of unsatisfactory progress.

(3) A Faculty may decline to examine a thesis if the student has not satisfactorily completed training documented in the progress plan.

2.10 Supervision

The Postgraduate Coordinator will appoint suitably qualified supervisors for each student undertaking a Master’s degree by research, in accordance with policy for supervision determined by the Academic Board.

Note: See also Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013

2.11 Location of candidature

(1) Subject to the annual approval of the supervisors and Postgraduate Coordinator, students will pursue their candidature:

   (a) within the University, including its research stations and teaching hospitals;
   (b) on fieldwork, including in the field or in libraries, museums or other repositories;
   (c) within industrial laboratories or research institutions or other institutions considered by the Postgraduate Coordinator to provide adequate facilities for that candidature; or
   (d) within a professional working environment.

(2) Throughout the course of his or her candidature, a student will attend the University for such:

   (a) face-to-face consultation with his or her supervisors;
   (b) School and Faculty or University school seminars; and
   (c) coursework or other studies required under clause 2.9 of this Rule;
as specified annually by the Postgraduate Coordinator.

(3) Subject to sub-clause 2.11(4), a student who pursues his or her candidature outside Australia must complete a minimum of two research periods of candidature within the University prior to submitting his or her thesis for examination.

(4) For the purposes of sub-clause 2.11(3), the two research periods of candidature to be completed within the University may be completed:
   (a) at any time during the candidature; and
   (b) continuously or in several non-consecutive periods.

2.12 Progress

(1) At intervals no longer than one year, Postgraduate Coordinators must require students to:
   (a) provide evidence of satisfactory progress in their candidature (including any required progress and review forms); and
   (b) participate in a progress review interview.

(2) Satisfactory progress will be assessed by a Review Panel in accordance with the Progress Policy.

(3) On the basis of any evidence provided by the student and any information obtained during the interview, the Postgraduate Coordinator may determine that the student:
   (a) has demonstrated satisfactory or marginal progress, and specify the conditions of candidature to apply the following year; or
   (b) has demonstrated unsatisfactory progress, and:
      (i) allow the student to continue to be enrolled with conditions, including a supplementary progress review in accordance with the Progress Policy; or
      (ii) recommend to the Associate Dean that the student be asked to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

(4) When determining the conditions of candidature to apply the following year, the Postgraduate Coordinator must indicate whether they are satisfied that the proposed supervision arrangements are satisfactory.

(5) After considering a recommendation made by the Postgraduate Coordinator in accordance with sub-clause paragraph 2.12(3)(b)(ii), the Associate Dean may:
   (a) allow the student’s candidature to continue and specify the conditions of candidature to apply the following year; or
   (b) require the student to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

2.13 Students may be required to show good cause

(1) An Associate Dean may require a student to show good cause:
   (a) following a progress review, in accordance with paragraph subclauses 2.5(3)(b) or 2.12(5)(b);
(b) if the student has not submitted his or her thesis for examination by the latest date to do so as required by clause 2.20; or
(c) at any other time, on the recommendation of the Postgraduate Co-ordinator.

(2) A student who is required to show good cause will be sent a notice that:

(a) requires the student to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature, on or before a specified date;
(b) states why the student is being asked to show good cause;
(c) sets out the actions that may be taken in respect of the candidature; and
(d) advises the student of his or her right to seek independent advice and assistance in preparing his or her response.

(3) The Associate Dean must give the student a reasonable opportunity to make written submissions about the matter.

(4) If, after considering any submissions made by the student, progress reports, any reports by the supervisors or Postgraduate Coordinator, and any other relevant information, the Associate Dean forms the opinion that the student has shown good cause, the Associate Dean will permit the student to continue the candidature.

(5) If, after considering the information referred to in sub-clause 2.13(4), the Associate Dean forms the opinion that the student has not shown good cause, the Associate Dean must, by written notice setting out his or her reasons:

(a) terminate the student’s candidature; or
(b) impose conditions or restrictions on the continuation of the student’s candidature.

**Note.** For review of these decisions see *University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.*

(6) In addition to the decision made under sub-clause 2.13(4) or sub-clause 2.13(5), the Associate Dean might also offer the student the option to transfer to another course within the Faculty for which the student is eligible. The Associate Dean may impose conditions or restrictions on that offer.

(7) A person whose candidature for a higher degree by research has been terminated by an Associate Dean in accordance with sub-clause 2.13(5)(a) will not be permitted to re-enrol in that candidature.

(8) Where a person whose candidature for a higher degree by research has been terminated by an Associate Dean in accordance with sub-clause 2.13(5)(a), that person may be excluded by the Associate Dean from applying for admission to a higher degree by research within the Faculty for the longer period of:

(a) at least two academic years; or
(b) if the person is applying for a Research Training Program place, the period of time until the person is entitled to the maximum period allowed for the course under the Research Training Program.

**Note:** As at the date of this Rule, detailed information about entitlement for Research Training Program can be found in Research Training Program: Conditions of Grant, which can be found at https://www.education.gov.au/research-training-program.
2.14 Discontinuation of candidature

(1) Subject to this clause and the course resolutions, a student in a course may, by notice to the Faculty, discontinue their enrolment in the course or in one or more units of study.

(2) The notice must be in a form approved or accepted by the Faculty.

(3) A student's enrolment in the course or the relevant units of study will be treated as discontinued from the date of the notice, unless they produces evidence that:
   (a) the discontinuation occurred at an earlier date; and
   (b) there was good reason why the application could not be made at an earlier time.

(4) A student who discontinues enrolment in a course during their first year of enrolment in the course will not be permitted to re-enrol in that course unless:
   (a) the Associate Dean granted prior permission to re-enrol; or
   (b) the student applies for and gains a new admission to the course.

(5) A student may not discontinue enrolment in a course or a unit of study after the end of classes in that course or unit of study, except in accordance with paragraphs sub-clauses 2.14(3)(a) and (b).

2.15 Suspension of candidature

(1) Subject to the course resolutions and to any restrictions imposed on student visa holders by the Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000, a student in a course may, by notice to the Faculty, suspend their enrolment in the course:
   (a) for a maximum period of one year; or
   (b) with the approval of the Associate Dean, for a longer period.

(2) The notice must be in a form approved or accepted by the Faculty.

(3) At the end of the suspension period, the student must comply with any requirements notified by the Associate Dean for completing the course. Those requirements apply to the student, despite anything to the contrary in the course resolutions.

2.16 Lapse of candidature

(1) If a student does not enrol by the last census date for enrolment in each research period, and the student has not discontinued or sought approval to suspend enrolment, the student's candidature lapses.

(2) If a student's candidature in a course lapses, then, despite any contrary provision in this Rule, the student must apply for and gain a new admission to the course in order to re-enrol.
2.17 Return to candidature

(1) Subject to written advice from the Associate Dean, if a student returns to candidature after suspension the course requirements as in force at the time of the student’s return to candidature apply.

(2) The Associate Dean may, in writing, modify the application of the course resolutions with respect to a particular student’s return to candidature.

(3) A student whose candidature has been discontinued or lapsed must apply for and gain a new admission to the course in order to re-enrol. The course requirements in place at the time of the new admission apply.

2.18 Leave of absence

Subject to the course resolutions, a student may, with the approval of the Postgraduate Coordinator, take leave of absence from the course for a period less than one research period.

2.18A Maximum time for completion

(1) The provisions of this clause apply to all candidatures commenced on or after 1 January 2019.

(2) A student must complete a Master’s by Research by the end of the eighth research period after the research period in which they first enrolled.

(3) Any credit granted under clause 2.6 of this Rule will be included for the purposes of calculating research periods under subclause 2.18A(2).

(4) Subject to clause 1.7A, the relevant Associate Dean may extend the time for a student’s completion in exceptional circumstances.

2.19 Earliest date for submission of thesis for examination

Subject to clause 2.7 and this clause 2.19:

(a) a student may not submit a thesis for examination until he or she has completed at least four research periods of full-time enrolled candidature or at least 8 research periods of part-time enrolled candidature; and

(b) for the purposes of paragraph sub-clause 2.19(a), a student’s candidature will be considered to include any periods of credit granted under clause 2.6.

(c) the student must be enrolled at the time that the thesis is submitted for examination.

2.20 Latest date for submission of thesis for examination

(1) The following provisions apply to candidatures commenced before 1 January 2019.

(a) Subject to clause 2.7 and this clause 2.20, a student who has undertaken all of his or her candidature on a full-time basis must submit his or her thesis
thesis for examination after no more than eight research periods of enrolled candidature.

(i) for the purposes of sub-clause 2.20(1)(a), a student’s candidature will be considered by the University to include any periods of credit granted under clause 2.6.

(ii) for the purposes of paragraph subclause (a)(i), a student’s candidature will be considered by the University to include any periods of credit granted under clause 2.6.

(d)(b) Subject to this clause, a student who has undertaken all of his or her candidature on a part-time basis must submit his or her thesis for examination after no more than 16 research periods of enrolled candidature.

(e)(c) Where a student has undertaken his or her candidature as a mixture of part-time candidature and full-time candidature, a part-time research period will be counted as the equivalent of one half of a full-time research period, and the student must submit his or her thesis for examination after no more than the equivalent of eight full-time research periods of enrolled candidature.

(f)(d) The Associate Dean may approve an extension of candidature with a latest date for submission of thesis for examination beyond the maximum period specified in this clause.

(e) The student must be enrolled at the time that the thesis is submitted for examination.

(2) The following provisions apply to candidatures commenced on or after 1 January 2019.

(a) Subject to clause 2.7 and this clause 2.20, a student who has undertaken all of their candidature on a full-time basis must submit their thesis for examination after no more than six seven research periods of enrolled candidature.

(b) Except with the approval of the relevant Associate Dean under subclause (2)(d), a student who has undertaken all of their candidature on a part-time basis must submit their thesis for examination after no more than 14 research periods of enrolled candidature.

(c) Where a student has undertaken their candidature as a mixture of part-time candidature and full-time candidature, a part-time research period will be counted as the equivalent of one half of a full-time research period, and the student must submit their thesis for examination after no more than the equivalent of eight full-time research periods of enrolled candidature.

(d) The Associate Dean may only approve an extension of the latest date for submission of a student’s thesis in exceptional circumstances.

(e) The student must be enrolled at the time that the thesis is submitted for examination.

(5)

2.21 Content of thesis

(1) At the end of his or her course of advanced study and research, the student must submit a thesis for examination in the form required by Academic Board policy or procedures and any applicable course resolutions.
(2) Subject to sub-clause 2.21(3), a student may not submit as his or her their thesis any work that has been presented for a degree or diploma at the University or at another university or institution.

(3) A student may submit work that has been presented for a degree or diploma at the University or at another university or institution where the work is submitted as part of the thesis, and the student has identified those parts of the thesis that have previously been presented for a degree or diploma.

(4) A student who undertook his or her their candidature in a language school in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences may:
   (a) submit a thesis written in English or in the target language determined by the school; or
   (b) where a school has specified by means of a Faculty resolution that it will consider applications to submit a thesis in a language other than English or the target language of the school, submit a thesis in another language approved by the school.

(5) Applications to submit a thesis in a language other than English or the target language of a school must be:
   (a) made by an applicant in writing; and
   (b) considered and determined by the Associate Dean (taking into account arrangements for supervision and examination);

prior to the commencement of candidature.

2.22 Form of thesis for examination

(1) A candidate must submit his or her their thesis for examination in the form required by the Academic Board.

(2) The thesis must be accompanied by a certificate from the co-ordinating supervisor stating whether, in the supervisors’ opinion, the form of presentation of the thesis is satisfactory.

(3) The thesis must also be accompanied by an abstract in a form prescribed by resolution of the Academic Board.

(4) Subject to this Rule, the student must submit with the thesis a statement certifying his or her their understanding that, if the candidature is successful, the thesis will be lodged with the University Librarian and made available for use.

2.23 Examination procedures

The examination of candidates for the degree of Master’s by research will be conducted in accordance with the course resolutions and with policies, procedures, standards and guidelines determined by the Academic Board.

2.24 Aegrotat and posthumous awards

Aegrotat and posthumous awards may be made in circumstances involving serious illness or death.
PART 3 DOCTORATES BY RESEARCH OTHER THAN THE DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

3.1 Course resolutions

(1) The Academic Board may, on the recommendation of the Faculty, prescribe for a Doctorate by research other than the Doctor of Philosophy, standards relating to:
   (a) admission requirements;
   (b) degree requirements;
   (c) candidature; and
   (d) examination.

3.2 Application and meaning of this Part

This Part applies to Doctorates by research other than the Doctor of Philosophy and Higher Doctorates.

3.3 Eligibility for admission to candidature

(1) Subject to sub-clauses 3.3(2) and (3) and to admission requirements specified in the course resolutions, to be eligible for admission by an Associate Dean to candidature for a Doctorate by research other than a Doctor of Philosophy, an applicant must:
   (a) hold or have completed all the academic requirements for:
      (i) a Master’s degree by research or higher qualification; or
      (ii) a Master’s degree by coursework including a research component equivalent to 25% of one year’s full-time enrolment; or
      (iii) a Bachelor’s degree with first or second class honours; or
      (iv) a Bachelor’s degree and either relevant professional experience or a portfolio of works as determined by the Faculty; and
   (b) meet other criteria for admission as specified in the course resolutions.

(2) An Associate Dean may admit to candidature an applicant who does not meet the requirements of sub-clause 3.3(1), provided that the applicant holds a qualification or qualifications that, in the opinion of the Faculty Graduate Studies Committee relevant faculty committee are equivalent to those prescribed in sub-clause 3.3(1).

(3) The Associate Dean may impose on a student admitted to candidature pursuant to sub-clause 3.3(2) such conditions as the Associate Dean considers appropriate.

3.4 Application for admission to candidature

(1) An applicant for admission to candidature for a Doctorate by research other than the Doctor of Philosophy must submit to the relevant Faculty:
(a) if required by the course resolutions, a proposed course of advanced study and research, approved by the Associate Dean, in consultation with the Postgraduate Coordinator of the school in which the work is to be undertaken;

(b) satisfactory evidence of the applicant’s eligibility for admission; and.

(c) a statement certifying the applicant’s understanding that, subject to this Rule, if the candidature is successful, his or her thesis will be lodged with the University Librarian and made available for use.

3.5 Probationary admission to candidature

(1) Where provision is made for probationary admission in the course resolutions, the Associate Dean may admit a student to candidature for a Doctorate other than a PhD on a probationary basis for a period not exceeding four research periods.

(2) On completion by the student of any probationary period imposed pursuant to sub-clause 3.5(1), the relevant Head of School or Postgraduate Coordinator will review the student’s work and recommend to the Associate Dean that:

(a) the student’s candidature be confirmed; or

(b) the student be required to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

(3) After considering a recommendation made by the relevant Head of School or Postgraduate Coordinator in accordance with sub-clause 3.5(2), the Associate Dean may:

(a) confirm the student’s candidature; or

(b) require the student to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

Note: See clause 3.13 for details of the ‘show good cause’ process.

(4) The candidature of a student that is confirmed in accordance with paragraph subclause 3.5(3)(a) will be considered by the University to have commenced on the date of the student’s probationary admission to candidature.

3.6 Credit for previous studies

(1) Subject to sub-clause 3.6(2), a student who, at the date of admission to candidature, has completed at least two research periods as a candidate for a higher degree by research in any Faculty of the University may be permitted by the Associate Dean to receive credit for all or any part of the higher degree candidature.

(2) The Associate Dean may grant credit in accordance with sub-clause 3.6(1), provided that the student’s previous higher degree candidature was:

(a) a course of full-time or part-time advanced study and research;

(b) pursued by the student under the supervision of a supervisor appointed by the relevant Faculty, University school or Board of Studies;

(c) directly related to the student’s proposed course of advanced study for the Doctoral degree; and
(d) the student has discontinued his or her candidature in the previous higher degree.

(3) Subject to sub-clause 3.6(4), a student who, at the date of admission to candidature, has completed at least six months as a candidate for a higher degree by research at another university or institution may be permitted by the Associate Dean to receive credit for all or any part of the previous higher degree candidature.

(4) The Associate Dean may grant credit in accordance with sub-clause 3.6(3), provided that:

(a) at the time of admission to the higher degree at the other university or institution, the student held academic qualifications equivalent to those set out in clause 3.3;

(b) the previous higher degree by research candidature was:
   (i) a course of full-time or part-time advanced study and research;
   (ii) pursued by the student under the supervision of a supervisor appointed by the other university or institution; and
   (iii) directly related to the student's proposed course of advanced study for the Doctoral degree by research; and

(c) the student has discontinued his or her candidature in the previous higher degree by research at the other university or institution.

(5) Where the course resolutions specify the completion of coursework as part of the requirements of the award, and subject to the course resolutions and the Coursework Policy 2014, the Associate Dean may grant a student credit for previously completed coursework.

3.7 Limit on credit for previous studies

(1) The amount of credit for previous studies that may be granted to a student in accordance with clause 3.6 is limited by the following requirements:

(a) the combined duration of the student's previous higher degree by research candidature and the Doctoral candidature must meet the requirements set out in clauses 3.18A, 3.19 and 3.20 of this Rule;

(b) any period of discontinued, suspended or lapsed candidature (as set out in clauses 3.14 to 3.16 of this Rule) must comply with standards set by the Academic Board and this Rule; and

(c) no student who has been granted credit may present a thesis for examination less than:
   (i) six months, for a full-time student; or
   (ii) twelve months, for a part-time student;
   following admission to candidature at the University.

3.8 Control of candidature

(1) All candidates for a Doctoral degree by research are required to undertake their candidature wholly under the control of the University.
(2) The Associate Dean may require a student who is employed by an institution to provide a statement by the relevant employer acknowledging that the candidature is under the exclusive control of the University.

3.9 Other studies during candidature

(1) A student must satisfactorily complete any training required by the course resolutions, the Associate Dean, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) or Supervisor, including units of study, lectures, seminars, workshops, online modules, non-award courses, or practical work. –

Note: In accordance with this Rule, a Doctorate must comprise a minimum of two-thirds research.

(2) Failure to satisfactorily complete training documented in the student's progress plan satisfactorily may be considered as evidence of unsatisfactory progress.

(3) A Faculty may decline to examine a thesis if the student has not satisfactorily completed training documented in the progress plan.

3.10 Supervision

The relevant Postgraduate Coordinator will appoint suitably qualified supervisors for each student undertaking a Doctoral degree by research in accordance with policy for supervision determined by the Academic Board.

Note: See also Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013

3.11 Location of candidature

(1) Subject to the annual approval of the supervisors and the Postgraduate Coordinator, students will pursue their candidature:
   (a) within the University, including its research stations and teaching hospitals;
   (b) on fieldwork, including in the field or in libraries, museums or other repositories;
   (c) within industrial laboratories or research institutions or other institutions considered by the Head of Department to provide adequate facilities for that candidature; or
   (d) within a professional working environment.

(2) Throughout the course of his or her candidature, a student will attend the University for such:
   (a) face-to-face consultation with his or her supervisors;
   (b) School and Faculty or University school seminars; and
   (c) coursework or other studies required under clause 3.9 of this Rule; as specified annually by the Postgraduate Coordinator.

(3) Subject to sub-clauses 3.11(4) and (5), a student who pursues his or her candidature outside Australia must complete a minimum of four research periods of...
candidature within the University prior to submitting his or her thesis for examination.

(4) For the purposes of sub-clause 3.11(3), the four research periods of candidature to be completed within the University may be completed:
(a) at any time during the candidature; and
(b) continuously or in several non-consecutive periods.

(5) A student granted credit under clause 3.6 must complete a minimum of two research periods of candidature within the University prior to submitting his or her thesis for examination.

3.12 Progress

(1) At intervals no greater than one year, Postgraduate Coordinators must require students to:
(a) provide evidence of satisfactory progress in their candidature (including any required progress and review forms); and
(b) participate in a progress review interview.

(2) Satisfactory progress will be assessed by a Review Panel in accordance with the Progress Policy.

(3) On the basis of any evidence provided by the student and any information obtained during the interview, the Postgraduate Coordinator may determine that the student:
(a) has demonstrated satisfactory or marginal progress, and specify the conditions of candidature to apply the following year; or
(b) has demonstrated unsatisfactory progress, and:
   (i) allow the student to continue to be enrolled with conditions, including a supplementary progress review in accordance with the Progress Policy; or
   (ii) recommend to the Associate Dean that the student be asked to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

(4) When determining the conditions of candidature to apply the following year, the Postgraduate Coordinator must indicate whether he or she is satisfied that the proposed supervision arrangements are satisfactory.

(5) After considering a recommendation made by the Postgraduate Coordinator in accordance with sub-clause 3.12(3)(b)(ii), the Associate Dean may:
(a) allow the student’s candidature to continue and specify the conditions of candidature to apply the following year; or
(b) require the student to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

3.13 Students may be required to show good cause

(1) An Associate Dean may require a student to show good cause:
(a) following a progress review, in accordance with paragraph sub-clause 3.5(3)(b) or sub-clause 3.12(5)(b);
(b) if the student has not submitted his or her thesis for examination by the latest date to do so, as required by clause 3.20; or
(c) at any other time, on the recommendation of the Postgraduate Coordinator.

(2) A student who is required to show good cause will be sent a notice that:
(a) requires the student to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature, on or before a specified date;
(b) states why the student is being asked to show good cause;
(c) sets out the actions that may be taken in respect of the candidature; and
(d) advises the student of his or her right to seek independent advice and assistance in preparing his or her response.

(3) The Associate Dean must give the student a reasonable opportunity to make written submissions about the matter.

(4) If, after considering any submissions made by the student, progress reports, any reports by the supervisors or the Postgraduate Coordinator, and any other relevant information, the Associate Dean forms the opinion that the student has shown good cause, the Associate Dean will permit the student to continue the candidature.

(5) If, after considering the information referred to in sub-clause 3.13(4), the Associate Dean forms the opinion that the student has not shown good cause, the Associate Dean must, by written notice setting out his or her reasons:
(a) terminate the student’s candidature; or
(b) impose conditions or restrictions on the continuation of the student’s candidature.

Note. For review of these decisions see University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

(6) In addition to the decision made under sub-clause 3.13(4) or sub-clause 3.13(5), the Associate Dean may also offer the student the option to transfer to another course within the Faculty for which the student is eligible. The Associate Dean may impose conditions or restrictions on that offer transfer of course.

(7) A person whose candidature for a higher degree by research has been terminated by an Associate Dean in accordance with 3.13(5)(a) will not be permitted to re-enrol in that candidature.

(8) Where a person whose candidature for a higher degree by research has been terminated by an Associate Dean in accordance with sub-clause 3.13(5)(a), that person may be excluded by the Associate Dean from applying for admission to a higher degree by research within the faculty for the longer period of:
(a) at least two academic years; or
(b) if the person is applying for a Research Training Program place, the period of time until the person is entitled to the maximum period allowed for the course under the Research Training Program.

Note: As at the date of this Rule, detailed information about entitlement for Research Training Program can be found in Research Training Program: Conditions of Grant, which can be found at https://www.education.gov.au/research-training-program.
3.14 Discontinuation of candidature

(1) Subject to this clause and the course resolutions, a student in a course may, by notice to the Faculty, discontinue their enrolment in the course or in one or more units of study.

(2) The notice must be in a form approved or accepted by the Faculty.

(3) A student's enrolment in the course or the relevant units of study will be treated as discontinued from the date of the notice, unless the student produces evidence that:
   
   (a) the discontinuation occurred at an earlier date; and
   
   (b) there was good reason why the application could not be made at an earlier time.

(4) A student who discontinues enrolment in a course during their first year of enrolment in the course will not be permitted to re-enrol in that course unless:
   
   (a) the Associate Dean granted prior permission to re-enrol; or
   
   (b) the student applies for and gains a new admission to the course.

(5) A student may not discontinue enrolment in a course or a unit of study after the end of classes in that course or unit of study, except in accordance with sub-clauses 3.14(3)(a) and (b).

3.15 Suspension of candidature

(1) Subject to the course resolutions and to any restrictions imposed on student visa holders by the Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000, a student in a course may, by notice to the Faculty, suspend their enrolment in the course:
   
   (a) for a maximum period of one year; or
   
   (b) with the approval of the Associate Dean, for a longer period.

(2) The notice must be in a form approved or accepted by the Faculty.

(3) At the end of the suspension period, the student must comply with any requirements notified by the Associate Dean for completing the course. Those requirements apply to the student, despite anything to the contrary in the course resolutions.

3.16 Lapse of candidature

(1) If a student does not enrol by the last census date for enrolment in each research period, and the student has not discontinued or sought approval to suspend enrolment, the student's candidature lapses.

(2) If a student's candidature in a course lapses, then, despite any contrary provision in this Rule, the student must apply for and gain a new admission to the course in order to re-enrol.
3.17 Return to candidature

(1) Subject to written advice from the Associate Dean, if a student returns to candidature after suspension, the course requirements as in force at the time of the student’s return to candidature apply.

(2) The Associate Dean may, in writing, modify the application of the course resolutions with respect to a particular student’s return to candidature.

(3) A student whose candidature has been discontinued or lapsed must apply for and gain a new admission to the course in order to re-enrol. The course requirements in place at the time of the new admission apply.

3.18 Leave of absence

Subject to the course resolutions, a student may, with the approval of the Postgraduate Coordinator, take leave of absence from the course for a period less than one research period.

3.18A Maximum time for completion

(1) The provisions of this clause apply to all candidatures commenced on or after 1 January 2019.

(2) A student must complete the Doctorate by Research by the end of the 16th research period after the research period in which they first enrolled.

(3) Any credit granted under clause 3.6 and 3.7 of this Rule will be included for the purposes of calculating research periods under subclause 3.18A(2).

(4) Subject to clause 1.7A, the relevant Associate Dean may extend the time for a student’s completion in exceptional circumstances.

3.19 Earliest date for submission of thesis for examination

(1) For the purposes of this clause, a student’s candidature will be considered by the University to include any periods of credit granted under clause 3.6 of this Rule.

(1) Subject to clauses 3.6 and 3.7 and this clause 3.19 a student may not submit a thesis for examination until he or she has completed at least 12 research periods of full-time enrolled candidature, or at least 24 research periods of part-time enrolled candidature.

(2) The Associate Dean may permit a student to submit a thesis for examination up to two research periods earlier than the period prescribed in sub-clause 3.19(2), provided that the Associate Dean is satisfied that the student has made exceptional progress in his or her candidature.

(3) The Chair of the Academic Board may permit a student to submit a thesis earlier than the periods prescribed in sub-clauses 3.19(1) and (2), provided that the Chair of the Academic Board is satisfied that the student has made exceptional progress in his or her candidature.

(4) Prior to exercising his or her discretion under sub-clause 3.19(4), the Chair of the Academic Board may obtain advice from the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board, Dean or Associate Dean.
(5) The student must be enrolled at the time that the thesis is submitted for examination.

3.20 Latest date for submission of thesis for examination

(1) The following provisions apply to candidatures commenced before 1 January 2019.

(a) Subject to clause 3.6 and this clause 3.20, a student who has undertaken all of his or her candidature on a full-time basis must submit his or her thesis for examination:

(i) after no more than 16 research periods of enrolled candidature; and

(ii) for the purposes of paragraph (a), a student’s candidature will be considered by the University to include any periods of credit granted under clause 3.6.

(b) Subject to this clause, a student who has undertaken all of his or her candidature on a part-time basis must submit his or her thesis for examination after no more than 32 research periods of enrolled candidature.

(c) Where a student has undertaken his or her candidature as a mixture of part-time candidature and full-time candidature, a part-time research period will be counted as the equivalent of one half of a full-time research period, and the student must submit his or her thesis for examination after no more than the equivalent of 16 full-time research periods of enrolled candidature.

(d) The Associate Dean may approve an extension of candidature with a new latest date for submission of thesis for examination beyond the maximum period specified in this clause.

(e) The student must be enrolled at the time that the thesis is submitted for examination.

(2) The following provisions apply to candidatures commenced on or after 1 January 2019.

(a) Subject to clause 3.6 and this clause 3.20, a student who has undertaken all of their candidature on a full-time basis must submit their thesis for examination after no more than 14 research periods of enrolled candidature.

(b) Except with the approval of the relevant Associate Dean under subclause (2)(d), a student who has undertaken all of their candidature on a part-time basis must submit their thesis for examination after no more than 28 research periods of enrolled candidature.

(c) Where a student has undertaken their candidature as a mixture of part-time candidature and full-time candidature, a part-time research period will be counted as the equivalent of one half of a full-time research period, and the student must submit their thesis for examination after no more than the equivalent of 14 full-time research periods of enrolled candidature.

(d) The Associate Dean may only approve an extension of the latest date for submission of a student's thesis under exceptional circumstances.

(e) The student must be enrolled at the time that the thesis is submitted for examination.
3.21 Content of thesis

(1) At the end of his or her course of advanced study and research, the student must submit a thesis for examination in the form required by Academic Board policy or procedures and any applicable course resolutions.

(2) Subject to sub-clause 3.21(3), a student may not submit as his or her thesis any work that has been presented for a degree or diploma at the University or at another university or institution.

(3) A student may submit work that has been presented for a degree or diploma at the University or at another university or institution where the work is submitted as part of the thesis, and the student has identified those parts of the thesis that have previously been presented for a degree or diploma.

(4) A student who undertook his or her candidature in a language school in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences may:
   (a) submit a thesis written in English or in the target language determined by the school; or
   (b) where a school has specified by means of a Faculty resolution that it will consider applications to submit a thesis in a language other than English or the target language of the school, submit a thesis in another language approved by the school.

(5) Subject to the course resolutions, applications to submit a thesis in a language other than English or the target language of a school must be:
   (a) made by an applicant in writing; and
   (b) considered and determined by the Associate Dean (taking into account arrangements for supervision and examination);

prior to the commencement of candidature.

3.22 Form of thesis for examination

(1) A candidate must submit his or her thesis for examination in the form required by the Academic Board.

(2) The thesis must be accompanied by a certificate from the co-ordinating supervisor stating whether, in the supervisors’ opinion, the form of presentation of the thesis is satisfactory.

(3) The thesis must also be accompanied by an abstract in a form required by the Academic Board.

(4) Subject to this Rule, the student must submit with the thesis a statement certifying his or her understanding that, if the candidature is successful, the thesis will be lodged with the University Librarian and made available for use.

3.23 Examination procedures

(1) The examination of candidates for a Doctorate by research will be conducted in accordance with the course resolutions and with standards and guidelines determined by the Academic Board.
(2) Where the course resolutions do not specify examination procedures, the examination of candidates for a Doctorate by research will be conducted in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Academic Board for the Doctor of Philosophy.

3.24 Aegrotat and posthumous awards

Aegrotat and posthumous awards may be made in circumstances involving serious illness or death.

PART 4 DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

4.1 Application of this part

This Part applies to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

4.2 Eligibility for admission to candidature

(1) Subject to sub-clauses 4.2(2) and (3), to be eligible for admission by the Associate Dean to candidature for the Doctor of Philosophy, an applicant must:

(a) hold or have completed all the academic requirements for:

(i) a Master's degree by research or higher level degree; or

(ii) a Master's degree by coursework including a research component equivalent to 25% of one year's full-time enrolment; or

(iii) a Bachelor's degree with first or second class honours; and

(b) meet additional criteria for admission to the degree as specified by the Faculty.

(2) An Associate Dean may admit to candidature an applicant who does not meet the requirements of sub-clause 4.2(1), provided that the applicant holds or has completed all the requirements for a Bachelor's degree, and:

(a) has obtained a high distinction or distinction in the highest course available in the subject or subjects relevant to the proposed course of advanced study and research; or

(b) has completed a period of relevant full-time or part-time advanced study and research towards a Master’s degree by research at the University, at such a standard as demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Associate Dean that the applicant is suitably prepared in the field of study to undertake the Doctor of Philosophy. Students admitted on this basis will be granted credit for their candidature in the Master’s degree, consistently with clause 4.5.

(3) The Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of Academic Board may admit to candidature an applicant who does not meet the requirements of sub-clauses 4.2(1) or (2), provided that the applicant holds qualifications that, in the opinion of the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee on the recommendation of the Associate Dean, are equivalent to those prescribed in sub-clauses 4.2(1) or (2).
(4) The Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of Academic Board may impose on a student admitted to candidature pursuant to sub-clause 4.2(3) such conditions as the Chair considers appropriate.

4.3 Application for admission to candidature

(1) An applicant for admission to candidature for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy must submit to the relevant Faculty:

(a) a proposed course of advanced study and research, approved by the Associate Dean, in consultation with the Postgraduate Coordinator of the school in which the work is to be undertaken; and

(b) satisfactory evidence of the applicant's eligibility for admission; and

(c) a statement certifying the applicant's understanding that, subject to this Rule, if the candidature is successful, his or her thesis will be lodged with the University Librarian and made available for use.

4.4 Probationary admission to candidature

(1) The Associate Dean may admit a student to candidature for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy on a probationary basis for a period not exceeding four research periods.

(2) On completion by the student of any probationary period imposed pursuant to sub-clause 4.4(1), the Postgraduate Coordinator will review the student's work and recommend to the Associate Dean that:

(a) the student's candidature be confirmed; or

(b) the student be required to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

(3) After considering a recommendation made by a Postgraduate Coordinator in accordance with sub-clause 4.4(2), the Associate Dean may:

(a) confirm the student's candidature; or

(b) require the student to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

Note: See clause 4.12 for details of the 'show good cause' process.

(4) The candidature of a student that is confirmed in accordance with paragraph subclause 4.4(3)(a) will be considered by the University to have commenced on the date of the student's probationary admission to candidature.

4.5 Credit for previous studies

(1) Subject to sub-clause 4.5(2), a student who, at the date of admission to candidature, has completed at least two research periods as a candidate for a higher degree by research in any Faculty of the University may be permitted by the relevant Associate Dean to receive credit for all or any part of the higher degree candidature.
(2) The Associate Dean may grant credit in accordance with sub-clause 4.5(1), provided that the student’s higher degree candidature was:

(a) a course of full-time or part-time advanced study and research;

(b) pursued by the student under the supervision of a supervisor appointed by the relevant Faculty, University school or Board of Studies;

(c) directly related to the student’s proposed course of advanced study for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy; and

(d) the student has discontinued his or her candidature in the previous higher degree.

(3) Subject to sub-clause 4.5(4), a student who, at the date of admission to candidature, has completed at least six months as a candidate for a higher degree at another university or institution may be permitted by the Associate Dean to receive credit for all or any part of the higher degree candidature.

(4) The Associate Dean may grant credit in accordance with sub-clause 4.5(3), provided that:

(a) at the time of admission to the higher degree by research at the other university, or institution, the student held academic qualifications equivalent to those set out in clause 4.2;

(b) the higher degree candidature was:

   (i) a course of full-time or part-time advanced study and research;

   (ii) pursued by the student under the supervision of a supervisor appointed by the other university or institution; and

   (iii) directly related to the student’s proposed course of advanced study for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy; and

(c) the student has discontinued his or her candidature in the higher degree at the other university or institution.

4.6 Limit on credit for previous studies

(1) The amount of credit for previous studies that may be granted to a student in accordance with clause 4.5 is limited by the following requirements:

(a) the combined duration of the student’s previous higher degree candidature and the Doctor of Philosophy candidature must meet the requirements set out in clauses 4.17A, 4.18 and 4.19 of this Rule;

(b) any period of discontinued, suspended or lapsed candidature (as set out in clauses 4.13 to 4.15 of this Rule) must comply with standards set by the Academic Board and this Rule; and

(c) no student who has been granted credit may present a thesis for examination less than:

   (i) six months, for a full-time student; or

   (ii) twelve months, for a part-time student; following admission to candidature at the University.
4.7 Control of candidature

(1) All candidates for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy are required to undertake their candidature wholly under the control of the University.

(2) The Associate Dean may require a student to provide a statement from his or her employer acknowledging that the candidature is under the exclusive control of the University.

4.8 Other studies during candidature

(1) A student must satisfactorily complete any training required by the course resolutions, the Associate Dean, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) or Supervisor, including units of study, lectures, seminars, workshops, online modules, non-award courses, or practical work.

Note: In accordance with this Rule, a Doctorate must comprise a minimum of two-thirds research.

(2) Failure to complete training documented in the student’s progress plan satisfactorily may be considered as evidence of unsatisfactory progress.

(3) A Faculty may decline to examine a thesis if the student has not satisfactorily completed training documented in the progress plan.

4.9 Supervision

The Postgraduate Coordinator will appoint suitably qualified supervisors for each candidate for the Doctor of Philosophy in accordance with policy for supervision determined by the Academic Board.

Note: See also Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013

4.10 Location of candidature

(1) Subject to the annual approval of the supervisors and Postgraduate Coordinator, students will pursue their candidature:

(a) within the University, including its research stations and teaching hospitals;

(b) on fieldwork, including in the field or in libraries, museums or other repositories;

(i) within industrial laboratories or research institutions or other institutions considered by the Head of Department to provide adequate facilities for that candidature; or

(ii) within a professional working environment.

(2) Throughout the course of his or her candidature, a student will attend the University for such:

(a) consultation with his or her supervisors; and

(b) School and Faculty or University school seminars; and

(c) coursework or other studies required under clause 4.08 of this Rule;
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as specified annually by the Postgraduate Coordinator.

(3) Subject to sub-clauses 4.10(4) (5) and (6), a student who pursues his or her candidature outside Australia must complete a minimum of four research periods of candidature within the University prior to submitting his or her thesis for examination.

(4) A student whose minimum length of candidature is eight research periods (rather than the usual 12 research periods), and who pursues his or her candidature outside Australia, must complete a minimum of two research periods of candidature within the University prior to submitting his or her thesis for examination.

(5) For the purposes of sub-clauses 4.10(3) and (4), the period required to be completed within the University may be completed:
(a) at any time during the candidature; and
(b) continuously or in several non-consecutive periods.

(6) A student granted credit under 4.5 must complete a minimum of two research periods of candidature within the University prior to submitting his or her thesis for examination.

4.11 Progress

(1) At intervals no greater than one year, Postgraduate Coordinators must require students to:
(a) provide evidence of satisfactory progress in their candidature (including any required progress and review forms); and
(b) participate in a progress review interview.

(2) Satisfactory progress will be assessed by a Review Panel in accordance with the Progress Policy.

(3) On the basis of any evidence provided by the student and any information obtained during the interview, the Postgraduate Coordinator may determine that the student:
(a) has demonstrated satisfactory or marginal progress, and specify the conditions of candidature to apply the following year; or
(b) has demonstrated unsatisfactory progress, and:
(i) allow the student to continue to be enrolled with conditions, including a supplementary progress review in accordance with the Progress Policy; or
(ii) recommend to the Associate Dean that the student be asked to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

(4) When determining the conditions of candidature to apply the following year, the Postgraduate Coordinator must indicate whether he or she is satisfied that the proposed supervision arrangements are satisfactory.

(5) After considering a recommendation made by the Postgraduate Coordinator in accordance with sub-paragraph sub-clause 4.11(3)(b)(ii), the Associate Dean may:
(a) allow the student's candidature to continue and specify the conditions of candidature to apply the following year; or
(b) require the student to show good cause why he or she they should be permitted to continue the candidature.

4.12 Students may be required to show good cause

(1) An Associate Dean may require a student to show good cause:

(a) following a progress review, in accordance with paragraph sub-clause 4.4(3)(b) or sub-clause 4.11(5)(b);

(b) if the student has not submitted his or her thesis for examination by the latest date to do so, as required by clause 4.19; or

(c) at any other time, on the recommendation of the Postgraduate Co-ordinator.

(2) A student who is required to show good cause will be sent a notice that:

(a) requires the student to show good cause why he or she they should be permitted to continue the candidature, on or before a specified date;

(b) states why the student is being asked to show good cause;

(c) sets out the actions that may be taken in respect of the candidature; and

(d) advises the student of his or her right to seek independent advice and assistance in preparing his or her response.

(3) The Associate Dean must give the student a reasonable opportunity to make written submissions about the matter.

(4) If, after considering any submissions made by the student, progress reports, any reports by the supervisors or Postgraduate Coordinator, and any other relevant information, the Associate Dean forms the opinion that the student has shown good cause, the Associate Dean will permit the student to continue the candidature.

(5) If, after considering the information referred to in sub-clause 4.12(4), the Associate Dean forms the opinion that the student has not shown good cause, the Associate Dean must, by written notice setting out his or her reasons:

(a) terminate the student’s candidature; or

(b) impose conditions or restrictions on the continuation of the student’s candidature.

Note. For review of these decisions see University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

(6) In addition to the decision made under sub-clauses 4.12(4) or 4.12(5), the Associate Dean might also offer the student the option to transfer to another course within the Faculty for which the student is eligible. The Associate Dean may impose conditions or restrictions on that offer transfer of course.

(7) A person whose candidature for a higher degree by research has been terminated by an Associate Dean in accordance with sub-clause 4.12(5)(a) will not be permitted to re-enrol in that candidature.

(8) A person whose candidature for a higher degree by research has been terminated by an Associate Dean in accordance with sub-clause 4.12(5)(a); that person may be excluded by the Associate Dean from applying for admission to a higher degree within the Faculty for the longer period of:

(a) at least two academic years; or
(b) if the person is applying for a Research Training Program place, the period of time until the person is entitled to the maximum period allowed for the course under the Research Training Program.

Note: As at the date of this rule, detailed information about entitlement for Research Training Program can be found in Research Training Program: Conditions of Grant, which can be found at https://www.education.gov.au/research-training-program

4.13 Discontinuation of candidature

(1) A student in a course may, by notice to the Faculty, discontinue his or her enrolment in the course or in one or more units of study.

(2) The notice must be in a form approved or accepted by the Faculty.

(3) A student’s enrolment in the course or the relevant units of study will be treated as discontinued from the date of the notice, unless he or she produces evidence that:

(a) the discontinuation occurred at an earlier date; and

(b) there was good reason why the application could not be made at an earlier time.

(4) A student who discontinues enrolment in a course during his or her first year of enrolment in the course will not be permitted to re-enrol in that course unless:

(a) the Associate Dean granted prior permission to re-enrol; or

(b) the student applies for and gains a new admission to the course.

(5) A student may not discontinue enrolment in a course or a unit of study after the end of classes in that course or unit of study, except in accordance with sub-clauses 4.13(3)(a) and (b).

4.14 Suspension of candidature

(1) A student in a course may, by notice to the Faculty, suspend his or her enrolment in the course:

(a) for a maximum period of one year; or

(b) with the approval of the Associate Dean, for a longer period.

(2) The notice must be in a form approved or accepted by the Faculty.

(3) At the end of the suspension period, the student must comply with any requirements notified by the Associate Dean for completing the course.

4.15 Lapse of candidature

(1) If a student does not enrol by the last census date for enrolment in each research period, and the student has not discontinued or sought approval to suspend enrolment, the student’s candidature lapses.

(2) If a student’s candidature in a course lapses, then, despite any contrary provision in this Rule, the student must apply for and gain a new admission to the course in order to re-enrol.
4.16 Return to candidature

(1) Subject to written advice from the Associate Dean, if a student returns to candidature after suspension in candidature, the requirements as in force at the time of the student's return to candidature apply.

(2) A student whose candidature has been discontinued or lapsed must apply for and gain a new admission to the course in order to re-enrol. The course requirements in place at the time of the new admission apply.

4.17 Leave of absence

Subject to the course resolutions, a student may, with the approval of the Postgraduate Coordinator, take leave of absence from the course for a period of less than one research period.

4.17A Maximum time for completion

(1) The provisions of this clause apply to all candidatures commenced on or after 1 January 2019.

(2) A student must complete the PhD Doctor of Philosophy by the end of the sixteenth research period after the research period in which they first enrolled.

(3) Any credit granted under clause 4.6 of this Rule will be included for the purposes of calculating research periods under subclause 4.17A(2).

(4) Subject to clause 1.7A, the relevant Associate Dean may extend the time for a student’s completion in exceptional circumstances.

4.18 Earliest date for submission of thesis for examination

(1) For the purposes of this clause, a student’s candidature will be considered by the University to include any periods of credit granted under clause 4.6 of this Rule.

(2) Subject to clause 4.6 and this clause 4.18 a student may not submit a thesis for examination until he or she has completed at least 12 research periods of full-time enrolled candidature, or at least 24 research periods of part-time enrolled candidature.

(3) The Associate Dean may permit a student to submit a thesis for examination up to two research periods earlier than the period prescribed in sub-clause 4.18(2), provided that, in the opinion of the Associate Dean, evidence has been produced that the student has made exceptional progress in his or her candidature.

(4) The Chair of the Academic Board may permit a student to submit a thesis earlier than the periods prescribed in sub-clauses 4.18(2) and (3), provided that, in the opinion of the Chair of the Academic Board, evidence has been produced that the student has made exceptional progress in his or her candidature.

(5) Prior to exercising his or her discretion under sub-clause 4.18(4), the Chair of the Academic Board may obtain advice from the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board, Dean or Associate Dean.

(6) The student must be enrolled at the time that the thesis is submitted for examination.
4.19 Latest date for submission of thesis for examination

(1) For the purposes of this clause, a student's candidature will be considered by the University to include any periods of credit granted under clause 4.5 of this Rule.

(1) The following provisions apply to candidatures commencing before 1 January 2019.

(a) Subject to this clause 4.19, a student who has undertaken all of their candidature on a full-time basis must submit their thesis for examination after no more than 16 research periods of enrolled candidature.

(b) A student who has undertaken all of their candidature on a part-time basis must submit their thesis for examination after no more than 32 research periods of enrolled candidature.

(c) Where a student has undertaken their candidature as a mixture of part-time candidature and full-time candidature, a part-time research period will be counted as the equivalent of one half of a full-time research period, and the student must submit their thesis for examination after no more than the full-time equivalent of 16 research periods of enrolled candidature.

(d) The Associate Dean may approve an extension of candidature with a new latest date for submission of thesis for examination beyond the maximum period specified in this clause.

(e) The student must be enrolled at the time that the thesis is submitted for examination.

(2) The following provisions apply to candidatures commenced on or after 1 January 2019.

(a) Except with the approval of the relevant Associate Dean under sub-clause (2)(d), a student who has undertaken all of their candidature on a full-time basis must submit their thesis for examination after no more than 14 research periods of enrolled candidature.

(b) Except with the approval of the relevant Associate Dean under sub-clause (2)(d), a student who has undertaken all of their candidature on a part-time basis must submit their thesis for examination after no more than 28 research periods of enrolled candidature.

(c) Where a student has undertaken their candidature as a mixture of part-time candidature and full-time candidature, a part-time research period will be counted as the equivalent of one half of a full-time research period, and the student must submit their thesis for examination after no more than the full-time equivalent of 14 research periods of enrolled candidature.

(d) The Associate Dean may only approve an extension of the latest date for submission of a student's thesis under exceptional circumstances.

(e) The student must be enrolled at the time that the thesis is submitted for examination.
4.20 Content of thesis

(1) At the end of his/her course of advanced study and research, the student must submit a thesis for examination in the form required by Academic Board policy or procedures.

(2) Subject to sub-clause 4.20(3), a student may not submit as his/her thesis any work that has been presented for a degree or diploma at the University or at another university or institution.

(3) A student may submit work that has been presented for a degree or diploma at the University or at another university or institution where:

(a) his/her candidature has been governed by an approved cotutelle agreement; or

(b) the work is submitted as part of the thesis, and the student has identified those parts of the thesis that have previously been presented for a degree or diploma.

(4) A student whose candidature is governed by an approved cotutelle agreement may submit a thesis written in English or in another language.

(5) A student who undertook his/her candidature in a language school in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences may:

(a) submit a thesis written in English or in the target language determined by the school; or

(b) where a school has specified by means of a Faculty resolution that it will consider applications to submit a thesis in a language other than English or the target language of the school, submit a thesis in another language approved by the school.

(6) Applications to submit a thesis in a language other than English or the target language of a school must be:

(a) made by an applicant in writing; and

(b) considered and determined by the Associate Dean (taking into account arrangements for supervision and examination); prior to the commencement of candidature.

4.21 Form of thesis for examination

(1) A candidate must submit his/her thesis for examination in the form required by the Academic Board.

(2) The thesis must be accompanied by a certificate from the coordinating supervisor stating whether, in the supervisors’ opinion, the form of presentation of the thesis is satisfactory.

(3) The thesis must also be accompanied by an abstract in the form required by the Academic Board.

(4) Subject to this Rule, the student must submit with the thesis a statement certifying his/her understanding that, if the candidature is successful, the thesis will be lodged with the University Librarian and made available for immediate public use.
4.22 Examination procedures
The procedures for examination of candidates for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy will be prescribed by the Academic Board.

4.23 Aegrotat and posthumous awards
Aegrotat and posthumous awards may be made in circumstances involving serious illness or death.

PART 5 HIGHER DOCTORATES

5.1 Meaning of this Part

(1) In this Part:
   (a) assessment committee means the committee appointed by the Dean in accordance with clause 5.5.
   (b) higher doctorate means any of the following:
       (i) Doctor of Agricultural Economics;
       (ii) Doctor of Dental Science;
       (iii) Doctor of Engineering;
       (iv) Doctor of Laws;
       (v) Doctor of Letters;
       (vi) Doctor of Letters in Education;
       (vii) Doctor of Letters in Social Work;
       (viii) Doctor of Medical Science;
       (ix) Doctor of Music;
       (x) Doctor of Science;
       (xi) Doctor of Science in Agriculture;
       (xii) Doctor of Science in Architecture;
       (xiii) Doctor of Science in Economics;
       (xiv) Doctor of Veterinary Science.
   (c) published work meets the higher doctorate standard if it is generally recognised by scholars in the relevant field of study as a distinguished contribution to knowledge or creative achievement.

5.2 Award of Higher Doctorates

(1) The Academic Board may, on the recommendation of the relevant Dean, award a higher doctorate for published work that, in the opinion of the examiners:
(a) constitutes a distinguished contribution to knowledge or creative achievement; and
(b) is recognised by scholars in the relevant field as constituting a distinguished contribution to knowledge or creative achievement in that field.

(2) Without limiting sub-clause 5.2(1), a published work may be regarded as a distinguished contribution to knowledge if:
(a) it represents a significant advance in knowledge in the relevant field;
(b) it has caused, or become a major part of, a significant debate among scholars in the relevant field (including in books and journals); or
(c) it has caused significant changes in the direction of research or in the practice of recognised scholars in the relevant field.

5.3 Eligibility for admission to candidature

(1) Subject to this clause 5.3, to be eligible for admission to candidature for a higher doctorate, an applicant must:
(a) hold a degree from the University that was conferred five or more years prior to the application date;
(b) hold a degree from another university or institution that was conferred five or more years prior to the application date; or
(c) have qualifications that were conferred five or more years prior to the application date and standing that are determined by the Faculty and by the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board to be equivalent to holding a degree from the University; and
(d) for the Doctor of Dental Science, hold or have completed all the academic requirements for the award of the Bachelor of Dental Surgery;
(e) for the Doctor of Medical Science, hold or have completed all the academic requirements for the Bachelor of Medicine;
(f) for the Doctor of Music hold or have completed all the academic requirements for:
   (i) the Bachelor of Music; or
   (ii) the Bachelor of Arts including a three year sequence of courses in Music;
(g) for the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine Science hold or have completed all the academic requirements for a bachelor’s degree as specified in the course resolutions, the Bachelor of Veterinary Science.

(2) To be eligible for admission to candidature, an applicant who does not meet the requirements of subclause paragraph 5.3(1)(a) must:
(a) have been a full-time member of the academic staff of the University for at least three years (or pro-rata part-time); or
(b) be recognised by the Academic Board, on the recommendation of the Dean, to have been involved in the teaching and research of the University to an equivalent level.

(3) To be eligible for admission to candidature, an applicant for a degree referred to in subclauses paragraphs 5.3(1)(d) to -(g) who does not meet the requirements of
those paragraphs subclauses must be recognised by the Dean and the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of Academic Board to have equivalent academic standing.

5.4 Application for admission to candidature

(1) An application for admission to a higher doctorate must:
   (a) state the name of the higher doctorate to which the application relates;
   (b) specify the applicant’s academic qualifications; and
   (c) describe the applicant’s association with the University.

(2) The application must be accompanied by:
   (a) a list of the published works that the candidate proposes to submit for examination;
   (b) a description of the themes of the published works; and
   (c) where there are a large number of publications whose dates range over a period of time and cover a range of subjects, a statement of how these publications are related to one another and to the theme.

5.5 Preliminary assessment of application for admission

(1) The Dean will appoint a committee to consider and determine, in respect of each application for admission, whether:
   (a) the applicant is eligible for admission to candidature;
   (b) the published work is in a field appropriate to the nominated degree;
   (c) the Faculty is competent to examine the published work at the required level; and
   (d) whether the applicant should be admitted to candidature.

(2) The committee may not determine that the applicant should be admitted to candidature unless the requirements of each of paragraphs subclauses 5.5(1)(a) to -(c) are met.

(3) If the committee determines that the applicant should be admitted to candidature, the committee will recommend to the Dean that he or she recommends to the Academic Board:
   (a) that the applicant be admitted to candidature; and
   (b) the appointment of at least three named examiners, of whom at least two will be external examiners.

(4) The assessment committee will comprise:
   (a) the Dean;
   (b) the Postgraduate Coordinator most closely associated with the relevant field of work;
   (c) the academic staff member most closely associated with the relevant field of work; and
   (d) other persons appointed by the Dean.
5.6 Admission to candidature

The Academic Board may, on the recommendation of the Dean, admit to candidature for a higher doctorate an applicant who meets the requirements for admission in this Part.

5.7 Enrolment

A successful applicant must enrol as a candidate for the higher doctorate in the first enrolment period following receipt of his or her offer of admission.

5.8 Submission of work for examination

(1) The candidate must submit to the Dean five copies of the published work.

(2) The work submitted must include:
   (a) a description of the theme of the published work;
   (b) a record of original research undertaken by the candidate;
   (c) a statement by the candidate of:
      (i) the sources from which the information in the work was derived;
      (ii) the extent to which the work draws on the work of others; and
      (iii) the portion of the work that the candidate claims as original;

(3) if the work submitted contains research that was carried out conjointly, a statement by the candidate of the extent to which the candidate was responsible for the initiation, conduct or direction of the research; and

(4) if the principal publications, as distinct from any supporting papers, incorporate work previously submitted for a degree or diploma at the University or at any other university or institution, a statement by the candidate of those parts of the publications that have previously been submitted.

(5) A candidate for the Doctor of Letters must submit work that includes at least one substantial work.

(6) A candidate for the Doctor of Music may submit one or more major musical works of the candidate’s own composition

5.9 Appointment of examiners

(1) The Academic Board will, on the recommendation of the Dean, appoint at least three examiners, of whom at least two will be external examiners.

(2) The Academic Board may appoint examiners in addition to those recommended by the Dean.

5.10 Examination

(1) Each examiner for a candidature must:
   (a) examine the published work; and
(b) make a separate report on whether, in the examiner’s opinion, the work meets the requirements for higher doctorates set out in clause 5.2.

(2) The assessment committee will consider the examiners reports, having regard to the requirements of clause 5.2, and recommend to the Dean that:

(a) that the higher doctorate be awarded; or

(b) that the higher doctorate not be awarded.

(3) After considering the recommendation of the assessment committee, the Dean:

(a) will provide to the Academic Board:
   (i) the names and qualifications of the examiners; and
   (ii) the substance of the examiners’ reports; and

(b) will recommend to the Academic Board that:
   (i) the higher doctorate be awarded;
   (ii) the higher doctorate not be awarded; or
   (iii) the Academic Board appoint a further examiner or examiners.

(4) The Academic Board will determine the result of the examination.

5.11 Lodging the published work

If the Academic Board decides to award a higher doctorate to the candidate, the Faculty must lodge with the Director, University Libraries one electronic or bound copy of the published work in the form required by the Academic Board.

PART 6 HIGHER DEGREE BY RESEARCH THESES

6.1 Meaning of this Part

(1) In this Part:

(a) restricted appendix means a section of a thesis to which public access has been restricted in accordance with clause 6.3.

(b) thesis refers to the complete final thesis, including any corrections or emendations to the satisfaction of the Postgraduate Coordinator.

6.2 Lodgement

(1) Subject to this Part, a candidate for a higher degree by research will not be permitted to undertake a program of advanced study and research that is likely to result in the lodgement of a thesis that cannot be made available for public use.

(2) Subject to this Part, all successful candidates for a higher degree must lodge a copy of their final thesis with the University Librarian, University Libraries.
(3) Subject to clause 6.3, 6.5 and 6.6, a thesis lodged with the University Librarian, University Libraries will be made available for use consistently with this Rule and Academic Board policy and procedures.

Note 1: Applicants are required to certify their awareness of this requirement prior to admission to candidature. See paragraphs clauses 2.4(1)(c), 3.4(1)(c) and 4.3(1)(c).

Note 2: Candidates are required to certify their awareness of this requirement at the time their thesis is submitted for examination. See sub-clauses 2.22(4), 3.22(4) and 4.21(4).

(4) Immediately following lodgement, the University Librarian, University Libraries will arrange for a statement of the author’s rights under copyright law to be affixed or appended to the thesis.

6.3 Use of confidential material

(1) If, at any time between application for admission to candidature and the lodgement of the thesis, it appears to the candidate’s supervisors or Postgraduate Coordinator that:

(a) successful completion of the candidature will require the use of confidential material; and

(b) the candidate would not be at liberty to fully disclose this confidential material in the thesis;

the matter will be reported as soon as possible to the Faculty Graduate Studies Committee.

(2) The Faculty Graduate Studies Committee may, if it considers it appropriate to do so, recommend to the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board that the candidate be granted:

(a) permission to include in an appendix to the thesis any material that is essential to the thesis but which, for a limited period, may not be available for public inspection;

(b) permission to restrict access to the whole thesis for a limited period, with a redacted version of the thesis available for public inspection; or

(c) exemption, in respect of the appendix, from the requirement to give the undertaking prescribed by sub-clauses 2.22(4), 3.22(4) and 4.21(4).

(3) If, after considering the recommendation of the Faculty Graduate Studies Committee, the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board decides to give the permission and exemption referred to in sub-clause 6.3(2), the University Librarian, University Libraries will restrict public access to the appendix for a period specified by the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board.

(4) Other than in exceptional circumstances, any period of restriction to a restricted appendix will not exceed five years.
6.4 Access to confidential material in a restricted appendix

(1) The University Librarian Director, University Libraries may grant access by a scholar to a restricted appendix, provided that the scholar:
(a) demonstrates genuine concern with the material in the appendix; and
(b) has the written consent of either:
   (i) the author of the thesis; or
   (ii) the Postgraduate Coordinator.

(2) The Postgraduate Coordinator may not consent to access by a scholar to a restricted appendix unless:
(a) all reasonable steps have been taken to contact the author; and
(b) the author cannot be contacted.

6.5 Restricted access to protect intellectual property

(1) Where:
(a) the subject of an applicant or candidate's higher degree thesis is work conducted collaboratively with industry; and
(b) there is a reasonable basis for concern that intellectual property contained in the thesis will be improperly exploited by others;
the Dean may recommend to the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board that access to the thesis be restricted for a limited period of time.

(2) After considering the Dean's recommendation, the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee may determine that access to the thesis should be restricted for a limited period of time.

(3) Other than in exceptional circumstances, any period of restricted access to the thesis will not exceed 18 months from the date of the award of the degree.

6.6 Restricted access to protect the interests of the author

(1) If, at any time between application for admission to candidature and the lodgement of the thesis, it appears to the candidate that there is a reasonable basis for believing that his or her interests would be at risk if the thesis were made immediately available to the public, the candidate may apply in writing to the Associate Dean for access to the thesis to be restricted for a limited period of time.

(2) The candidate's application to the Associate Dean should:
(a) clearly set out the reasons for the application;
(b) clearly state the length of the requested restriction on access; and
(c) include supporting evidence, as appropriate.

(3) If, after considering the candidate's application, the Associate Dean is satisfied that restricting access to the thesis is necessary to protect the candidate's interests, the Associate Dean may:
(a) restrict access to the thesis for a period not exceeding six months from the date of the award of the degree; or

(b) recommend to the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board that:
   (i) a longer period of restriction; or
   (ii) an extension of an earlier period of restriction;
   be approved.

(4) The Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee may determine to restrict access to the thesis for a limited period of time.

(5) Other than in exceptional circumstances, any period of restricted access to the thesis will not exceed 18 months from the date of the award of the degree.

6.7 Right of examiners to access

(1) Notwithstanding any other clause in this Rule, the thesis and any restricted appendix will be available to the examiners of the thesis, including:
   (a) any Faculty committee or board of postgraduate studies; and
   (b) any committee of the Academic Board;
for the purposes of examination or re-examination.

PART 7  ENGLISH LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS

7.1 All applicants whose first language is not English

(1) All applicants whose first language is not English must meet the University’s English language requirements to be eligible for admission to a higher degree by research course.

(2) Subject to this Part, any applicant for admission to a higher degree by research course whose first language is not English, must meet the requirements as listed on the Academic Board Admissions Standards website <Insert ELP Admissions Standards webpage link>

(a) in the five years prior to their application, successfully completed tertiary studies in which the language of the institution, instruction, examination and assessment was English; or

(b) in the two years prior to their application, successfully completed an appropriate course at the University’s Centre for English Teaching, with results at a standard required for the award course that the applicant is applying for; or

(c) in the two years prior to their application, achieved:
   (i) an IELTS overall band score of 6.5 with a minimum of 6.0 in each band; or
   (ii) a paper based TOEFL score of 577 plus a Test of Written English (TWE) score of 4.5; or
(iii) an internet based TOEFL (IBT) score of 90 plus a minimum score of 23 for Writing and 22 for Reading, Speaking and Listening; or

(iv) a Pearson Test of English (Academic) (PTE) score of 61; or

(v) a Cambridge English: Advanced (CAE) score of 58.

(3) An applicant for admission to a higher degree by research course in a Faculty that has, with the approval of the Academic Board, set English language requirements above the minimum requirements set out in the Admissions Standard <insert hyperlink>paragraph (2) must meet the Faculty’s requirements.

7.2 Exceptional circumstances Exemption from English language requirements in certain circumstances

(1) In exceptional circumstances only, the Dean may, in writing, deem a student demonstrates grant an exemption from the English language requirements for admission to a higher degree by research course by means other than those listed in the Academic Board Admissions Standard – English Language Proficiency <insert ELP test standards webpage link>, in accordance with clause 7 of those standards.

(a) the applicant has an IELTS score and:

(i) the overall or average band score is no more than 0.5 below the overall or average band score otherwise required by this Rule; and

(ii) any individual band score is no more than 1.0 below the individual band score otherwise required by this Rule; or

(b) the applicant has a score on another test permitted by this Rule and the applicant’s score was no more than a corresponding amount below the score otherwise required by this Rule; and

(c) the Dean is satisfied that the applicant has enough competence in written and spoken English to complete the course successfully.

(2) The Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board may, in exceptional circumstances, modify the limits prescribed in subparagraph subclause (1)(a) or (b), as they apply in a particular case.

(3) In considering whether an applicant has enough competence in written and spoken English to complete the course successfully, the Dean:

(a) must take into account any advice of the Postgraduate Coordinator; and

(b) may consider any other relevant matter, including:

(i) the applicant’s ability to communicate in an academic environment;

(ii) whether the applicant has been known to the Faculty for at least two years;

(iii) whether the candidature is to be governed by an approved cotutelle agreement;

(iv) any appropriate work experience that the applicant has had in an English-language environment; and

(v) any oral discussions between Faculty members and the applicant.

(4) The Dean must record in writing on the student file any grant of exemption from English language requirements, including:
(a) the proof of proficiency in English provided by the applicant; and
(b) the reasons, in accordance with this PolicyRule, that the Dean approved the waiver.

PART 8 UNDERTAKING COURSEWORK UNITS OF STUDY

8.1 Enrolment in and assessment of coursework units of study

A higher degree by research student who is enrolled in a coursework unit of study will be subject to the provisions of Part 12 and Part 14 of the Coursework Policy 2014, including in respect of enrolment and assessment.

PART 9 SPECIAL CONSIDERATION

9.1 Coursework units of study

(1) A higher degree by research student who is enrolled in a coursework unit of study will be subject to the provisions of the Coursework Policy 2014 in respect of special consideration due to illness or misadventure.

9.2 Progress and examination

(1) Special consideration is not available for illness or misadventure in:
(a) the assessment of a student’s progress in a progress review; or
(b) the examination process.

(2) A student required to show good cause may request special consideration for illness, misadventure or exceptional circumstances outside of their control.

9.3 Variation of candidature

(1) A student may request special consideration due to illness, misadventure or circumstances outside of their control when seeking to vary candidature, including in respect of requests for:
(a) suspension;
(b) a change from full-time to part-time enrolment (or vice-versa);
(c) extension of the latest date to submit for examination.
PART 10 MISCELLANEOUS

10.1 Rules, resolutions and policies that cease to have effect

(1) The following rules, resolutions and policies, as amended and in force immediately before the commencement of this Rule, cease to have effect to the extent set out in the table below:

(a) University of Sydney (Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)) Rule 2004
(b) University of Sydney (Amendment Act) Rule 2000:
   (i) Part 9: Division 10 and Division 11
   (ii) Part 10: Division 3 and Division 5

NOTES

University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011
Date adopted: 21 March 2011
Date commenced: 25 March 2011
Related documents:

   Educational Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 (Cth)
   Coursework Policy 2014
   Essential Resource for Postgraduate Students Policy 2016
   Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degrees by Research Students Policy 2015
   Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013
   Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Policy 2015
   Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Procedures 2015
   Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Procedures 2015
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<td>1 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13(8)(b); 2.13(8)(b) note;</td>
<td>Replaced “Research Training Scheme” with “Research Training Program” and corrected hyperlink</td>
<td>1 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13(8)(b); 3.13(8)9b note;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12(8)(b); 4.12(8)(b) note.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1(1)(b)(viii)</td>
<td>Replaced “Doctor of Medicine” with “Doctor of Dental Medicine”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Commencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO BE ADDED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Frequency distribution EFTSL consumption by over-time PhD students. The data were collected from early March 2018 and represent 497 students, which is approximately 13% of total university PhD load.
Figure 2: Frequency distribution EFTSL consumption by over-time Master’s by Research students.

The data were collected from early March 2018 and represent 111 students, which is approximately 13% of total university Master’s by Research load.
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**RECOMMENDATION**

*That the Academic Quality Committee:*
1. endorse the proposed amendments to the Coursework Policy 2014;
2. endorse the draft Admissions Standards – English Language Proficiency requirements schedule; and
3. endorse changes to the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (HDR Rule).

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Admissions Working Party conducted four meetings throughout 2018 to address a range of policy gaps pertaining to admissions. The three main issues were clarifying the role of the Academic Board in determining entry requirements and standards, formalising the previously announced mathematics prerequisites in policy, and addressing a number of discrepancies regarding English Language Proficiency (ELP) requirements. The first two issues were addressed at the 7 August Academic Board meeting, while a solution to the latter is proposed in this paper. As the primary work of the Admissions Working Group has been concluded, the Admissions Subcommittee endorsed the discontinuation of the Admissions Working Party at its 8 October meeting.

It is recommended that the Academic Quality Committee endorses amendments to the Coursework Policy and HDR Rule, and a new draft Admissions Standard for ELP. The policy changes are intended to:

- establish an equivalent admission standard for all applicants applying for entry into an award course;
- establish an objective measure for English as a first language;
- remove the discrepancy in the expiration point (enrolment or commencement) of ELP tests by making that validity point the commencement date for all students;
- establish a five year expiration window for applicants using qualifications as evidence of ELP;
- establish a two year expiration window for applicants providing English test scores as evidence of ELP;
- include living in an English-speaking country for five years prior to commencement of study as proof of ELP; and
- include current registration with an accreditation body as proof of ELP.

Additionally, the academic standard will ensure all standard ELP test scores currently situated in the Coursework Policy, HDR Rule, and various online test score tables, are aligned and situated in one document. As such, the standard’s introduction will coincide with the removal of various test scores in the policy and rule. In addition to the Academic Quality Committee, the amendments to the Coursework Policy will be provided to relevant Academic Board and University Executive committees. The draft changes to the HDR Rule will also be provided to Senate for approval. A table detailing the proposed changes to the Coursework Policy and HDR Rule is included in attachment 1.

**CONTEXT**

The Admissions Working Party was established at the 19 March Admissions Subcommittee meeting to review and develop policy amendments pertaining to Mathematics prerequisites, English language requirements, policy nonalignment between undergraduate and postgraduate admissions, recent and non-recent school
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leavers, and domestic and international students. Additional issues were raised throughout the course of the meetings of the Working Party, such as the impact of Mathematics prerequisites on prospective Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students and students from disadvantaged backgrounds.

At its meeting on the 7 August, the Academic Board approved changes to the Coursework Policy, providing the Academic Board with the ability to determine admissions standards and establishing a location for these standards on the Board’s website. One such standard pertains to Mathematics prerequisites, which was also drafted following consultation with the Admissions Working Party and approved at the 7 August meeting of the Board.

Following this, the Admissions Working Party canvassed a range of issues regarding ELP requirements as established in policy and found on University websites, culminating in proposed amendments to existing policies and the establishment of a new Admissions Standard for ELP.

ISSUES

English Language Test Scores

Currently, there is a nonalignment of ELP test score conversions across the Coursework Policy, HDR Rule, and the Admissions Concordance Table. The HDR Rule and postgraduate subclause of the Coursework Policy set the minimum IELTS score at 6.5 and specifies a TOEFL paper-based score of 577, the advertised Admissions Concordance Table sets the equivalent of an IELTS 6.5 as a TOEFL paper-based score of 565, while the undergraduate admissions subclause of the Coursework Policy lists this equivalent TOEFL score as 550. As such, these three different scores will need to be aligned to ensure consistency across degree-types. In doing so, there is also an opportunity to ensure better alignment with other Go8 institutions. Currently, Monash is the only other Go8 institution to set a TOEFL paper-based score at 550, with the remaining Go8 institutions setting the requirement at a score between 570 and 577. As such, rather than realigning the HDR entry score to 550 or 565 to match the current undergraduate coursework level, it is proposed that the undergraduate coursework score be aligned with the score already used by the University of Sydney for HDR students and by UNSW, the University of Melbourne, and the University of Adelaide for undergraduate admissions (TOEFL: 577). The Centre for English Teaching has also confirmed that a score of 577 is an appropriate equivalent for IELTS 6.5.

In addition to introducing a consistent minimum requirement across degree-types, it is proposed that specific test scores are removed from policy and established in an Academic Board Admissions Standard. Removing the test results from the rule and policy would support administrative simplification by making test score conversions a procedural matter, as these scores are subject to change. Under this process, approval of the Academic Board would still be required to adjust test scores, however a change to the Coursework Policy and HDR Rule would not be needed. Faculties would still be able to set higher test scores as required, and these differing scores would be listed in the same academic standard to ensure ease of identifying both the requirements for undergraduate and postgraduate admissions, but also for different discipline areas. Currently this information is listed (with various scores for the same test) in two parts of the Coursework Policy, the HDR Rule, the Admissions website, the Admissions Concordance Table document, and the Faculty-specific English Language Requirements (undergraduate) document.

Expiration of test results

There is a misalignment in the time-window provided for demonstrating ELP through an English skills test. Currently, the test score provided to demonstrate proficiency for undergraduate applicants must be no older than two years at the commencement date of the course, while the time-window applied for graduate admissions is no older than two years at the application date of the course. It is proposed that the commencement/application date differential is addressed by using the course commencement date as the relevant test result expiry date for all prospective students. Commencement date is preferred as it would provide an easy to determine date (based on the relevant Semester, Term, or Research Period) and would ensure consistent applicability to all commencing students as the date of enrolment can vary substantially amongst the same cohort (particularly with deferments).

Additionally, the timeframe allowed for demonstrating ELP varies across degree type. For instance, there is no time limit applied for undergraduate admission through the completion of secondary or tertiary studies taught in English, yet graduate students have a five year limit. Therefore, it is proposed that English language
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requirements for undergraduate and postgraduate admissions are aligned in policy, with the difference based on the ELP source, rather than course type. As such, ELP test scores, CET courses, and English subjects completed as part of non-English secondary qualifications will have a two year expiration window; while secondary and tertiary qualifications completed in English, accreditation, and residency and employment in an English speaking country will have a five year expiration timeframe. This difference reflects the distinction between completing a test or subject and completing an entire qualification. Furthermore, IELTS Test Partners cannot confirm the validity of test results that are more than two years old. Whether it is a two or five year window, all timeframes will be based on the date of commencement.

POLICY AMENDMENTS

The proposed policy amendments seek to ensure alignment between undergraduate coursework, postgraduate coursework, and HDR admissions requirements through the creation of a single document delineating admissions standards as approved by the Academic Board. In doing so, requirements will become consistent across University degree levels.

The Admissions Standard includes provisions whereby ELP test results submitted for demonstrating ELP will be valid for two years from the date the prospective student will commence their studies, while educational qualifications will be valid for five years. Additional criteria for proving ELP will be also established in the policy: if an applicant has lived in an English speaking country for five years prior to the commencement date of studies; and if an applicant is currently registered with an accreditation body that has an English language requirement that is equivalent or greater than the University of Sydney.

Furthermore, when applying for admission to the University, prospective students are required to indicate if their first language is English. There are a number of situations where discrepancies can occur in this process because the policy does not contain an objective measure for demonstrating English as a first language. To address this, such a requirement has been included in the Admissions Standard. Furthermore, the ‘Dean’s waiver’ clauses (24 ‘Exemption from English language requirements in certain circumstances’) have been removed from the policy and rule, edited, and placed in the standard under clause 7 ‘Exceptional circumstances’. The faculty-specific IELTS requirements (undergraduate and postgraduate) have also been updated based on faculty feedback and will be incorporated in the new Admissions Standard (Table 4 and Table 5 in attachment 3). The policy amendments are detailed further in attachment 1.

CONSULTATION

The membership of the Admissions Working Party included:

- Assoc. Prof. Alison Purcell (Chair)
- Assoc. Prof. Tim Wilkinson, Chair of the Admissions Sub-Committee
- Assoc. Prof. Peter McCallum, Director Education Strategy
- Assoc. Prof. Rae Cooper, Associate Dean (Programs)
- Assoc. Prof. Alyson Simpson, Associate Dean (Education)
- Assoc. Prof. Catherine Hardy
- Wencong Chai, Head of Admissions
- Mandy Baric, Director of Compliance and Student Affairs
- Mary Teague, Head of Widening Participation
- Hugh O’Dwyer, Policy and Project Officer

Academic and administrative staff in various faculties with specific ELP test score requirements higher than the minimum requirement also assisted in updating the faculty-specific test score requirement tables in the draft Admissions Standard. The CET and Admissions team also provided advice regarding ELP requirements.

Additionally, draft policy amendments have been provided to the Policy Management Unit and the following committees:

- Admissions Sub-Committee (8 October)
- University Executive Education Committee (16 October)
- Academic Quality Committee (30 October)
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- Academic Standards and Policy Committee (6 November)
- University Executive (15 November)
- Academic Board (27 November)

The HDR Rule amendments will also be provided to Senate (14 December).

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Coursework Policy 2014 and HDR Rule amendments table
Attachment 2: Coursework Policy 2014 – proposed amendments
Attachment 3: Draft Admissions Standards – English Language Proficiency
**Coursework Policy 2014 English Language Changes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Reason for amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*9A(1)</td>
<td>Insert a new clause that states: ‘Except as determined by the Academic Board, the same or equivalent admission standard shall apply to all applicants for an award course.’</td>
<td>To establish an equivalent admission standard for all applicants applying for entry into an award course as this does not currently exist in the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*21(1)-(2)</td>
<td>Insert a new clause 21 ‘All applicants whose first language is English’, as the Coursework Policy currently only refers to applicants whose first language is not English. Current clause and associated subclauses will be 21A.</td>
<td>To establish an objective measure for determining English as a first language, such as citizenship or long-term/permanent residency of an English speaking country. The list of these countries will be provided in the draft Admissions Standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21A(2)(a)</td>
<td>Remove the clause and place in Admissions Standard. Make the expiration of an Australian educational qualification five years from the date of commencement. Insert ‘approved’ qualification so a standard of qualifications can be set.</td>
<td>To ensure consistency for commencement date and expiration timeframe for all coursework applicants. Commencement date is preferred to enrolment date, as enrolment times vary for prospective students. Regarding the ‘approved Australian educational qualification’, Admissions Team to develop a list of recognised qualifications (.i.e. provider name and AQF level) with a minimum duration of one year EFTSL to accompany this clause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21A(2)(b)</td>
<td>Remove the clause and place in Admissions Standard. Make the expiration of secondary or tertiary studies five years from the date of commencement. Admissions standard to contain information currently listed in subclauses (i) and (ii), while adding additional clause (iii) regarding approved English language subjects completed in secondary qualification where the language was not entirely English.</td>
<td>To ensure consistency for commencement date and expiration timeframe for all coursework applicants. Formalise in policy additional secondary qualifications accepted for proof of ELP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21A(2)(c)</td>
<td>Remove the clause and place in Admissions Standard. Make the expiration of CET course completion to be within two years from the date of commencement.</td>
<td>To ensure consistency for commencement date and expiration timeframe for all coursework applicants. For qualifications, the expiration will be five years, but for English Tests and CET short courses the timeframe will be two years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21A(2)(d)(i)-(iv)</td>
<td>Remove the clause and place in Admissions Standard. Make the expiration of English Proficiency Test scores two years from the date of commencement. Remove list of test scores and place in the Admissions Standard. Adjust minimum TOEFL paper based score from 550 to 577.</td>
<td>To ensure consistency for commencement date and expiration timeframe for all coursework applicants. Removing the test results from the rule would support administrative simplification whereby test conversion scores could be altered via approval of the Academic Board, without requiring an amendment to the Coursework Policy. Additionally, the paper based TOEFL score of 550 will be increased to 577 to align with the postgraduate (coursework and HDR) conversion. CET have confirmed that 577 is an appropriate equivalent score to the IELTS 6.5 and reflects the score applied by the rest of the Go8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21A(2)(e)(i)-(iv)</td>
<td>Remove the clause and place in Admissions Standard. Make the expiration of an International Baccalaureate for English Language Proficiency purposes two years from the date of commencement. Remove specific International Baccalaureate English levels and place in Admissions standard.</td>
<td>Listing the levels is unnecessary, the amendment specifies that the International Baccalaureate was studied in English (rather than French or Spanish). The IB is already covered in 21(2)(b) as it is a secondary qualification. Difference between an IB completed exclusively in English, and those not (but with a sufficient grade in IB English) are included in the new Admissions Standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21A(4)(b)</td>
<td>Remove the clause and place in Admissions Standard. Add ‘equivalent part-time’ and replace ‘university study’ with ‘tertiary study’ to align with 21(2)(b).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21A(7)</td>
<td>Remove the clause and place in Admissions Standard.</td>
<td>Clause unchanged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21A(8)</td>
<td>Remove the clause and place in Admissions Standard.</td>
<td>Clause unchanged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21A(9) Note</td>
<td>Replace concordance table link with Admissions Standard hyperlink.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*21B</td>
<td>Insert a new clause 21B - Exceptional circumstances</td>
<td>Removing the undergraduate/postgraduate inconsistency regarding the Dean’s waivers as currently a Dean’s waiver is allowed for postgraduate but not undergraduate admissions. The new clause aligns with Dean’s waiver clause (24) for postgraduate courses. The detail will be included in the Admissions Standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*23(1)-(2)</td>
<td>Insert a new clause 23 ‘All applicants whose first language is English’, as the Coursework Policy currently only refers to applicants whose first language is not English. Current clause and associated subclauses will be 21A.</td>
<td>To establish an objective measure for determining English as a first language, such as citizenship or long-term/permanent residency of an English speaking country. The list of these countries will be provided in the draft Academic Standard. Reflects the new clause 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23A(2)(a)</td>
<td>Remove the clause and place in Admissions Standard. Make the expiration of tertiary studies five years from the date of commencement.</td>
<td>To align with other commencement and expiration changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23A(2)(b)</td>
<td>Remove the clause and place in Admissions Standard. Make the expiration of CET course completion to be within two years from the date of commencement.</td>
<td>To align with other commencement and expiration changes in 21A(2)(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23A(2)(c)</td>
<td>Remove the clause and place in Admissions Standard. Make the expiration of English Language Proficiency Test scores two years from the date of commencement. Remove list of test scores and place on the Academic Boards – Academic Standards site.</td>
<td>Aligns with 21A(2)(d).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Remove subclauses and include in Admissions Standard.</td>
<td>Change to ‘Exceptional circumstances’ – streamline the policy architecture by including ELP admissions in Admissions Standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Admissions Standard clause 6(2)(a) – Other ELP</td>
<td>Insert a new clause that includes living and working in an English speaking country for five years prior to the commencement of studies as proof of ELP.</td>
<td>An additional criteria for demonstrating English Language Proficiency. Applies to undergraduate and postgraduate (coursework and higher degree by research) students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Admissions Standard clause 6(2)(b) – Other ELP</td>
<td>Insert a new clause whereby an applicant meets the ELP standard if they are currently registered with an accreditation body that has an English language requirement that is equivalent or greater than the University of Sydney.</td>
<td>An additional criteria for demonstrating English Language Proficiency. Applies to undergraduate and postgraduate (coursework and higher degree by research) students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HDR Rule 2011 English Language Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1(2)(a)</td>
<td>Remove the clause and place in Admissions Standard. Make the expiration of tertiary studies five years from the date of commencement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1(2)(b)</td>
<td>Remove the clause and place in Admissions Standard. Make the expiration of CET course completion to be within two years from the date of commencement. To align with other commencement and expiration changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1(2)(c)</td>
<td>Remove the clause and place in Admissions Standard. Make the expiration of English Language Proficiency Test scores two years from the date of commencement. Remove list of test scores and place on the Academic Boards – Academic Standards site. To align with ELP Test amendments in the Coursework Policy. Minimum test scores will remain unchanged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1(3)</td>
<td>Replace ‘paragraph’ with Admissions Standard link.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2(1)-(4)</td>
<td>Remove the clause and place in Admissions Standard. Change to ‘Exceptional circumstances’. Align with changes in the Coursework Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2(3)(b)(v)</td>
<td>Remove the clause and place in Admissions Standard. ‘faculty’ correction. Nomenclature correction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PART 1  PRELIMINARY

1  Name of policy

This is the Coursework Policy 2014.

2  Commencement

This policy commences on the day after the day on which it is registered.

3  Statement of intent

This policy governs all coursework award courses leading to the following qualifications:

(a) Diplomas;
(b) Advanced Diplomas;
(c) Bachelor Degrees;
(d) Bachelor Honours Degrees;
(e) Graduate Certificates;
(f) Graduate Diplomas; and
(g) Masters Degrees.

Note: These are the only coursework qualifications awarded or conferred by the University. See clause 1.3(2) of the Coursework Rule.

Note: ‘Masters Degrees’ includes the following exceptions endorsed under the Issuance Policy of the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) relating to AQF level 9 qualifications that contain the word ‘doctor’ rather than ‘master’ in their title: Juris
4 Application

(1) Except to the extent that a contrary intention is expressed:

(a) this policy applies to:

(i) staff, affiliates, students and applicants for coursework award courses; and
(ii) non-award students, exchange students and study abroad students enrolled in a unit of study at the University;

(b) it is a condition of each student’s admission to candidature that the student complies with their obligations under this policy.

(2) Authorities and responsibilities set out in this policy are also defined in the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016.

5 Definitions

(1) In this policy:

- **academic adviser** means an academic employee nominated by the Dean of a faculty or Head of School and Dean of a University school to provide advice on student progression matters.

- **academic progression register** means the record of all students whose academic progression is being monitored by a faculty in accordance with this policy.

- **academic progression requirements** means the requirements for academic progression in an award course, set out in faculty resolutions, award course resolutions or this policy.

- **academic transcript** means a written statement setting out a student’s academic record at the University.

- **admission** means admission to candidature in a coursework award course at the University.

- **advanced standing** means acknowledgement by the University of relevant prior academic achievement or relevant experience, usually in the form of a reduced volume of learning, or credit points that count towards the requirements of an award course.

- **appended honours course** means a course that leads to an award of a degree with honours where the honours component is undertaken after the student has met the course requirements for the degree (without honours).

- **applicant** means an applicant for admission to a coursework award course at the University.
assessment means the process of measuring the performance of students (as in examinations, assignments and other assessable work) that enables students to monitor their progress and contributes to their academic results in a unit of study.

Associate Dean means the Associate Dean of a faculty or University school with responsibility for coursework award courses at the relevant level, or the deputy chairperson of a board of studies or a person appointed by the Dean to have responsibility for coursework award courses at the relevant level.

Australian Tertiary Admissions Rank (ATAR) for an applicant, means:
- the applicant’s rank in relation to the applicant’s secondary cohort, as provided to the University by UAC; or
- the applicant’s results in a school leaving examination in another State, Territory or country, converted to an ATAR equivalent, as provided to the University by UAC.

ATAR cut off for a course, means the ATAR fixed by the relevant faculty as the minimum ATAR that an applicant must achieve to be eligible for admission to the course, unless the applicant is eligible for admission to the course through an educational access scheme.

Australian citizen has the meaning it has under the Australian Citizenship Act 2007 (Cth).

Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) means the national framework for recognition and endorsement of education qualifications.

authentic assessment means assessment tasks that relate the application of knowledge to problems, skills and performances that are found in general or disciplinary practices or professional contexts. It includes but is not limited to projects, investigations and report writing.

award course means a course approved by the Academic Board and endorsed by the Senate, on the recommendation of the Academic Board, that leads to the conferral of a degree or the award of a diploma or certificate.

award course resolutions means the resolutions setting out the requirements for the award approved by the Academic Board and tabled at a meeting of the Senate.

Note: See clause 2.3 of the Coursework Rule.
Bachelor degree means an undergraduate degree that:

- achieves at least the outcome specified for level seven of the AQF;
- is a program of liberal, professional or specialist learning and education; and
- builds on prior secondary or tertiary study.

The University offers two types of Bachelor degrees:

- Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees; and
- Professional or Specialist Bachelor Degrees

Note: See clause 83A.

Bachelor of Advanced Studies means the Bachelor degree available as a combined degree with all Liberal Studies and specified Professional or Specialist Bachelor degrees, as set out in the applicable award course resolutions. The Bachelor of Advanced Studies is a Liberal Studies Bachelor degree.

Note: See clause 83C.

barrier unit of study means a unit of study that the faculty has determined must be passed before a student is permitted to progress.

candidature means the period during which a student is eligible to enrol in units of study in a coursework award course at the University.

capstone experience means a unit of study that provides students with an opportunity to draw together the learning that has taken place during the course, synthesise it with their own learning and experience, and draw conclusions that form the basis for further investigation, and intellectual and professional growth.

census date means the date on which a student's enrolment in a unit of study becomes final.

combined degree course means a combination of two degree programs structured to enable students to count a specified number of credit points towards the requirements for both award courses, resulting in a lower volume of learning than if the two degrees were taken separately. See also double degree course and vertically integrated combined degree course.

Commonwealth supported place means a place in an award course in respect of which the student and the Commonwealth government both contribute towards the cost of the student's education.
compulsory unit of study means a unit of study that must be completed before the award of a degree, but which does not constitute a barrier unit of study.

course means a planned and structured sequence of learning and teaching primarily aimed at the acquisition of knowledge, skills and understanding.

course requirements means the requirements for an award course set out in any relevant faculty resolutions and the award course resolutions.

coursework award course means a course approved by the Academic Board and endorsed by the Senate, that leads to a degree, diploma or certificate and is undertaken predominantly by coursework. While the program of study in a coursework award course may include a component of original, supervised research, other forms of instruction and learning normally will be dominant. All undergraduate award courses, and graduate certificates, graduate diplomas and those Masters degrees that comprise less than 66% research are coursework award courses.

Coursework Rule means the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014.

credit means advanced standing based on previous attainment in another award course at the University or at another institution, or in a non-award course approved by the Academic Board. The advanced standing is expressed as credit points granted towards the award course. Credit may be granted as specific credit or non-specific credit.

credit point means a measure of value indicating the contribution that each unit of study provides towards meeting award course completion requirements, stated as a total credit point value.

criteria means statements that identify the key characteristics or qualities of student performance in an assessment task.

cross-credited unit of study means a unit of study that, on completion, is credited towards the requirements of two awards, or two component parts of a combined award.

cross-institutional study means enrolment by a student in a unit or units of study at another university or institution.

Dean means, as appropriate, the Dean of the relevant faculty or the Head of School and Dean of the relevant University school.

delegate means an officer, employee or committee of the University to whom Senate has made a delegation of power.

department means an academic disciplinary grouping established within a school.
disability has the meaning prescribed in Section 4 of the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Cth)*. At the date of this policy the definition is:

disability, in relation to a person, means:

(a) total or partial loss of the person’s bodily or mental functions; or
(b) total or partial loss of a part of the body; or
(c) the presence in the body of organisms causing disease or illness; or
(d) the presence in the body of organisms capable of causing disease or illness; or
(e) the malfunction, malformation or disfigurement of a part of the person’s body; or
(f) a disorder or malfunction that results in the person learning differently from a person without the disorder or malfunction; or
(g) a disorder, illness or disease that affects a person’s thought processes, perception of reality, emotions or judgment or that results in disturbed behaviour;

and includes a disability that:

(a) presently exists; or
(b) previously existed but no longer exists; or
(c) may exist in the future (including because of a genetic predisposition to that disability); or
(d) is imputed to a person.

To avoid doubt, a disability that is otherwise covered by this definition includes behaviour that is a symptom or manifestation of the disability.

domestic applicant means an applicant who is:

- an Australian citizen;
- a permanent resident of Australia; or
- a New Zealand citizen.

domestic student means a student who is:

- an Australian citizen;
- a permanent resident of Australia; or
- a New Zealand citizen.

double degree course means a course in which a student completes two AQF qualifications under one set of award course resolutions with no cross-crediting of units of study between the qualifications.

educational access scheme means an entry scheme approved by the Academic Board in accordance Part 7 of this policy.
embedded program means a sequence of linked courses in closely related academic or professional areas that:

- allows for consequential and incrementally higher levels of academic achievement;
- specifies in the award course resolutions conditions for transfer from one linked award to a higher linked award; and
- allows credit points for a unit of study to count towards more than one of the linked awards.

enrolment means enrolment in a coursework award course at the University. A person is not enrolled until the person has completed, to the satisfaction of the University, all requirements for enrolment or re-enrolment in the award course concerned.

exchange student means a person who is:

- not an Australian citizen;
- not admitted to an award course at the University;
- admitted to a formally approved program of study at an overseas institution with which the University has an exchange agreement; and
- enrolled in one or more units of study at the University.

exemption means an exemption given by a faculty to a student from the requirement to complete parts of the prescribed work for a particular unit of study within a course, including attendance at prescribed lectures, seminars, tutorials and practical work.

faculty means a faculty, University school or a board of studies and in this policy refers to the faculties or University schools responsible for the relevant award course.

feedback means information provided to students on the quality of their learning in relation to an assessment activity, which forms the basis of improved student learning.

flexible entry scheme means an entry scheme for Australian recent school leavers, approved by the Academic Board in accordance with clause 26 of this policy.

Graduate Certificate means an advanced program of study that builds on prior undergraduate study or, where approved by the faculty, prior experience that is considered by the faculty to demonstrate the required knowledge and aptitude.

Graduate Diploma means an advanced program of study that builds on either or both of prior undergraduate or postgraduate study.
**graduate qualities** means the qualities demonstrated by all graduates of award courses on completion of the requirements of the award course. At the date of this policy, for undergraduate award courses, Part 2 of *Learning and Teaching Policy 2015* details these as:

(a) depth of disciplinary expertise;
(b) broader skills:
   (i) critical thinking and problem solving;
   (ii) oral and written communication;
   (iii) information and digital literacy;
   (iv) inventiveness;
(c) cultural competence;
(d) interdisciplinary effectiveness;
(e) an integrated professional, ethical and personal identity;
(f) influence.

**group work** means a formally established project to be carried out by a number of students working together that results in a single piece of assessment or a number of associated pieces of assessment.

**Higher School Certificate (HSC)** means a Higher School Certificate granted by the NSW Board of Studies under the *Education Act 1990*.

**International English Language Testing System (IELTS)** means the test jointly administered by British Council, IDP Education Pty Ltd and the University of Cambridge.

**integrated honours course** means a course that leads to the award of a degree with honours that is not an appended honours course. The honours component of the course is integrated within the overall course without extending the time for completion of the course.

**international applicant** means an applicant who is not:
- an Australian citizen;
- a permanent resident of Australia; or
- a New Zealand citizen.

**International Baccalaureate** means the diploma awarded to a person who successfully completes the International Baccalaureate program, developed and administered by the International Baccalaureate Organisation.

**international student** means a student who is not:
- an Australian citizen;
- a permanent resident of Australia; or
- a New Zealand citizen.
learning outcomes means statements of what students know, understand and are able to do on completion of a unit of study, a major, program, stream, award course, or other curriculum component.

Liberal Studies Bachelor degree means a degree of study at Bachelor level of three years duration (or part-time equivalent) that provides students with a broad multi-disciplinary education that develops disciplinary expertise and graduate qualities.

Note: See clause 83B.

major means a defined sequence of units of study taken by a student which develops depth of expertise in a field of study.

Note: See Part 3 of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015

Masters degree by coursework means a program of advanced learning and professional training that builds on undergraduate study, achieves at least the learning outcomes specified for level 9 of the AQF and normally leads to a capstone experience. The University offers four types of Masters degree by coursework:

- **Advanced Learning Masters**: a minimum one year full-time advanced study course that builds on prior undergraduate study in the same discipline or in a relevant discipline;
- **Professional Masters degree**: a Masters degree that prepares the student for accreditation or recognition in a specific profession, building either on prior undergraduate study in the discipline or on undergraduate study in another appropriate discipline;
- **Research Pathway Masters degree**: a Masters degree that develops advanced knowledge and research skills in a discipline to prepare a student to undertake a Doctor of Philosophy;
- **Masters Degree (Extended)**: a Professional Masters Degree of extended duration, typically three or four years full-time. The degree of Doctor of Dental Medicine, Juris Doctor, Doctor of Medicine and Doctor of Veterinary Medicine are referred to in the AQF as ‘Masters Degree (Extended)’.

minor means a defined sequence of units of study taken by a student which develops expertise in a field of study.

Note: See Part 3 of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015

misadventure means an unforeseen accident, mishap or personal misfortune.

moderation means the process by which the validity and reliability of assessment marks are verified.

non-award student means a person who is not admitted to an award course at the University, and who is not an exchange student or study abroad student, but is enrolled in a unit of study at the University.
non-specific credit means a ‘block credit’ for a specified number of credit points at a particular level. These credit points may be in a particular subject area but are not linked to a specific unit of study.

New Zealand Qualifications framework (NZQF) means the New Zealand national framework for recognition and endorsement of education qualifications.

open learning environment means a shared pool of units of study which are:
  • of zero, two or six credit points value;
  • approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies; and
  • available to all students according to the award course resolutions applicable to the award course in which they are enrolled.

postgraduate award course means an award course leading to the award of a Graduate Certificate, Graduate Diploma, Masters degree or a Doctorate. Normally, a postgraduate award course requires the prior completion of a relevant undergraduate degree or diploma.

principal examiner means the designated person responsible for the assignment of final marks and grades in a unit of study.

Professional or Specialist Bachelor degree means a degree that develops disciplinary or professional expertise for a specific profession or career specialisation and graduate qualities.

Note: See clause 83C.

program means a combination of units of study that develops expertise in a multi-disciplinary domain or a professional or specialist field and includes at least one recognised major.

Note: See Part 3 of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015

program director means the person responsible at a stream, program, major or degree level for managing the curriculum and providing coordination and advice to staff and students.

Progression profile means the record of all relevant documentation relating to a student’s academic progression, including correspondence and interview records.

Progression rate means the rate at which a student accrues credit in their award course over a defined period, measured as a credit point progression rate and a unit of study progression rate.

Progression requirements means the requirements for academic progression set out in the faculty resolutions, award course resolutions and this policy.

Recent school leaver means a person who completed the HSC or equivalent in the year immediately prior to admission or proposed admission to an award course, or who completed their HSC in the year immediately prior to that if the person has not undertaken any tertiary study.
Registrar means the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar).

semester average mark means the average mark obtained by a student for all units of study attempted in a semester, weighted according to credit point value.

simple extension means an informal arrangement between a student and a unit of study co-ordinator to permit late submission of work, as provided in clause 66A of this policy.

special admission program means a flexible entry scheme or an educational access scheme approved by the Academic Board and listed in Part 7 of this policy.

specialisation has the meaning given in the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015, which at the date of this policy is:

- the disciplinary or professional expertise developed for a profession or career in a Professional or Specialist Bachelor degree or postgraduate degree; or
- the research specialisation developed in a Research Pathway Masters degree.

specific credit means the recognition of previously completed studies as directly equivalent to specific units of study.

Staying on Track information session means an information session held intensively, for a full week in each semester, to assist students who are failing to meet academic progression requirements.

Staying on Track survey means a self-reflective survey designed to assist students to identify why they are having difficulties meeting academic progression requirements.

Stream means a version of a degree that can be conceptualised as a separate degree for admission purposes but that is linked to a set of other streams of the degree through shared nomenclature, shared course components and shared rules. In degree nomenclature, streams may be indicated in parentheses following the name of the main degree.

Student means a person who is currently admitted to candidature in an award course of the University and, where relevant, an exchange student or non-award student.

Study abroad student means a person who is:

- not an Australian citizen;
- not admitted to an award course at the University;
- admitted to a formally approved program of study at an overseas institution with which the University does not have an agreement; and
- enrolled in units of study at the University.
Summer School means the intensive teaching period (split into three separate sessions) between December and January of each year, in which students may elect to undertake one or more units of study.

Technical and Further Education college (TAFE) means a college operated by TAFE NSW.

Testamur means a certificate or award provided to a graduate, usually at a graduation ceremony.

Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) means the test administered by Educational Testing Service or its licensees.

undergraduate award course means a coursework award course leading to the award of an Associate Diploma, Diploma, Advanced Diploma or Bachelor degree or Bachelor (Honours) degree.

undergraduate degree means an undergraduate award course at Bachelor level that achieves at a minimum the learning outcomes specified for AQF level 7.

unit of study means the smallest stand-alone component of an award course that is recordable on a student’s transcript. Units of study have an integer credit point value, normally six credit points, except where approved by the Academic Board.

Note: See also Part 3 of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015

unit of study co-ordinator means the academic staff member with overall responsibility for the planning and delivery of a unit of study.

Universities Admission Centre (UAC) means the Universities Admissions Centre (NSW & ACT) Pty Limited, which processes applications for admission to most undergraduate courses at the University of Sydney and other participating institutions.

university means a body that is established as a university or recognised as a university, by or under a law of the Commonwealth or a State or Territory, and meets nationally agreed criteria for a university.

University means the University of Sydney, established under the University of Sydney Act 1989.

vertically-integrated combined degree means a combined degree across two AQF levels, for example Bachelor and Masters, or Masters and Doctorate.

waiver means an exemption given by a faculty to a student from the requirement to complete a prescribed unit of study.

Winter School means the intensive teaching period in July of each year, in which students may elect to undertake one or more units of study.
working day means a day on which the University is usually open for business. This does not include any Saturday, Sunday, public holiday or any day designated as part of the University’s Christmas shutdown period.

(2) A heading to a Part or Schedule is a provision of this policy. Other headings are not provisions of this policy, but the number of a section or subsection is a provision of this policy even if it is in a heading.

(3) A note, marginal note, footnote or endnote is not a provision of this policy.

PART 2 ADMISSION TO AWARD COURSES

6 Quotas

On the recommendation of the Dean, the Registrar may determine:

(a) the maximum number of applicants who may be admitted to a specified award course in a specified academic year;
(b) the maximum number of applicants who may be admitted to a specified award course under a special admission program in a specified academic year;
(c) the maximum number of students who may enrol in a specified unit of study in a specified academic year; and
(d) the maximum number of continuing students who may enrol in a specified unit of study in a specified academic year.

7 Admission by Dean

Note: The Dean is responsible for the admission of candidates to courses within their faculty. See clause 2.5 of the Coursework Rule and Part 8 of this policy.

(1) Subject to and in accordance with the Coursework Rule and this policy, the relevant program director may permit any person to enrol as a non-award student in a specified unit of study within that Faculty.

(2) Subject to anti-discrimination legislation, the Dean may decline to admit an applicant, or to offer to admit an applicant, to an award course if, in the opinion of the Dean, appropriate and satisfactory provision cannot be made for the applicant.

8 General requirements

A person is eligible for admission to an award course only if:

(a) the person meets the requirements in the Coursework Rule, this policy and the relevant award course resolutions for admission to the award course;
(b) the person has not made a material misrepresentation in applying for admission to the award course; and
(c) if the person is an international applicant who will study in Australia, the person holds a visa enabling them to undertake courses of study in Australia.

9 Admission and candidature

(1) The admissions process commences when an applicant accepts the University’s offer of admission to an award course.

(2) A person is admitted to candidature on the date on which they complete the admissions process.

(a) Domestic students are admitted to candidature on the date of their first enrolment.

(b) International students are admitted to candidature on the date on which they:

(i) complete their acceptance online, or complete their acceptance of offer form;

(ii) pay the applicable fees to the University; and

(iii) enrol for the first time.

(3) Enrolment may be deferred in accordance with clause 38 of this policy.

(4) Candidature ceases when an award is conferred or candidature is otherwise terminated by the University.

9A Admission standards

(1) Except as determined by the Academic Board, the same or equivalent admission standard shall apply to all applicants for an award course.

PART 3 ELIGIBILITY FOR ADMISSION TO UNDERGRADUATE COURSES

10 Domestic applicants – secondary studies

(1) To be eligible for admission to candidature in an undergraduate award course on the basis of secondary studies, a domestic applicant must have successfully completed:

(a) a NSW Higher School Certificate examination, leading to the calculation of an ATAR, in accordance with procedures prescribed by the NSW Vice-Chancellor’s Conference from time to time;

(b) a State or Territory leaving examination considered by the Academic Board to be equivalent to the HSC; or

(c) any other school leaving examination, provided that the program of study and the standard of the examination are considered by the Academic Board to be equivalent to the program and the standard required of candidates for the HSC.
(2) The University will convert interstate or overseas school-leaving results in the manner determined by the Academic Board from time to time.

Note: The University will convert interstate and New Zealand results in accordance with the Interstate Transfer Index endorsed by the New South Wales Vice-Chancellors’ Conference.

(3) The University will use the better of either the most recent ATAR or any other accepted secondary qualification.

(4) If, following any offer of admission, the results of an applicant are found to be incorrect, the University:
   (a) if the applicant achieved a higher ATAR or equivalent than originally awarded, will endeavour to admit the applicant to the award course to which the correct ATAR or equivalent would have earned admission;
   (b) if the applicant achieved a lower ATAR or equivalent than originally awarded:
      (i) reserves its right to withdraw its offer of admission at any time within the first four weeks of the student’s first semester; and
      (ii) will endeavour to admit the applicant to a course for which the applicant would have qualified with the lower ATAR.

(5) No offer of admission to an award course will be made or withdrawn pursuant to subclause (4) without the approval of the Registrar.

Note: In giving approval under subclause (5), the Registrar will take into account whether it is too late in the year for the student to commence studies in a new course effectively.

11 Domestic applicants – tertiary studies

(1) To be eligible for admission to candidature in an undergraduate award course on the basis of tertiary studies, a domestic applicant must have successfully completed the equivalent of at least one full-time year of tertiary study at Bachelor level or higher.

Note: For subclause (1), one full-time year of tertiary study means 48 credit points of study at the University, or the part-time equivalent.

(2) Subject to the award course resolutions, consideration will be given to the applicant’s record of both tertiary and secondary studies, with the better of either record being used to determine their eligibility for admission.

(3) Where the applicant does not have recognised secondary qualifications, only the tertiary record will be considered.

(4) Where the applicant has made more than one attempt at tertiary study, only the best attempt at tertiary study will be considered.

(5) Subject to clause 81, an applicant who:
   (a) has been excluded from a diploma or degree program for failure to meet progression requirements; and
   (b) following the exclusion, passes at least one semester of study at degree level; or
   (c) provides to the Associate Dean a satisfactory explanation of the circumstances for the exclusion;
is eligible for admission on the basis of tertiary studies.

(6) Subject to clause 81, an applicant who:

(a) has a record of failure and exclusion from tertiary study; and
(b) believes that their studies have been affected by circumstances beyond their control;

may apply for special consideration for admission by the relevant faculty.

Note: For information on the Special Consideration for Admission Scheme see clause 34.

Note: Clause 81 deals with applications for readmission to a course following exclusion from the same course due to failure to meet progression requirements.

12 Domestic applicants – other qualifications

To be eligible for admission to candidature in an undergraduate award course on the basis of other qualifications, a domestic applicant must have successfully completed:

(a) a preparation program approved by the Academic Board in accordance with clause 15 that was commenced by the applicant as an international student;
(b) the Diploma of Tertiary Preparation offered through the University’s Centre for Continuing Education provided that applicants under the age of 21 at the date of commencement of the course to which they seek admission also have an HSC or equivalent;
(c) an AQF diploma that provides appropriate academic preparation approved by the faculty provided that applicants under the age of 21 at the date of commencement of the course to which they seek admission also have an HSC or equivalent;
(d) another preparation program determined by the Academic Board to have a program of study and standard required of applicants equivalent to the HSC; or
(e) some other form of prior learning approved by the Academic Board.

12A Domestic applicants – transitional provisions

(1) A domestic applicant who commenced an AQF diploma between 1 January and 25 March 2015 is eligible for admission to candidature in an award course on the basis of that diploma.

(2) Other applicants with an AQF diploma completed during 2015 are eligible for admission to candidature in an award course on the basis of that diploma only with approval of the Chair of the Admissions Committee, the Chair of the Academic Board and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar).

13 International applicants

(1) To be eligible for admission to candidature in an undergraduate award course, an international applicant must have:

(a) met one or more of the requirements for admission to an undergraduate award course in clauses 10-12 above; or
(b) successfully completed a preparation program approved by the Academic Board in accordance with clause 15.

(2) Subject to approval by the Academic Board, international applicants may be admitted on the basis of forecast scores.

(3) International applicants, other than exchange students, will be considered for admission on a fee-paying basis only. Local student quotas will not apply.

14 Domestic and international applicants – special entry requirements

(1) Faculties may, with the approval of the Academic Board, impose special entry requirements.

(2) Domestic and international applicants for admission to an undergraduate award course must meet any special entry requirements approved by the Academic Board and prescribed in the award course resolutions.

14A Domestic and international applicants – admission prerequisites

(1) The Academic Board may determine standards which set prerequisites for admission to particular award courses.

(2) Such standards will be published on the Academic Board standards website as the Academic Board Admissions Standard – English Language Proficiency.

15 Approved preparation programs

(1) The preparation programs approved by the Academic Board for international students are:

(a) foundation programs offered by public higher education providers in Australia who are authorised to self-accredit their courses under the AQF;

(b) foundation programs offered by public higher education providers in New Zealand who are authorised to self-accredit their courses under the New Zealand Qualifications Framework; and

(c) the Advanced International Certificate of Education, University of Cambridge.

(2) The Academic Board may approve foundation and preparation programs offered by private higher education providers in Australia and New Zealand for international students, provided that:

(a) the courses offered in Australia are accredited under the AQF at Certificate IV level or above; and

(b) the courses offered in New Zealand are accredited under the NZQF at Certificate IV level or above.

(3) The Academic Board may approve foundation and preparation programs offered by overseas higher education providers for international students on a case-by-case basis.
(4) The preparation program approved by the Academic Board for domestic students is the Diploma of Tertiary Preparation offered through the University’s Centre for Continuing Education (see also clause 12(b) above).

(5) Unless otherwise specified in a particular course resolution, admission standards for foundation and preparation programs that are recognised for admission by the Academic Board will be set in accordance with the relevant UAC schedule.

PART 4  ELIGIBILITY FOR ADMISSION TO POSTGRADUATE COURSES

16  Graduate Certificate

To be eligible for admission to a Graduate Certificate, an applicant must:

(a) have a Bachelor degree or higher award from the University in a relevant discipline, as determined by the program director; or

(b) have a Bachelor degree or higher award from another university or institution that the program director determines to be equivalent to a degree or award mentioned in subclause (a); and

(c) meet other requirements specified in the faculty resolutions and relevant award course resolutions.

17  Graduate Diploma

To be eligible for admission to a Graduate Diploma, an applicant must:

(a) have a Bachelor degree or higher award from the University in a relevant discipline, as determined by the program director;

(b) have a Graduate Certificate from the University in a relevant discipline, as determined by the program director;

(c) have a Bachelor degree or higher award from another university or institution that the program director determines to be equivalent to a degree, award or certificate mentioned in subclause (a) or (b); or

(d) if the applicant does not satisfy subclauses (a) - (c), have completed the requirements for an award course leading to:

(i) an embedded graduate certificate in the appropriate discipline at the University, as determined by the program director; or

(ii) a program at another tertiary institution that the program director determines to be the equivalent of such a course; without graduating from the course; and

(e) meet other requirements specified in the faculty resolutions and relevant award course resolutions.
18 Masters Degree (Advanced Learning Masters degree)

To be eligible for admission to an Advanced Learning Masters degree, an applicant must:

(a) have a Masters degree, a Graduate Diploma, a Bachelor degree (Honours), or a Bachelor degree (Pass) with a credit average, from the University in a relevant discipline, as determined by the program director;

(b) have a degree, diploma or award from another university or institution that the program director determines to be equivalent to a degree or diploma mentioned in subclause (a); or

(c) if the applicant does not satisfy subclauses (a) or (b), have completed:
   (i) the requirements for an award course leading to an embedded Graduate Diploma or Graduate Certificate in the appropriate discipline at the University of Sydney, as determined by the program director; or
   (ii) a program at another tertiary education institution, being a program that the program director determines to be the equivalent of an embedded course mentioned in subclause (i);

without graduating from the course; and

(d) meet other requirements specified in the faculty resolutions and relevant award course resolutions.

19 Masters degree (Professional Masters degree)

To be eligible for admission to a Professional Masters degree, an applicant must:

(a) have a Masters degree, a Bachelor degree, or a Graduate Diploma from the University in a relevant discipline, as determined by the program director;

(b) have a degree from another university or institution that the program director determines to be equivalent to a degree or award mentioned in subclause (a); or

(c) if the applicant does not satisfy subclause (a) or (b), have completed:
   (i) the requirements for an award course leading to an embedded Graduate Diploma or Graduate Certificate in the appropriate discipline at the University of Sydney, as determined by the program director; or
   (ii) a program at another tertiary education institution that the program director determines to be the equivalent of an embedded course mentioned in subclause (i);

without graduating from the course; and

(d) meet other requirements specified in the faculty resolutions and relevant award course resolutions.

Note: The Masters Degree (Extended) is a form of Professional Masters degree – see the definition of Masters degree by coursework.
20 Exemption from eligibility requirements in exceptional circumstances

(1) Subject to subclause (2) below, a Dean may, in writing, grant an exemption from the eligibility requirements in clauses 16, 17 and 19 for an applicant for admission to:

(a) a Graduate Certificate;
(b) a Graduate Diploma; or
(c) a Professional Masters degree.

(2) A Dean may only grant an exemption from the eligibility requirements in clauses 16, 17 and 19 if satisfied that the applicant:

(a) has qualifications and experience equivalent to those eligibility requirements; and

(b) has provided evidence of experience and achievement sufficient to demonstrate mastery of the subject matter and graduate qualities equivalent to those gained by applicants who meet the eligibility requirements.

Note: For subclause (2)(b), evidence of experience and achievement could be provided through publications or authorship of official documents.

PART 5 ENGLISH LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS – UNDERGRADUATE COURSES

21 All applicants whose first language is English

(1) All applicants whose first language is English must provide:

(a) evidence of citizenship or permanent residency of an English speaking country; and

(b) completion of secondary and/or tertiary study in English at a recognised institution of an English country.

(2) The English speaking countries referenced in subclauses 21(1)(a)-(b) are the countries listed on the Academic Board Admissions Standard – English Language Proficiency Academic Board Standards website.<Insert ELP Admissions Standards webpage link>.

21A All applicants whose first language is not English

(1) All applicants whose first language is not English must meet the University’s English language requirements to be eligible for admission to an undergraduate award course.

(2) Subject to this Part, any applicant for admission to an undergraduate award course whose first language is not English, must have meet the requirements as listed on the Academic Board Admissions Standard – English Language Proficiency Academic Board Admissions Standards website.<Insert ELP Admissions Standards webpage link>.
(a) an Australian educational qualification; or
(b) a record of satisfactory achievement in secondary or tertiary studies:
   (i) in an English-speaking country; or
   (ii) in which the language of instruction was English; or
(c) satisfactorily completed an appropriate course at the University’s Centre for English Teaching; or
(d) within two years of the date on which the applicant will commence the course, achieved:
   (i) an IELTS overall band score of 6.5, with at least 6.0 in each band;
   (ii) a paper based TOEFL score of 550 plus a Test of Written English (TWE) score of 4.5;
   (iii) an internet based TOEFL score of 79 plus a score of 23 for Writing and 22 for Reading, Speaking and Listening;
   (iv) a Pearson Test of English (Academic) (PTE) score of 58;
   (v) a Cambridge English: Advanced (CAE) score of 58; or
(d) within the past two years, achieved an International Baccalaureate diploma having, as part of the studies for that diploma, successfully completed:
   (i) English A1 at Higher or Standard Level, or A: Literature;
   (ii) English A2 at Higher or Standard Level, or A: Language and Literature;
   (iii) English B at Higher Level with Grade 4 or more; or
(d) English B at Standard Level with Grade 5 or more.

(3) An applicant for admission to an undergraduate award course in a faculty that has set English language requirements above the minimum requirements set out in subclause (2) must meet the faculty’s requirements as approved by the Academic Board.

Note: These faculty requirements must be approved by the Academic Board in accordance with the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority—Academic Functions) Rule 2016.

(4) Applicants seeking admission to an undergraduate award course on the basis of satisfactory achievement in secondary or tertiary studies in accordance with subclause (2)(b) must have completed either:
   (a) senior secondary study; or
   (b) at least one year of full-time university study; in which the language of instruction was English.

(5) Where an applicant has provided insufficient evidence of current English competency relevant to a particular award course, the relevant Associate Dean may require the applicant to undergo further assessment of either or both of written or spoken English.

(6) An Associate Dean who requires an applicant to undergo a further assessment for the purpose of subclause (5) above will report the circumstances and the form of the assessment to the Registrar as soon as possible thereafter.
(7) The Head of School and Dean of the Sydney College of the Arts may, on application and at their discretion, admit to the Bachelor of Visual Arts an applicant who has achieved an IELTS overall band score of 6.0.

(8) The Head of School and Dean of the Sydney Conservatorium of Music may, on application and at their discretion, admit to the Diploma of Music an applicant who has achieved an IELTS overall band score of 6.0.

(9)(3) If the Academic Board has prescribed qualifications accepted as proof of English language proficiency for applicants who have undertaken study in specified countries, an applicant who holds the prescribed qualifications will be considered to have met the minimum English language requirements for all undergraduate courses.

Note: A conversion table for English Language Skills Tests is available on the Academic Board Admissions Standard – English Language Proficiency Academic Board standards website [update hyperlink to new Admissions Standard].

21B Exemption from English language requirements in certain circumstances

Exceptional circumstances

In exceptional circumstances only, a Dean may, in writing, deem a student demonstrates English language requirements for admission to an undergraduate course by means other than those listed in the Academic Board Admissions Standard – English Language Proficiency [Insert ELP test standards webpage link] in accordance with clause 7 of those standards. The Dean may, in writing, grant an exemption from the English language requirements for admission to an undergraduate course in accordance with the requirements established in clause 7 of the Academic Board Admissions Standard – English Language Proficiency [Insert ELP test standards webpage link].

22 International applicants whose first language is not English

Where an international applicant:

(a) is required by the Commonwealth government to provide IELTS or TOEFL results in order to obtain a student visa; and

(b) does not have a record of satisfactory achievement in secondary or tertiary studies in an English speaking country;

the University will use the IELTS or TOEFL results as the primary tool for assessing whether the applicant has satisfied English language requirements.

PART 6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS – POSTGRADUATE COURSES

23 All applicants whose first language is English

(1) All applicants whose first language is English must provide:
23A All applicants whose first language is not English

(1) All applicants whose first language is not English must meet the University’s English language requirements to be eligible for admission to a postgraduate award course.

(2) Subject to this Part, any applicant for admission to a postgraduate award course whose first language is not English, must meet the requirements as listed on the Academic Board Admissions Standard – English Language Proficiency Academic Board Admissions Standards website <Insert ELP Admissions Standards webpage link>.

(a) in the five years prior to their application, successfully completed tertiary studies in which the language of the institution, instruction, examination and assessment was English; or

(b) in the two years prior to their application, successfully completed an appropriate course at the University’s Centre for English Teaching, with results at a standard required for the award course that the applicant is applying for; or

(c) in the two years prior to their application, achieved:

(i) an IELTS overall band score of 6.5 with a minimum of 6.0 in each band; or

(ii) a paper based TOEFL score of 577 plus a Test of Written English (TWE) score of 4.5; or

(iii) an internet based TOEFL (IBT) score of 90 plus a minimum score of 23 for Writing and 22 for Reading, Speaking and Listening; or

(iv) a Pearson Test of English (Academic) (PTE) score of 61; or

(v) a Cambridge English: Advanced (CAE) score of 58.

(3) An applicant for admission to a postgraduate award course in a faculty that has set English language requirements above the minimum requirements set out in subclause (2) must meet the faculty’s requirements as approved by the Academic Board.

24 Exemption from English language requirements in certain circumstances

Exceptional circumstances

(1) In exceptional circumstances only, a Dean may, in writing, deem a student demonstrates English language requirements for admission to a postgraduate course by means other than those listed in the Academic Board Admissions
Standard – English Language Proficiency <insert ELP test standards webpage link> in accordance with clause 7 of those standards. The Dean may, in writing, grant an exemption from the English language requirements for admission to a postgraduate course in accordance with the requirements established in clause 7 of the Academic Board Admissions Standard – English Language Proficiency <insert ELP test standards webpage link>, if:

(a) the applicant has an IELTS score and:
   (i) the overall or average band score is no more than 0.5 below the overall or average band score otherwise required by this policy; and
   (ii) any individual band score is no more than 1.0 below the individual band score otherwise required by this policy; or

(b) the applicant has a score on another test permitted by this policy and the applicant’s score was no more than a corresponding amount below the score otherwise required by this policy; and

(c) the Dean is satisfied that the applicant has enough competence in written and spoken English to complete the course successfully.

(2) The Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board may, in exceptional circumstances, modify the limits prescribed in subclause (1)(a) or (b), as they apply in a particular case.

(3) In considering whether an applicant has enough competence in written and spoken English to complete the course successfully, the Dean:
   (a) must take into account any advice of the relevant Associate Dean; and
   (b) may consider any other relevant matter, including:
      (i) the applicant’s ability to communicate in an academic environment;
      (ii) whether the applicant has been known to the faculty for at least two years;
      (iii) any appropriate work experience that the applicant has had in an English language environment; and
      (iv) any oral discussions between faculty members and the applicant.

(4) The Dean must record in writing on the student file any approval to waive English language requirements, including:
   (a) the proof of proficiency in English provided by the applicant; and
   (b) the reasons, in accordance with this policy, that the Dean approved the waiver.
PART 7  SPECIAL ADMISSION PROGRAMS

25  Application for a special admission program

(1) While eligibility for admission to the University is based on academic merit, the University recognises that, for many reasons, some domestic applicants are unable to demonstrate their full potential for success at tertiary level study through the normal qualifying processes. The University has established flexible entry schemes and educational access schemes to assist these domestic applicants to gain admission to undergraduate courses.

(2) Special admission programs may be faculty or course specific and must be approved by the Academic Board. All approved special admission programs must be set out in the relevant faculty resolutions or award course resolutions.

(3) Domestic applicants may apply for admission under more than one flexible entry scheme and educational access scheme, provided that their ATAR or equivalent lies within the approved eligibility band for each scheme. Except for Conditional Early Offers Schemes, the Cadigal Program and the Future Leaders Scheme, no such applicant will be admitted to a course if their ATAR or equivalent is more than five rank points below the relevant cut-off for the course. For the Future Leaders Scheme, no applicant will be admitted to a course if their ATAR is below the Minimum Eligibility Score for that course.

(4) Despite anything in this Part, flexible entry schemes and educational access schemes are subject to any quota set in accordance with clause 6 of this policy.

26  Flexible entry schemes

(1) The Academic Board may by resolution, on the recommendation of a faculty, establish or amend a flexible entry scheme for an undergraduate award course.

(2) A flexible entry scheme must set a flexible entry band for ATARs, and otherwise be consistent with this clause.

(3) Flexible entry schemes for specified courses are available to domestic applicants who:
   (a) are eligible Australian recent school leavers, including applicants who hold an International Baccalaureate;
   (b) have an ATAR or ATAR equivalent that lies below the ATAR cut-off for that course; and
   (c) do not have a tertiary record.

(4) Flexible entry schemes comprise two components:
   (a) a flexible entry ATAR band, lying between the ATAR cut-off and a lower limit that is not more than 5 rank points below the ATAR cut-off; and
   (b) a flexible entry criterion or criteria, selected from the list approved by the Academic Board in clause 26(5), that allows admission of eligible applicants whose ATAR lies within the flexible entry band.

(5) The Academic Board approved flexible entry criteria are:
   (a) satisfactory performance in the HSC, or HSC equivalent, in subjects relevant to the course;
(b) satisfactory performance in extra-curricular academic activities relevant to the course;

Note: For subclause (5)(b), extra-curricular activities might, for example, include Science Olympiads.

(c) aptitude for the award course, demonstrated by:
   (i) relevant work or other experience;
   (ii) submission of a portfolio; or
   (iii) submission of a statement of interest in the course.

Note: For subclause (5)(c), faculties may use written submissions, interviews or other methods to obtain information about aptitude.

(6) A flexible entry scheme in force at the commencement of this policy continues in force. It may be terminated by resolution of the Academic Board, but must not be amended if the scheme, as amended, would be inconsistent with this clause.

26A Future Leaders Scheme

(1) The University recognises that appointment to certain school leadership roles indicates abilities in a student, beyond those identified by their ATAR, that are also relevant to the university environment. In recognition of this, school leaders may be admitted to a course with an ATAR below that required for normal admission to that course.

(2) The Future Leaders Scheme is available, for specified courses, to domestic and international applicants who:
   (a) are eligible current school leavers attending a secondary school registered with the relevant state or territory Department of Education, including applicants who hold an International Baccalaureate;
   (b) are nominated by their school principal or nominee as dux or captain of the school;
   (c) have an ATAR or ATAR equivalent that lies between the previous year’s ATAR cut-off for that course and a lower limit determined by the faculty for that course; and;
   (d) meet all other applicable course entry requirements.

27 Broadway Scheme

(1) The purpose of the Broadway Scheme is to help domestic applicants who have experienced educational disadvantage to gain admission to undergraduate award courses.

(2) Domestic applicants who are eligible for admission under the Broadway Scheme are permitted to compete for admission with an ATAR or equivalent of up to five rank points below the ATAR cut-off for the award course, or equivalent.

(3) The Broadway Scheme is available to domestic applicants who:
   (a) have successfully completed Year 12 or equivalent interstate or overseas secondary education (including at a high school or a technical and further education college, or an equivalent education institution); and
have suffered:

(i) long-term educational disadvantage; or
(ii) severe disadvantage during the final two years of their secondary education.

(4) The Broadway Scheme is not available to applicants who have a record of tertiary study.

(5) For the purposes of determining whether an applicant has suffered educational disadvantage, the Associate Dean of the relevant faculty may consider:

(a) whether the home environment or conditions for study for the applicant were adverse;
(b) any chronic illness, disability or personal trauma, the applicant suffered;
(c) whether the applicant’s schooling or family life has been disrupted;
(d) whether the applicant has English language difficulties;
(e) whether the applicant’s family responsibilities are or were excessive;
(f) any financial hardship affecting the applicant;
(g) whether the applicant was in a remote or isolated location;
(h) whether the applicant has suffered physical or psychological abuse.

28 Cadigal Program

(1) The purpose of the Cadigal Program is to address the educational disadvantage experienced by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, by facilitating and supporting their participation in University courses. It comprises:

(a) provision of preparatory studies for Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islanders who want to undertake degree courses at the University;
(b) provision for reduced academic eligibility requirements for admission to courses for Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander applicants;
(c) provision for a reduced first year load for Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander students; and
(d) a continuing support program for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students.

(2) The Cadigal Program involves a commitment by the University that up to 5% of student places will be available to Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander applicants.

(3) The Cadigal Program is available to applicants of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent.

(4) An applicant will be taken to be of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent only if they comply with the Confirmation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Identity Policy 2015.

(5) Selection of applicants for admission under the Cadigal Program will be on the basis of application and academic assessment.

(6) The Associate Dean of a faculty may admit an applicant to an undergraduate award course under the Cadigal Program only if:

(a) where the applicant will be under 21 years old on 31 March in the academic year after the year in which the application is made:
(i) the applicant has an ATAR of equal to or higher than the rank determined jointly for the award course by the faculty and the administrator of the Cadigal Program; or

(ii) the applicant has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Associate Dean their capacity to succeed in coursework at a university level;

(b) where the applicant will be over 21 years old on 31 March in the academic year after the year in which the application is made:

(i) the applicant has successfully completed a tertiary education preparation course that the Associate Dean determines to be relevant to the course;

(ii) the applicant has successfully completed, or has partly completed, an accredited course at diploma level or above; or

(iii) the applicant has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Associate Dean their capacity to succeed in coursework at a university level.

(7) An Associate Dean may, for a maximum period of one year, place requirements and restrictions on the enrolment of a student who is offered admission to an undergraduate award course under the Cadigal Program, including:

(a) requiring a student to complete a unit or units of study within a specified time;

(b) prohibiting enrolment by the student in a unit or units of study;

(c) restricting the maximum unit of study load in which a student can enrol.

Note: For subclause 6(a)(i): the minimum ATAR will be lower than that required for mainstream entry.

29 Conditional Early Offers Schemes

(1) The purpose of a Conditional Early Offers Scheme is to enable the University to identify, prior to completion of the HSC or equivalent, domestic students with academic promise who have suffered educational disadvantage and would benefit from additional support and early engagement with the University.

(2) The Associate Dean of a faculty may, under a Conditional Early Offers Scheme, make a prospective domestic student a conditional offer of admission to an undergraduate award course at the end of Year 10, or during year 11 or 12.

(3) The Associate Dean of a faculty may admit a domestic applicant to candidature in an undergraduate award course under the Conditional Early Offers Scheme only if:

(a) the applicant has an ATAR of equal to or higher than the rank determined jointly for the award course by the faculty and the administrator of the Conditional Early Offers Scheme; and

(b) the student maintains the level of academic performance demonstrated in accordance with subclause (5) below.

(4) For the purposes of determining whether an applicant has suffered educational disadvantage, the Associate Dean of the relevant faculty may consider:

(a) whether the home environment or conditions for study for the applicant were adverse;

(b) any chronic illness, disability or personal trauma, the applicant suffered;

(c) whether the applicant’s schooling or family life has been disrupted;
(d) whether the applicant has English language difficulties;
(e) whether the applicant’s family responsibilities are or were excessive;
(f) any financial hardship affecting the applicant;
(g) whether the applicant was in a remote or isolated location;
(h) whether the applicant has suffered physical or psychological abuse.

(5) For the purposes of determining whether an applicant has demonstrated early academic promise, the Associate Dean may, with the approval of the Academic Board, consider:
(a) evidence provided by the Principal of the applicant’s school;
(b) performance in the Record of School Achievement;
(c) performance in a test approved by the Academic Board;
(d) other measures of promise approved by the Academic Board, including an interview or portfolio.

Note: For subclause 3(a): the minimum ATAR will be lower than that required for mainstream entry.

30 Principal's Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme (E12)

(1) The purpose of the Principal’s Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme is to enable the University to identify, prior to completion of the HSC or equivalent, domestic students from low socio-economic backgrounds who are motivated and demonstrate potential to successfully undertake studies at the University.

(2) The Associate Dean of a faculty may, under the Principal’s Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme, make a prospective domestic student a conditional offer of admission to an undergraduate award course before the end of Year 12.

(3) Domestic applicants are eligible for the Principal’s Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme if:
(a) they have a written recommendation from their Principal; and
(b) they are completing their HSC in the year immediately prior to the year in which admission to an undergraduate award course at the University is sought; and
(c) they attend a school that is identified by the State or Commonwealth government as disadvantaged; or
(d) they are from a low socio-economic status background, as determined by the Academic Board from time to time.

(4) For their application for admission under the Principal’s Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme to be considered, applicants must complete the application form, including a statement of motivation demonstrating:
(a) their interest in and motivation for applying for one of the undergraduate award courses offered by the University; and
(b) their reasons for applying to the University.

(5) Applicants may be required to attend an interview.

(6) Applicants will be assessed against the following criteria:
(a) demonstrated interest in and motivation for the course of study;
(b) ability to set and meet long term goals;
(c) undertaking any prerequisite subjects;
(d) likelihood of meeting the required ATAR cut off score and succeeding in their studies at the University; and
(e) demonstrated leadership or citizenship skills.

(7) An assessment panel with at least two representatives from each participating faculty will evaluate all applications against the eligibility and selection criteria, and make a recommendation to the relevant Associate Dean.

(8) On receipt of a recommendation from the assessment panel, the Associate Dean may authorise a conditional offer of admission to an award course to be made to an applicant.

(9) The Associate Dean may admit an applicant to an undergraduate award course under the Principal's Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme only if the applicant has an ATAR of equal to or higher than the rank specified by the faculty for admission to the award course under the Scheme.

Note: The minimum ATAR will be lower than that required for mainstream entry.

(10) Applicants who are admitted under the Principal's Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme will receive academic and other support.

31 Mature Age Applicants Scheme

(1) The purpose of the Mature Age Applicants Scheme is to help domestic applicants who are over 21 years of age, and who would not normally meet the academic eligibility requirements, to gain admission to undergraduate courses.

(2) The Dean of the relevant faculty may determine that the Mature Age Applicants Scheme does not apply to a specified undergraduate course.

(3) Domestic applicants who are eligible for admission under the Mature Age Applicants Scheme are permitted to compete for admission, provided that they meet the minimum level of academic merit set by the faculty for the relevant undergraduate award course.

(4) Applicants are eligible for admission under the Mature Age Applicants Scheme if:

(a) they are at least 21 years old on 1 March of the year of admission to the University;
(b) they do not have an ATAR or equivalent that would enable them to compete for mainstream admission;
(c) they have not completed at least one year of study (or part-time equivalent) in a Bachelor degree or higher level qualification at a recognised tertiary institution; and
(d) they have, within the previous two years, completed one of the following approved preparation courses:
   (i) a preparation course offered by the University's Centre for Continuing Education;
   (ii) the Tertiary Preparation Certificate Course offered at a NSW TAFE college;
   (iii) an HSC that does not lead to an ATAR;
(iv) the Open Foundation Course or NEWSTEP Program offered by the University of Newcastle;

(v) the University Preparation Program offered by the University of New South Wales; or

(e) for admission to the Bachelor of Nursing, they have completed enrolled nursing qualifications; or

(f) they have completed an AQF Diploma or Advanced Diploma at a recognised tertiary institution that satisfied the University's requirements for admission, or at least one year of study (or part-time equivalent) in an approved Associate Diploma or Diploma at a recognised tertiary institution that satisfied the University's requirements for admission.

(5) Deans will determine the minimum level of academic merit required for admission to an undergraduate course under the Mature Age Applicants Scheme.

(6) Applicants may be required to:

(a) attend an interview;

(b) provide a work portfolio; or

(c) successfully complete a practical examination.

(7) When deciding whether to make an offer of admission under the Mature Age Applicants Scheme, the relevant Associate Dean may take into account:

(a) the applicant's personal qualities;

(b) whether the applicant is likely to complete the course successfully;

(c) the applicant's work experience;

(d) any relevant TAFE or AQF courses successfully completed by the applicant.

(8) Levels of assumed knowledge specified for each award course or equivalent are normally considered as prerequisites for applicants for admission through the Mature Age Applicants Scheme.

32 Elite Athletes or Performers Scheme

(1) The training that elite athletes and performers have to undertake, and their competitive and performance commitments, can detrimentally affect their secondary school studies. The purpose of the Elite Athletes and Performers Scheme is to address that detriment.

(2) Domestic applicants who are eligible for admission under the Elite Athletes and Performers Scheme are permitted to compete for admission with an ATAR or equivalent of up to five rank points below the ATAR cut-off for the award course, or equivalent.

(3) The Elite Athletes and Performers Scheme is available to domestic applicants who:

(a) have been assessed by the Elite Athletes Assessment Panel or the Elite Performers Assessment Panel, as relevant, as being elite; and

(b) can demonstrate that their sporting or performance commitments have impeded their HSC performance.

(4) For their application for admission under the Elite Athletes and Performers Scheme to be considered, applicants must complete and submit an application form prior to the last day of business in October of each year.
(5) The Elite Athletes Assessment Panel or the Elite Performers Assessment Panel, as relevant, will assess whether an applicant is an elite athlete or performer, normally prior to the publication of HSC results.

(6) The Elite Athletes Assessment Panel will set and follow standard criteria for determining whether an applicant is an elite athlete, and will seek advice about each applicant from referees and appropriate experts.

(7) The Elite Performers Assessment Panel will set and follow standard criteria for determining whether an applicant is an elite performer, and will seek advice about each applicant from referees and appropriate experts.

(8) The Elite Athletes and Performers Selection Committee will review assessments made by the Elite Athletes Assessment Panel and the Elite Performers Assessment Panel.

(9) Where the Elite Athletes and Performers Selection Committee endorses an assessment of an applicant, the Committee will forward the application to the relevant faculty for consideration.

34 Special Consideration for Admission Scheme

(1) The purpose of the Special Consideration for Admission Scheme is to help applicants who have experienced serious disadvantage during secondary study, or a previous attempt at tertiary study, to gain admission to undergraduate courses.

(2) Applicants who are eligible for admission under the Special Consideration for Admission Scheme are permitted to compete for admission with an ATAR or equivalent of up to five rank points below the relevant cut-off for the award course.

(3) The Special Consideration for Admission Scheme is available to applicants who:
   (a) have successfully completed Year 12 or equivalent secondary education (including at a high school or a technical and further education college, or an equivalent educational institution); or
   (b) have a record of previous tertiary study; and
   (c) have suffered serious disadvantage during the course of those studies.

PART 8 ADMISSION DECISIONS AND OFFERS

35 Basis for admission decisions

(1) Admission decisions must be made in accordance with the Coursework Rule and this policy.

(2) Subject to this policy, when deciding whether to make an offer of admission to an award course to an applicant, the Dean must adopt the principle that offers are to be made on the basis of the applicant's academic merit.

(3) For admission to undergraduate award courses, applicants' academic merit is to be measured principally by their secondary or tertiary results.

(4) The University may make more than one round of offers to applicants for an award course. The ATAR cut-off points may be different for different rounds of offers.

Note: See also clause 2.5 of the Coursework Rule and clause 7 of this policy.
36 **Conditional offers**

(1) An offer of admission to an award course may be made subject to specified conditions.

(2) Examples of conditions that might be imposed include conditions relating to:
   (a) health screening of the applicant;
   (b) criminal record checks;
   (c) child protection checks;
   (d) verification of the applicant's academic record;
   (e) visa requirements;
   (f) English language requirements; and
   (g) completion of prior study.

37 **Accepting an offer**

(1) An offer of admission to an award course can be accepted only in the manner described in the offer.

(2) An applicant is not considered to be admitted to an award course at the University until they have completed, to the satisfaction of the University, all requirements for enrolment in the course.

(3) An applicant who has accepted an offer of admission to an undergraduate award course and, prior to commencing that course, wishes to transfer to a different award course, may apply for and be admitted to the new course, provided that:
   (a) the applicant has met the minimum admission requirements for the new course at a standard equal to or higher than applicants who were offered admission to the course in the main round of offers made by the UAC;
   (b) a place is available in the course;
   (c) all available places are offered on the basis of merit; and
   (d) the offer is made and accepted before the commencement of teaching in the new course.

**PART 9 DEFERRAL**

38 **Deferred admission by commencing undergraduate applicants**

(1) An applicant offered a place in an award course may defer admission to that course, but only as provided in this Part.

(2) The University may permit an applicant to defer admission provided that the offer of admission has not lapsed or been withdrawn by the University due to the applicant’s actions prior or subsequent to the offer being made.

(3) Subject to subclause (4) below, the maximum period of deferral is one year.
(4) The Associate Dean of the relevant faculty may extend the period of deferral for an individual applicant to a maximum of two years.

(5) Applicants who are offered a place in an undergraduate award course at the Sydney Conservatorium of Music must undertake a further satisfactory audition prior to admission.

(6) The Associate Dean of the relevant faculty may decline to allow deferral for a particular course.

**PART 10 CHANGE OF RESIDENCY**

39 International applicants and students changing from international to domestic status

(1) If an international undergraduate applicant changes from international to domestic status prior to enrolling in their course and:

   (a) their ATAR or equivalent is equal to or higher than the ATAR required for domestic applicants to be admitted to the same course; and
   
   (b) there are places available in the course;

   the applicant will be transferred to a Commonwealth supported place.

(2) If an international undergraduate applicant changes from international to domestic status prior to enrolling in their course and either or both of the requirements in subclauses 39(1)(a) and (b) are not met, the applicant’s offer of admission will be cancelled and withdrawn.

(3) If an international undergraduate student changes from international to domestic status prior to the census date for their course and:

   (a) their ATAR or equivalent is equal to or higher than the ATAR required for domestic applicants to be admitted to the same course; and
   
   (b) there are places available in the course;

   the applicant will be transferred to a Commonwealth supported place.

(4) If an international undergraduate student changes from international to domestic status after the census date for their course and:

   (a) their ATAR or equivalent is equal to or higher than the ATAR required for domestic applicants to be admitted to the same course; and
   
   (b) there are places available in the course;

   the applicant will continue as an international fee paying student for that semester and transfer to a Commonwealth supported place in the subsequent semester.

(5) If an international undergraduate student changes from international to domestic status after the census date for their course and either or both of the requirements in clauses 39(5)(a) and (b) are not met, the applicant will continue as an
international fee paying student for that semester and transfer to a domestic fee-paying place in the subsequent semester.

(7) Subject to this clause, if an international postgraduate applicant changes from international to domestic status prior to enrolling in their course, the applicant will be transferred to a domestic fee-paying place.

(8) If an international postgraduate student changes from international to domestic status before the census date for their course, the student will be transferred to a domestic fee-paying place.

(9) If an international postgraduate student changes from international to domestic status after the census date for their course, the student will continue as an international fee paying student for that semester and transfer to a domestic fee-paying place in the subsequent semester.

(10) International students who are transferred to a domestic fee-paying place are permitted to compete for any available Commonwealth supported places in subsequent semesters.

(11) International applicants for the Doctor of Medicine will not be transferred to a domestic fee-paying place in accordance with subclause (7).

PART 11 RECOGNITION OF PRIOR LEARNING

40 Forms of recognition of prior learning

(1) The University recognises that students commence courses with different levels, areas and forms or prior learning.

(2) The University may recognise prior learning by granting:

(a) credit, which may take the form of:

(i) specific credit;

(ii) non-specific credit;

(iii) reduced volume of learning for an award course; or

(b) a waiver of a requirement to undertake a compulsory or a pre-requisite unit of study.

41 Specific credit, non-specific credit and reduced volume of learning

(1) Specific credit is the recognition of previously completed studies as directly equivalent to specific units of study offered by the University.

(2) Subject to this policy and the award course resolutions, specific credit may be granted for a unit of study where there is a substantial overlap of skills, knowledge and experience at a level deemed by the Associate Dean to be equivalent to a specific University of Sydney unit of study.

(3) Non-specific credit is ‘block credit’ given for a specified number of credit points at a particular level, in accordance with the award course resolutions. These credit
points may be in a particular subject area but are not linked to a specific unit of study.

(4) Reduced volume of learning is a reduction in the number of credit points required for a student to complete their award course, in recognition of the student’s:

(a) level and subject area of qualifications completed prior to admission; or
(b) equivalent professional experience.

Note: An example of specific credit is credit given for Physics 1 [PHYS1001] at the University of Sydney for Physics 1 undertaken at the University of Adelaide.

Note: Examples of non-specific credit are: the University of Sydney does not teach Russian but a student may be granted credit for a full first year of study in Russian undertaken at the University of New South Wales, as 12 junior credit points; a student may be granted 48 junior credit points for the first year of an Arts degree completed at another Australian university.

Note: Where possible, the University will assess credit before making an offer of admission. Where possible, the University will make an offer of credit to an applicant concurrently with their offer of admission. If accepted, credit offered to an applicant prior to enrolment will be granted at the time they are admitted to the award course. See the Coursework Credit Procedures 2015.

42 Awarding specific credit and non-specific credit for previous studies

(1) An Associate Dean may, in accordance with this policy, the faculty resolutions and the award course resolutions, grant specific credit or non-specific credit to an undergraduate or postgraduate student for study undertaken:

(a) in another award course at the University;
(b) in an award course at another Australian tertiary institution;
(c) at a recognised overseas tertiary institution;
(d) in an accredited higher education course offered by a registered private provider;
(e) in a course offered by the Vocational Education and Training Sector;
(f) in another award program approved by the Dean following an evaluation process; or
(g) in a non-award program approved by the Academic Board.

(2) Factors to be taken into account by an Associate Dean when evaluating a program for the purposes of subclause (1) include:

(a) the general educational practices and standards of the institution or system;
(b) the objectives of the particular course and the methods adopted to achieve those objectives;
(c) the duration of the course;
(d) the breadth, depth and balance of the course material;
(e) the methods of assessment in the course;
(f) the teaching staff conducting the course, including the numbers of teachers, and their professional qualifications, experience and educational expertise;
(g) the accommodation and facilities offered to students undertaking the course, including equipment, library, laboratories, workshops and other instructional or research resources.

(3) Entry to the University’s courses is competitive and eligibility for credit does not guarantee an applicant a place in a course.

(4) Credit will not be granted:

(a) for units of study completed more than:
   (i) 10 years ago; or
   (ii) if the faculty resolutions prescribe a shorter period, the prescribed period;

   prior to admission to candidature in the course that the credit is applied to;

(b) for units of study in an uncompleted course, unless the student provides evidence that he or she has abandoned credit in respect of that course;

(c) except with the permission of the Associate Dean, for units of study undertaken at another tertiary institution from which the student has been excluded;

(d) except with the permission of the Associate Dean, for units of study or non-specific credit listed in an offer of credit made by the University prior to enrolment or during candidature, and declined by the applicant or student in accordance with subclause 43A(2); or

(e) except with the permission of the Associate Dean, to reinstate specific credit or non-specific credit that has previously been rescinded, on request by the student in accordance with clause 43B.

(5) When granting credit, an Associate Dean may impose requirements on a student with respect to:

(a) progression to more advanced units of study within a particular course; and

(b) time limits for completion of the course.

(6) Regardless of any credit granted, a student must meet any pre-requisite or co-requisite requirements for an award course, unless the unit of study co-ordinator gives the student a waiver for those requirements.

(7) Regardless of any credit granted, a student must achieve and demonstrate the learning outcomes for the award course.

Note: See clause 46 regarding waivers.

43 Awarding reduced volume of learning

(1) A program director may, in accordance with this policy and the award course resolutions, and on request by a student, approve a reduction in the volume of learning required for the student to complete their award course, in recognition of:

(a) a prior qualification in the same discipline as the award course;

(b) a prior qualification in a cognate discipline deemed by the a program director to provide comparable preparation to subclause (a);

(c) relevant professional experience deemed by the program director to provide comparable preparation to subclause (a); or

(d) a prior qualification in an appropriate discipline at AQF level 8 or above.
(2) Factors to be taken into account for the purposes of subclause (1) include:
   (a) the factors set out in subclause 42(2) above;
   (b) whether the student’s experience is documented;
   (c) whether any documentation provided by the student demonstrates skills, knowledge or understanding that are equivalent to those that would be gained in relevant University studies.

(3) The onus will be on the student to provide appropriate documentation or other evidence.

(4) Reduced volume of learning will not be granted, except with the permission of the program director:
   (a) where the reduced volume of learning was previously listed in an offer of credit made by the University prior to enrolment or during candidature, and declined by the applicant or student in accordance with subclause 43A(2); or
   (b) to reinstate reduced volume of learning that has previously been rescinded, on request by the student in accordance with clause 43B.

43A Accepting and declining offers of specific credit, non-specific credit and reduced volume of learning

(1) The University may make offers to grant specific credit, non-specific credit and reduced volume of learning prior to enrolment or during candidature.

(2) An applicant or student must accept or decline (in whole or in part) any offer of credit made by the University:
   (a) prior to enrolment, on or before the date of their first enrolment in the award course for which credit is being offered;
   (b) during candidature, within twelve months of the date of the offer of credit.

(3) If an applicant or student does not accept or decline the offer of credit within the timeframe specified in subclause (2), the credit will not be processed and the University will regard the offer as having lapsed.

(4) The University may vary any offer to grant credit made to an applicant prior to enrolment, if the Associate Dean has authorised a period of deferral of greater than one year.

Note: See clause 38 regarding deferral.

43B Rescinding specific credit, non-specific credit and reduced volume of learning

(1) A program director may, in accordance with this policy and the award course resolutions, and on request by a student, rescind any specific credit, non-specific credit or reduced volume of learning previously granted to the student in accordance with this policy.

(2) Except with the permission of the program director, once any specific credit, non-specific credit or reduced volume of learning has been rescinded in accordance with this clause, a student may not seek to have it reinstated.
44 Limits on credit and reduced volume of learning

(1) Subject to this clause, and notwithstanding any credit or reduced volume of learning granted in order to qualify for an award:

(a) an undergraduate student must complete a minimum of:
   (i) one year (or part-time equivalent) of the award course at the University; and
   (ii) 48 credit points of the award course at the University;

(b) a postgraduate student must complete at least 50 per cent of the course requirements at the University; and

(c) a student enrolled in a Masters degree must complete a minimum of 48 credit points of postgraduate study (including any postgraduate study at another university) in order to qualify for the award.

(2) The Associate Dean may vary the requirements in subclause (1) where the work was completed:

(a) as part of an embedded program at the University;
(b) as part of another award course undertaken at the University; or
(c) as part of an award course approved by the University as part of an approved conjoint venture with another institution.

(3) Except with the approval of the Academic Board at course level, credit granted on the basis of work completed at an institution other than a university will not exceed one third of the course requirements.

(4) Except as provided for in subclause (6), credit towards postgraduate awards will not be granted for undergraduate units of study.

(5) Except as provided for in subclause (6), credit towards postgraduate awards will not be granted for previously completed postgraduate awards, except in the case of awards:

(a) in an embedded program at the University; or
(b) in a program completed at another university or institution deemed by the relevant Associate Dean to be the equivalent of a University of Sydney embedded program.

(6) Despite subclauses (4) and (5), a program director may grant credit in the form of a reduced volume of learning in recognition of completed undergraduate and postgraduate award courses in accordance with clause 43 and the award course resolutions.

(7) A program director may grant a graduate a limited amount of credit for a completed undergraduate course. Subject to this policy and the award course resolutions, a graduate who is admitted to candidature for the degree of Bachelor with credit for units of study in the completed course must complete a minimum of two years (or part-time equivalent) in the award course, unless additional credit from an uncompleted course or courses has also been granted.

Note: The provisions for granting credit in an award course offered as part of an approved conjoint venture are prescribed in the award course resolutions and the relevant faculty resolutions.
45 Credit in embedded programs, including embedded honours

**Note:** Faculties have authority to establish embedded programs in closely related academic or professional areas, to establish incrementally higher levels of attainment at Graduate Certificate, Graduate Diploma and Masters level. Faculties may specify in the award course resolutions or faculty resolutions conditions for transfer from one award in the embedded program to another.

(1) Students enrolled in an embedded program who have met the conditions for, and elect to, transfer to a longer award course in that embedded program:
   (a) may transfer their enrolment to the longer award course; and
   (b) will receive credit for all of the units of study completed in the shorter award course, provided that the units of study are approved as a requirement for the longer award course; and
   (c) will not be permitted to graduate from the shorter award course.

(2) Subject to the relevant course requirements, graduates of a course in an embedded program who subsequently become candidates for a longer award course in the same embedded program may be granted credit for units of study completed in the shorter award course.

(3) Students enrolled in an embedded program who have completed the requirements for any award course in that embedded program may elect to discontinue their enrolment and graduate from that award course.

(4) A student who has met the requirements for a Bachelor degree at pass level may, subject to the award course resolutions:
   (a) receive credit for completed units of study; and
   (b) enrol in the same Bachelor degree award course at honours level.

**Note:** For information on admission to a Bachelor degree award course at honours level, see clause 93.

46 Awarding waivers

(1) A program director may, having regard to a student's previous learning or experience, waive the requirement that the student undertake a compulsory unit of study.

(2) A program director may waive the requirement that a student meet a prerequisite requirement or a co-requisite requirement for a unit of study.

(3) A waiver given under subclause (1) or (2) may be subject to conditions set out in the waiver.

**Note:** For subclause (1): as the student will not have passed the compulsory unit of study, the student will have to make up the credit points by undertaking other units of study.
PART 12 ENROLMENT IN AND UNDERTAKING UNITS OF STUDY

47 Units of study

(1) In this Part, ‘table of units’ means a table of the units of study, as set out in the award course resolutions.

(2) Each unit of study is assigned a specified number of credit points by the faculty responsible for the unit of study.

(3) A student must pass a unit of study to acquire the credit points for that unit of study.

(4) The total number of credit points required for completion of an award course, including a combined degree or double degree course, is specified in the Senate resolutions and the award course resolutions.

(5) Subject to this policy, a student completes a unit of study if the student:
   (a) participates in the learning experiences for the unit of study;
   (b) meets the standards required by the University for academic honesty;
   (c) meets all examination, assessment and attendance requirements for the unit of study; and
   (d) demonstrates learning outcomes for the unit of study to a standard equivalent to a pass level or higher.

(6) A program director may, subject to the award course resolutions and with the approval of the relevant program director in the faculty in which the unit of study is offered, permit a student to enrol in and obtain credit for a unit of study that is not listed in the table of units for the course.

48 Students must enrol in units of study

(1) Subject to this policy, each student must, for each semester, enrol in units of study offered in their award course.

(2) The enrolments must be consistent with the requirements of this policy, the faculty resolutions and the award course resolutions.

Note: See also Part 13.

49 Assumed knowledge

(1) The University assumes that students enrolling in some first year units of study have successfully acquired a certain level of knowledge, expressed in terms of program studies and performance achieved in the HSC or equivalent.

(2) The Academic Board may, on the recommendation of the relevant faculty, specify assumed knowledge and recommended study areas for undergraduate courses.

(3) Students who have not acquired the assumed knowledge may enrol in any unit of study in their award course, but should undertake any recommended supplementary work before the unit of study commences.
Note: For the current list of assumed knowledge and recommended study areas for undergraduate courses, see the Academic Board standards website.

50 Prerequisite and co-requisite requirements

(1) Faculties may determine prerequisite and co-requisite requirements for enrolment in a unit of study.

(2) Subject to subclause 46(2), a student may not enrol in a unit of study unless they have met the prerequisite requirements for the unit of study.

(3) Subject to subclause 46(2), a student may not enrol in a unit of study for which there is a co-requisite requirement unless he or she also enrolls in or has already completed the co-requisite unit of study.

Note: For details of prerequisite and co-requisite requirements for courses, see the relevant faculty handbook.

51 Enrolment restrictions

(1) Except with the permission of the Associate Dean or in accordance with the award course resolutions, a student may not:
   (a) enrol in a unit of study that they have already completed towards the requirements for an award course;
   (b) enrol in any unit of study that overlaps substantially in content with a unit of study that has already been completed by the student, or for which credit or a waiver or exemption has been granted;
   (c) enrol in units of study additional to award course requirements;
   (d) enrol in units of study with a total credit point value exceeding:
       (i) for enrolments in any one semester – 30 credit points;
       (ii) for enrolments in the Summer School – 12 credit points;
       (iii) for enrolments in the Winter School – six credit points; or
   (e) enrol in a prohibited unit of study.

Note: The award course resolutions may prescribe a lower credit point value limit.

Note: The Associate Dean will specify prohibited units of study in the table of units.

(2) A student who is permitted, in accordance with subclause (1)(a), to re-enrol in a unit of study may receive a higher or lower grade, but not additional credit points.

52 Repeating a unit of study

(1) Unless granted an exemption by the unit of study co-ordinator, a student who repeats a unit of study must:
   (a) participate in the learning experiences provided for the unit of study; and
   (b) meet all the examination, assessment and attendance requirements for the unit of study.
(2) Except with the permission of the unit of study co-ordinator, a student who presents for reassessment in any unit of study is not eligible for any prize or scholarship awarded in connection with that unit of study.

53 Concurrent enrolment

(1) A student may not enrol in more than one award course at any level, except:
   (a) with the permission of the relevant Associate Deans; or
   (b) as part of an approved combined degree or double degree program.

Note: This includes courses offered by other institutions.

(2) The same unit of study cannot be counted towards the requirements for two different courses, except:
   (a) for combined degrees;
   (b) for the purpose of satisfying prerequisite, co-requisite and admission requirements; and
   (c) where a student is permitted to enrol in two postgraduate programs simultaneously, faculties may allow a maximum of two units of study to be cross-credited towards requirements for a maximum of two degrees as set out in clause 90.

54 Cross-institutional study

(1) A student may, with the permission of the program director, enrol in a unit or units of study at another university or institution and have those units of study credited to the student’s award course.

(2) The program director may impose conditions on any cross-institutional study approved in accordance with subclause (1).

55 Attendance

(1) A faculty may specify the attendance and participation requirements for its courses and units of study.

(2) A student enrolled in a unit of study must comply with the requirements set out in the faculty resolutions, award course resolutions or unit of study outline about undertaking the unit of study, including on matters such as:
   (a) attendance at and participation in lectures, seminars and tutorials; and
   (b) participation in practical work.

(3) A program director may specify the circumstances under which a student who does not satisfy attendance requirements may be deemed not to have completed a unit of study or award course.

(4) A unit of study co-ordinator may, having regard to the student’s previous studies, exempt a student from a requirement mentioned in subclause (1).
PART 13 DISCONTINUATION AND SUSPENSION OF ENROLMENT

56 Discontinuation of enrolment

(1) Subject to this clause, a student may discontinue their enrolment in an award course or in one or more units of study.

(2) A student’s enrolment in the course or the relevant units of study will be treated as discontinued from the date of discontinuation, unless they produce evidence that there was good reason why the application could not be made at an earlier time.

(3) A student who discontinues enrolment in a course during their first year of enrolment in the course will not be permitted to re-enrol in that course unless:
   (a) the Associate Dean granted prior permission to re-enrol; or
   (b) the student is later re-selected for admission to the course.

(4) A student may not discontinue enrolment in a course or a unit of study after the end of classes in that course or unit of study, except in accordance with subclause (2).

(5) A student who discontinues enrolment in a unit of study is to be awarded a grade set out in Schedule 1.

57 Suspension of enrolment by student

(1) Subject to restrictions imposed by the Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 on student visa holders, a student in a course may suspend their enrolment in a course:
   (a) for a maximum period of one year; or
   (b) with the approval of the Associate Dean, for a maximum period of two years.

(2) The suspension must be notified to the University in a manner approved or accepted by the faculty.

(3) At the end of the suspension period, the student must comply with any requirements notified by the Associate Dean for completing the course. Those requirements apply to the student despite anything to the contrary in the award course resolutions.

58 Suspension and termination of candidature for failure to enrol

(1) If a student is not enrolled in any unit of study by the last of the census dates for that semester, and the student has not discontinued or suspended enrolment, the student’s candidature is automatically suspended.

(2) If a student’s candidature is automatically suspended, then, despite any contrary provision in this policy, the procedures for the student to re-enrol in the course are to be as the relevant Associate Dean determines.

(3) If a student fails to re-enrol in that and the subsequent semester, their candidature will be terminated automatically.
59 Return to candidature

(1) If a student returns to candidature after a discontinuation or suspension, the course requirements in force at the time of the student's return to candidature apply to the student's candidature.

(2) Despite subclause (1), the Associate Dean may, in writing, modify the application of the course requirements in a particular case.

PART 14 ASSESSMENT

60 Statement of intent

(1) The purpose of this Part is to:

(a) set out the principles that underpin the University's approach to assessment;
(b) support students' development and progressive demonstration of graduate qualities;
(c) inform curriculum and teaching quality assurance programs; and
(d) underpin accountability for achievement of graduate outcomes.

(2) Assessments should be designed to provide feedback on performance or to establish that students have achieved an adequate standard to proceed or to graduate.

(3) This part applies to any coursework unit of study undertaken by a higher degree by research student.

61 Assessment principles and their implementation

(1) The following principles apply to assessment at the University.

(a) Assessment practices must advance student learning.
(b) Assessment practices must be communicated clearly to students and staff.
(c) Assessment practices must be valid and fair.
(d) Assessment practices must be continuously improved and updated.

(2) The University's assessment principles will be implemented in accordance with the implementation statements set out in this policy.

(3) The procedures for operation of the implementation statements are set out in the Assessment Procedures 2011.

62 Principle 1 - Assessment practices must advance student learning

This principle requires that:

(1) Assessment practices align with goals, context, learning activities and learning outcomes.
(2) A variety of assessment tasks are used while ensuring that student and staff workloads are considered.

(3) Assessment tasks reflect increasing levels of complexity across a program and foster enquiry-based learning.

(4) Constructive, timely and respectful feedback develops students' skills of self and peer evaluation and guides the development of future student work.

63 Principle 2 - Assessment practices must be communicated clearly to students and staff

This principle requires that:

(1) Unit of study outlines are available in the first week of any offering of the unit and communicate the purposes, timing, weighting and extent of assessment in sufficient detail to allow students to plan their approach to assessment.

(2) Unit of study outlines explain the rationale for the selection of assessment tasks (e.g. group task) in relation to learning outcomes.

(3) Procedures exist to ensure that all staff involved in teaching a unit of study share a common understanding of assessment practices.

(4) The process of marking and of combining individual task marks is explicitly explained in the unit outline.

64 Principle 3 - Assessment practices must be valid and fair

This principle requires that:

(1) Assessment tasks are authentic and appropriate to disciplinary and or professional context.

(2) Assessment incorporates rigorous academic standards related to the discipline(s) and is based on pre-determined, clearly articulated criteria with which students actively engage.

(3) Students' assessment will be evaluated solely on the basis of students’ achievement against criteria and standards specified to align with learning outcomes.

(4) Assessment practices address issues of equity and inclusiveness to accommodate and build upon the diversity of the student body so as not to disadvantage any student.

65 Principle 4 - Assessment practices must be continuously improved and updated

This principle requires that:

(1) Assessment tasks and outcomes are moderated through academic peer review and used to inform subsequent practice.

(2) Assessments are regularly updated to ensure alignment with program learning outcomes or graduate qualities.

(3) Professional development opportunities that are related to design, implementation and moderation of assessment are provided to staff.
Note: A student does not have a right to a merits review by the Student Appeals Body under the *University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006*, and cannot appeal against an academic decision on the ground that the student believes that the academic decision was made in a manner that was inconsistent with the Assessment Principles.

### 66 Common result grades

1. The University will award common result grades as set out in Schedule 1.
2. The grades of high distinction, distinction and credit indicate work of a standard higher than that required for a pass.
3. A student who completes a unit of study for which only a pass or fail result is available will be recorded as having satisfied requirements.

### 66A Simple extensions

1. A unit of study co-ordinator, who is satisfied that it is appropriate to do so, may permit a student to submit a non-examination task up to two working days after the due date with no penalty.
2. Such permission is an informal arrangement between the unit of study co-ordinator and the student which does not:
   a. affect the student’s entitlement to apply for special consideration under this policy;
   b. alter any time limits or other requirements relating to applications for special consideration; or
   c. constitute an academic decision for the purposes of the *University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006*.

Note: Any faculty resolution or local provision forbidding the granting of simple extensions is inconsistent with this policy.

### 67 Special consideration due to illness, injury or misadventure

1. Generally, an illness, injury or misadventure will be taken into account when considering a student’s performance in a course or unit of study.
2. Special consideration is provided in circumstances where well-attested illness, injury or misadventure occurs during a semester or at the time of an examination. It is an academic judgement which depends on the nature of the illness, misadventure or injury and its impact in relation to assessment or examination.
3. Students who bear a primary carer responsibility toward another person at the time of an assessment may also apply for special consideration on the basis of illness, injury or misadventure on the part of the person for whom they care if their ability to prepare for or perform the assessment is adversely affected.
4. Special consideration is also available to non-award students.
5. Students who are granted special consideration must nonetheless be required to demonstrate achievement of designated learning outcomes.
6. Rescinded.
7. A student who is reasonably capable of attempting an examination should do so, despite any accompanying application for special consideration.
(8) All requests for special consideration must be genuine and made in good faith.
   (a) Attempts to use special consideration as a means of gaining an unfair advantage in an assessment must be rejected.
   (b) Making a request for special consideration that is not genuine or in good faith may lead to disciplinary action against a student.
(9) A request for special consideration does not guarantee that the request will be granted.
(10) Special consideration must not be granted for:
   (a) balancing workloads from other units of study, disciplines or faculties;
   (b) information and communications technology-related problems, except where they could not have been prevented, avoided or the effects minimised by reasonable diligence by the student; or
   (c) jury service, military service, national sporting, religious or cultural commitments or other unforeseen events for which special arrangements may be provided in accordance with this policy.
(11) Special consideration granted to one or more students should not disadvantage other students.

68 Students with a disability

(1) Students with a permanent or temporary disability who have registered with the University’s Disability Services, and have satisfied the University’s requirements for supporting documentation, may be eligible for reasonable adjustments and or accessible examination and assessment arrangements.

Note: See the University’s Disability Services website.

(2) Disability Services will determine the student’s eligibility for adjustments and inform the student and faculty of the required reasonable adjustments.

(3) Students wishing to apply for accessible examination and assessment conditions must make their application through Disability Services within specified timeframes.

(4) Accessible examination and assessment conditions include, but are not limited to:
   (a) extra time for reading, writing, resting or toilet breaks;
   (b) use of a scribe;
   (c) examination papers in alternative formats;
   (d) use of assistive technology;
   (e) ergonomic furniture;
   (f) using a designated room and experienced supervisors;
   (g) using a separate room with a scribe or assistive technology;
   (h) rescheduling and or spacing of examinations into the deferred examination period.
69 Special arrangements for assessments

(1) The relevant delegate may make special arrangements available to any student who is unable to meet assessment requirements or attend examinations because of one or more of the following:
(a) essential religious commitments or essential beliefs (including cultural and ceremonial commitments);
(b) compulsory legal absence (such as jury duty or court summons);
(c) sporting or cultural commitments, including political or union commitments, where the student is representing the University, state or nation;
(d) birth or adoption of a child;
(e) Australian defence force or emergency service commitments (including Army Reserve);
(f) the relevant delegate forms the view that employment of an essential nature to the student would be jeopardised and that the student has little or no discretion with respect to the employment demand.

(2) The relevant delegate may make special arrangements for a student who is unable to meet assessment requirements or attend examinations for any other reason that is beyond the student’s reasonable control, at the delegate’s own discretion, on a case-by-case basis.

(3) Special arrangements are intended to support the University’s commitment to flexible learning. However, while every reasonable attempt is made to accommodate student needs, it may not be possible to provide such arrangements in all cases. This is particularly so where clinical placements and practicums are involved.

70 Responsibilities for implementation of this Part

(1) The Academic Board is responsible for:
(a) ensuring that assessment practices comply with this policy; and
(b) ensuring that assessment practices and procedures are monitored and reviewed at the level of faculties in accordance with this policy, and that changes to assessment practices are made where appropriate as a consequence of such review.

(2) The Registrar is responsible for:
(a) overseeing the release of results to students; and
(b) overseeing the conduct of examinations.

(3) Deans and Associate Deans are responsible for:
(a) ensuring that this policy is contextualised and implemented in all programs and units for which the faculty is responsible;
(b) ensuring that faculty practices and standards in relation to assessment are consistent with this policy and any associated procedures; and
(c) appointing a responsible head where the teaching of a unit of study is shared by more than one department.

(4) Heads of Schools and Deputy Heads of Schools are responsible for:
(a) appointing principal examiners; and
(b) appointing program directors.

(5) Program directors are responsible for:

(a) developing and overseeing an assessment strategy for the students’ program or major that is consistent with this policy and any associated procedures;
(b) fostering a whole of program or major approach to assessment;
(c) ensuring program or major learning outcomes and standards are made clear to students;
(d) monitoring overall assessment loads for both staff and students;
(e) ensuring program or major learning outcomes are assessed at appropriate points throughout the degree;
(f) ensuring that assessment tasks reflect increasing levels of complexity across the program or major; and
(g) facilitating and promoting opportunities for professional development of assessment practice for all staff teaching a program, with particular emphasis on new and less experienced teachers.

(6) Unit of study co-ordinators and or principal examiners are responsible for:

(a) developing and implementing an assessment strategy which is consistent with this policy and any associated procedures;
(b) managing the moderation of assessment design and marking to ensure the validity and reliability of assessment within the unit;
(c) ensuring that assessment requirements for a unit are discussed and understood by all members of staff involved in teaching and assessment, including seasonal and casual teachers; and
(d) monitoring and reflecting on student assessment outcomes and student survey data to make changes to the assessment strategy for the unit in light of the review, as appropriate.

(7) Unit of study lecturers and tutors are responsible for:

(a) assessing student work fairly, consistently and in a timely manner;
(b) providing timely feedback which enables students to further improve their learning and performance wherever possible; and
(c) advising students in relation to expectations relevant to specific assessment tasks.

(8) Students are responsible for:

(a) actively engaging with assessment tasks, including carefully reading the guidance provided, spending sufficient time on the task, ensuring their work is authentic and their own (whether individual or group work) and handing work in on time;
(b) actively engaging in activities designed to develop assessment literacy, including taking the initiative where appropriate (e.g. asking for clarification or advice);
(c) actively engaging with and acting on feedback provided;
(d) providing constructive feedback on assessment processes and tasks through student feedback mechanisms (e.g. student surveys or student representation on committees); and
(e) becoming familiar with University policy and faculty procedures and acting in accordance with those policy and procedures.

PART 15 PROGRESSION

71 Progression requirements

Note: A student enrolled in an award course must meet the progression requirements and all the course requirements for an award course within the time limits for the course.

See Part 4 of the Coursework Rule.

Subject to this policy, a faculty will prescribe in the faculty resolutions or the award course resolutions the progression requirements for coursework award courses in that faculty.

72 Statement of intent

(1) The University is committed to early identification and support of students who are not meeting progression requirements, and may therefore be at risk of exclusion from their award course.

(2) Associate Deans will assist and promote the progression of students who are not meeting progression requirements by:

(a) regularly and effectively advising students of progression requirements;
(b) identifying and alerting students who are not meeting progression requirements;
(c) providing assistance to students who are not meeting progression requirements; and
(d) tracking the progress of students after they are identified as not meeting progression requirements.

(3) Associate Deans will ensure that they have clear and transparent internal processes for handling students who are not meeting progression requirements, consistent with this policy.

73 Monitoring progression

(1) Associate Deans will monitor each student's progression, including through reports generated by the student record keeping system.

(2) When monitoring each student's progression, the Associate Dean may take into account:

(a) whether the student has attended compulsory teaching and assessment components of a unit of study;
(b) whether the student has over-enrolled in an attempt to catch up on failed units of study; and
(c) whether there are significant variations in the student's academic performance.
Where the attendance record of a student is deemed by the Associate Dean to be unsatisfactory, that information will be recorded in the student record keeping system.

### Progression profile

1. Associate Deans will establish and maintain a progression profile for each student who is identified as not meeting academic progression requirements.
2. The progression profile will include all documents relating to a student's academic progression, including correspondence and interview records.
3. The progression profile will be attached to the student's file.

### Triggers for identifying students who are not meeting academic progression requirements

1. At the end of each semester, relevant Associate Deans will identify the students in courses offered by their faculty who are not meeting academic progression requirements.
2. A student will be identified as not meeting academic progression requirements in a semester if:
   a. the student received a Fail, Discontinued - Fail or Absent Fail grade in more than 50% of the total credit points allocated to the units of study in which they were enrolled for the semester;
   b. the student’s semester average mark was less than 50;
   c. the award course resolutions stipulate that:
      i. an average mark above 50 is required in order to remain enrolled in an award course or stream; and
      ii. alternative enrolment is available; and
      the student's average mark for all the units of study in which they were enrolled for the semester was less than the required average mark;
   d. the student failed one or more barrier units of study, compulsory units of study, field work, clinical work, practicum or other professional experience specified in the award course resolutions;
   e. the student has failed twice to pass the same unit of study (excluding Summer School and Winter School units of study);
   f. the student’s attendance record during the semester was unsatisfactory; or
   g. the student is unable to complete their award course within the maximum time limit, while carrying a normal student load.

### Stage 1 - Students identified for the first time as not meeting academic progression requirements

1. The Associate Dean will send all students identified as not meeting academic progression requirements for the first time a letter and a self-reflective Staying on Track survey.
(2) The letter will advise each student:
(a) that they have been identified as not meeting academic progression requirements;
(b) why they have been identified as not meeting academic progression requirements;
(c) that they are advised to:
   (i) complete a Staying on Track survey; and
   (ii) attend a Staying on Track information session;
(d) that all correspondence and documents relating to their academic progression status will be recorded on their progression profile; and
(e) where the student is enrolled in an award course whose normal full-time duration is two years or less, that:
   (i) if they fail to meet progression requirements in the following semester, they may be asked to show good cause why they should be permitted to re-enrol in the award course; and
   (ii) they are recommended to consult an academic adviser in their faculty.

(3) Associate Deans may require students to consult an academic adviser.

(4) The Staying on Track survey will:
(a) assist students to identify why they are having difficulties meeting academic progression requirements;
(b) advise students to avail themselves of, and include details of, student support services available at the University, including:
   (i) the Counselling Service;
   (ii) the Learning Centre;
   (iii) the University Health Service; and
   (iv) the student representative bodies.

(5) The Staying on Track information session will:
(a) provide information on study skills; and
(b) introduce students to the student support services in subclause (4) (b).

Note: See clause 78 for information on the show cause process.

77 Stage 2 - Students at risk of being asked to show good cause

(1) Students who:
(a) are enrolled in an award course whose normal full-time duration is two years or less; and
(b) are identified for the second time as not meeting academic progression requirements, without an intervening period of satisfactory progress;
will be asked to show good cause why they should be permitted to re-enrol in the award course.
(2) Students who:

(a) are enrolled in an award course whose normal full-time duration is more than two years; and

(b) are identified for the second time as not meeting academic progression requirements, without an intervening period of satisfactory progress as prescribed in clause 82

will be sent a warning letter and a Staying on Track survey by the faculty.

(3) The letter will advise each student:

(a) that they have been identified as not meeting academic progression requirements;

(b) why they have been identified as not meeting academic progression requirements;

(c) that they are advised to:
   (i) complete a Staying on Track survey; and
   (ii) attend a Staying on Track information session, if they have not already done so;

(d) that they are required to consult an academic adviser in their faculty; and

(e) that all correspondence and documents relating to their academic progression status will be recorded on their progression profile.

(4) The Staying on Track survey will:

(a) assist students to identify and explain why they are having difficulties meeting academic progression requirements; and

(b) require students to consult with their year adviser or Associate Dean, who will ask them to provide information about any support services they have consulted or other remedial action they have taken since they were first identified as not meeting academic progression requirements.

(5) The Associate Dean will record whether the student has consulted an academic adviser.

Note: The Associate Dean will take into account whether a student has consulted an academic adviser when determining whether a student has shown good cause for the purposes of clause 78.

78 Stage 3 - Being asked to show good cause

(1) The relevant Associate Dean may require a student who has not met the progression requirements or other standards set out in applicable faculty local provisions to show good cause why they should be allowed to re-enrol.

(2) For the purposes of this policy, ‘good cause’ means:

(a) circumstances beyond the reasonable control of a student, which may include serious ill health or misadventure, but does not include demands of employers, pressure of employment or time devoted to non-University activities, unless these are relevant to serious ill health or misadventure; and

(b) reasonable prospects of meeting progression requirements in the following semester.
(3) Students will be asked to show good cause where:

(a) they are enrolled in an award course whose normal full-time duration is two years or less, and they have been identified as not meeting progression requirements for that award course twice, without an intervening period of satisfactory progress as prescribed in clause 82;

(b) they are enrolled in an award course whose normal full-time duration is more than two years, and they have been identified as not meeting progression requirements for that award course three times, without an intervening period of satisfactory progress as prescribed in clause 82; or

(c) they have twice failed the same compulsory or barrier unit of study, field work, clinical work, practicum or other professional experience.

(4) A student may be asked to show good cause more than once.

(5) A student who is asked to show good cause will be invited to provide written reasons why they should be permitted to re-enrol in their award course.

(6) A student's response to a request to show good cause should:

(a) outline the circumstances that have negatively affected the student’s study performance;

(b) explain the specific effects or impacts of those circumstances;

(c) outline the steps that the student has taken, or will take in the future, to address each of those circumstances, with a view to ensuring that they will not negatively affect the student's study performance in the future;

(d) if the student has previously been asked to show good cause, explain whether previously identified factors affecting their study performance have recurred, including reasons why previous strategies to address those factors have been ineffective; and

(e) attach any relevant documentary evidence.

(7) In all cases the onus is on the student to provide the Associate Dean with satisfactory evidence to establish good cause.

(8) The Associate Dean will provide reasons for their decision, which will be recorded on the student’s progression profile.

Note: Documentary evidence for subclause (6)(e) may include medical certificates, police reports, statutory declarations or academic transcripts. The Associate Dean may take into account relevant aspects of a student’s record in other courses or units of study within the University, and relevant aspects of academic studies at other institutions, provided that the student presents this information to the Associate Dean.

Note: A response to a request to show good cause is not a substitute for a special consideration or special arrangement application, which should be lodged as appropriate in accordance with this policy.

79 Permission to re-enrol

(1) The Associate Dean will permit a student who has shown good cause to re-enrol.

(2) Subject to clause 82, a student who is permitted to re-enrol will remain at Stage 3 of the process set out in this Part.
80 Actions that may be taken where a student does not show good cause

(1) Where a student has not shown good cause why they should be allowed to re-enrol, the Associate Dean may:

(a) exclude the student from the relevant course; or

(b) permit the student to re-enrol in the relevant award course subject to restrictions on units of study, which may include but are not limited to:

(i) passing a unit or units of study within a specified time;

(ii) exclusion from a unit or units of study; and

(iii) specification of the earliest date upon which a student may re-enrol in a unit or units of study.

(2) The Associate Dean may not exclude a student who subsequently does not meet any restrictions on enrolment imposed under subclause (1)(b) without allowing the student a further opportunity to show good cause.

Note: For information on student appeals against decisions made by an Associate Dean under this clause, see the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

81 Applying for re-admission after exclusion for failure to meet progression requirements

(1) A person who has been excluded from an award course may apply for re-admission to the award course after at least two years.

(2) Re-admission will not be permitted without the approval of the Associate Dean.

(3) With the written approval of the Associate Dean, a person who is re-admitted to their award course may be given credit for any work completed elsewhere in the University or at another institution during a period of exclusion.

Note: For information on student appeals against decisions made by an Associate Dean under this clause, see the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

Note: For information on applying for admission to other courses at the University after exclusion, see clause 11.

82 Reversion

(1) Where a student previously identified as not meeting academic progression requirements meets progression requirements for two consecutive semesters, their name will be removed from the academic progression register.

(2) If, having been removed from the academic progression register, a student who has previously been identified as not meeting academic progression requirements fails again to meet progression requirements, they will be regarded as being at Stage 1 of the process outlined in this Part. These students may, at the Associate Dean’s discretion, be required to consult an academic adviser about their progress.
PART 16  SHOW GOOD CAUSE FOLLOWING FAILURE, DISCONTINUATION OR EXCLUSION

83 Show good cause following failure, discontinuation or exclusion

(1) The Associate Dean may require a student to show good cause why they should be permitted to re-enrol in a unit of study that they have failed or discontinued more than once, whether that unit of study was failed or discontinued when the student was enrolled in an award course offered by the current faculty or by another faculty.

(2) The Associate Dean may require a student who:

(a) has had their candidature in an award course at the University, or at another institution, terminated due to failure or discontinuation; and

(b) has subsequently been admitted or re-admitted to an award course at the University;

to show good cause why they should be permitted to re-enrol in a year of candidature or a unit of study that they have failed or discontinued in the year immediately following the admission or re-admission.

(3) Where a student has not shown good cause why they should be allowed to re-enrol, the Associate Dean may:

(a) exclude the student from the relevant course; or

(b) permit the student to re-enrol in the relevant award course subject to restrictions on units of study, which may include but are not limited to:

(i) completion of a unit or units of study within a specified time;

(ii) exclusion from a unit or units of study; and

(iii) specification of the earliest date upon which a student may re-enrol in a unit or units of study.

(4) The Associate Dean may not exclude a student who subsequently does not meet any conditions on enrolment imposed under subclause (3)(b) without allowing the student a further opportunity to show good cause.

Note: For information on student appeals against decisions made by an Associate Dean under this clause, see the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

PART 17  AWARD COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Note: To qualify for the award of a degree, diploma or certificate, a student must:

• complete the award course requirements prescribed in any relevant faculty resolutions and the award course resolutions; and

• satisfy the requirements of the Coursework Rule and any applicable policy

See clause 5.1 of the Coursework Rule.

Note: See clause 102(3) for commencement dates of clauses 83A to 83C inclusive.
Note: See also clauses 18(1)–(10) of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

83A Award course requirements for all Bachelor degrees

(1) The Bachelor degree:
   (a) offers liberal, professional or specialist learning and education; and
   (b) builds on prior secondary or tertiary study.

(2) All Bachelor award courses must meet:
   (a) the requirements for either:
       (i) a Liberal Studies Bachelor degree; or
       (ii) a Professional or Specialist Bachelor’s degree;
       and
   (b) the applicable award course resolutions.

83B Award course requirements for the Liberal Studies Bachelor degree

(1) Any Liberal Studies Bachelor degree will have a requirement of 144 credit points of study as specified in the award course resolutions, including the requirement to complete:
   (a) core units of study as specified, to a maximum of 24 credit points;
   (b) a major or a program from the list specified;
   (c) a minimum of 12 credit points of elective units from the open learning environment; and
   (d) a minor from a shared pool of minors common to Liberal Studies Bachelor degrees.

(2) Every Liberal Studies Bachelor degree must be designed to support the development of the graduate qualities and must require all students to demonstrate those qualities.

(3) Every Liberal Studies Bachelor degree must offer the opportunity for students to complete:
   (a) a second major in place of the minor required in subclause 83B(1)(d) above from a shared pool of majors common to Liberal Studies Bachelor degrees;
   (b) a program from a pool of the degree’s list of available programs;
   (c) elective units of study from a shared pool of elective units common to Liberal Studies Bachelor degrees (except where the requirements for a program do not allow sufficient free credit points to take electives);
   (d) elective modules from the open learning environment;
   (e) in addition to the Liberal Studies Bachelor degree, the requirements for the Bachelor of Advanced Studies in a combined degree as set out in the award course resolutions.
83C Award course requirements for the Professional or Specialist Bachelor degree

(1) Any Professional or Specialist Bachelor degree must:
   (a) have a requirement of not less than 144 credit points of study as specified in the award course resolutions;
   (b) support the development of the graduate qualities; and
   (c) require all students to demonstrate those qualities.

(2) Professional or Specialist Bachelor degrees may offer the opportunity for students to complete, in addition to the Professional or Specialist Bachelor degree, a Bachelor of Advanced Studies.

84 Masters by coursework

The Masters by coursework degree:
   (a) is a program of either or both of advanced learning and professional training;
   (b) builds on prior undergraduate study; and
   (c) normally leads to a capstone experience, which provides an opportunity to synthesise the knowledge and experience gained.

85 The capstone experience

(1) All Advanced Learning Masters degrees and appropriate Professional or Specialist Masters degrees culminate in a capstone experience.

(2) The capstone experience:
   (a) is a unit of study designed to provide students with an opportunity to:
      (i) draw together the learning that has taken place during the award course;
      (ii) synthesise the learning that has taken place during the award course with their prior learning and experience; and
      (iii) draw conclusions that will form the basis for further investigation and intellectual and professional growth;
   (b) will be integrative, foster student autonomy and, where appropriate, a transdisciplinary perspective;
   (c) will contribute to award course aims and graduate qualities;
   (d) is taken towards the end of the award course, with the result captured in a mark or the component of a mark;
   (e) may take the form of:
      (i) a long essay;
      (ii) a thesis;
      (iii) a project;
      (iv) a professional placement;
(v) a comprehensive or oral examination;
(vi) a portfolio with commentary;
(vii) a performance;
(viii) an exhibition;
(ix) a public presentation;
(x) a law moot; or
(xi) another activity appropriate to the discipline.

86 Award course requirements for the Advanced Learning Masters degree

(1) The Advanced Learning Masters degree comprises a minimum of one year of full-
time advanced study culminating in a capstone experience.

(2) Advanced Learning Masters degrees contain optional opportunities for
interdisciplinary study and research and, where appropriate and feasible:
   (a) exchange and work-based projects; and
   (b) professional or industry experience.

(3) Advanced Learning Masters degrees carry the title Master of Arts in [discipline],
Master of Science in [discipline], or a title specified in the relevant award course
resolutions.

(4) Candidates for the Advanced Learning Masters degree must complete a minimum
of 48 credit points of study, or such higher number as specified in the award course
resolutions, including:
   (a) core advanced units of study as specified in the award course resolutions;
   (b) a capstone experience;
   (c) elective advanced units of study, including:
      (i) an optional 12 credit points of research, as prescribed in the award
          course resolutions;
      (ii) optional units of study offered by another faculty, as prescribed in the
           award course resolutions or with the permission of both faculties;
   (d) where specified in the award course resolutions, optional elective units
       designed by the faculty involving a professional or industry project; and
   (e) where appropriate and specified in the award course resolutions, optional
       inter-institutional units of study.

87 Award course requirements for the Professional Masters degree

(1) The Professional Masters degree comprises a minimum of one year and a
maximum of four years of full-time study leading to a qualification that contributes
to professional accreditation or recognition.

(2) Where appropriate to professional requirements, Professional Masters degrees will
include:
   (a) a capstone experience;
   (b) opportunities for interdisciplinary study;
(c) research;
(d) inter-institutional study; and
(e) professional or industry experience.

(3) Candidates for Professional Masters degrees must complete the requirements set out in the award course resolutions, which will include a minimum of 48 and a maximum of 192 credit points, including:

(a) core units of study as specified in the award course resolutions;
(b) where appropriate, a capstone experience;
(c) elective advanced units of study including, where appropriate and feasible:
   (i) an optional 12 credit points of research as set out in the award course resolutions;
   (ii) optional elective units of study offered by another faculty, as prescribed in the award course resolutions or with the permission of both faculties;
   (iii) where specified in the award course resolutions, optional elective units designed by the faculty involving a professional or industry project; and
   (iv) where specified in the award course resolutions, optional exchange units.

87A Award course requirements for Research Pathway Masters degree

(1) The Research Pathway Masters degree builds on a prior undergraduate degree and develops advanced knowledge and skills necessary to undertake research in a Doctor of Philosophy.

(2) The usual Research Pathway Masters degree is the Master of Advanced Studies [specialisation].

(3) The volume of learning in a Research Pathway Masters degree will depend on the student's prior undergraduate and postgraduate study, but will normally be:

(a) 48 credit points, for a student who has taken a major or specialisation in a 192 credit point undergraduate degree or AQF level 8 qualification at a standard accepted by the relevant faculty and in an area of the specialisation of the Masters degree;

(b) 72 credit points, for a student who has taken a major or specialisation in a 144 credit point undergraduate degree at a standard accepted by the relevant faculty and in an area of the specialisation of the Masters degree; or

(c) 96 credit points, for a student who has not taken a major or specialisation in the area of specialisation of the Masters degree at a standard accepted by the faculty.

(4) The course resolutions for each Research Pathway Masters degree must:

(a) require a maximum of 96 credit points; and

(b) include:
   (i) a research project of 24 – 36 credit points;
(ii) advanced coursework which develops knowledge and research skills in the discipline of the specialisation at 4000- and – 5000 level;

(iii) a minimum of 72 credit points at or above -4000 level;

(iv) a minimum of 36 credit points at or above -5000 level;

(v) a minimum of 6 credit points and a maximum of 12 credit points from the open learning environment at -5000 level.

(5) The course resolutions for a Research Pathway Masters degree may also provide for a maximum of 24 credit points at or above -3000 level for students admitted without an undergraduate major or specialisation as provided in subclause 87A(3)(c).

Note: For further discussion of levels, see the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

88 Award course requirements for the Graduate Diploma

(1) The Graduate Diploma is an advanced program of study building on either or both of prior undergraduate and postgraduate study.

(2) A Graduate Diploma may be offered as an embedded award in an Advanced Learning or Professional Masters program, or as a stand-alone award.

(3) Where it is offered as part of an embedded program, the title of a Graduate Diploma will be Graduate Diploma in [discipline], where [discipline] is:

(a) an identifier that is unique within the faculty; and

(b) is used in the title of all components of the embedded program.

(4) Where the Graduate Diploma is offered as a stand-alone program, its title will be as specified in the award course resolutions.

(5) Candidates for a Graduate Diploma must complete a minimum of 36 and a maximum of 48 credit points of study, including:

(a) core units of study as specified in the award course resolutions; and

(b) where appropriate, elective units of study including optional elective units of study offered by another faculty, as prescribed in the award course resolutions or with the permission of both faculties.

89 Award course requirements for the Graduate Certificate

(1) The Graduate Certificate is an advanced program of study building on:

(a) prior undergraduate study; or

(b) where approved by the faculty, prior experience that is considered by the faculty to demonstrate knowledge and aptitude to undertake the required units of study.

(2) A Graduate Certificate may be offered as an embedded award in an Advanced Learning program, a Professional Masters program, a Graduate Diploma, or as a stand-alone award.

(3) Where it is offered as part of an embedded program, the title of a Graduate Certificate will be Graduate Certificate in [discipline], where [discipline] is:

(a) an identifier that is unique within the faculty; and

(b) is used in the title of all components of the embedded program.
(4) Where the Graduate Certificate is offered as a stand-alone program, its title will be as specified in the award course resolutions.

(5) Candidates for the Graduate Certificate must complete a minimum of 24 and a maximum of 36 credit points of study, including:
   (a) core units of study as specified in the award course resolutions; and
   (b) where appropriate, elective units of study including optional elective units of study offered by another faculty, as prescribed in the award course resolutions or with the permission of both faculties.

90 Award course requirements for combined postgraduate coursework degrees and double degrees

(1) Subject to this clause, faculties may establish combined degree and double degree programs involving postgraduate coursework awards allowing some units to be cross-credited to both degrees.

(2) The minimum course requirement for a double Masters degree is 96 credit points, equating to two years of full-time study.

(3) The cross-credited units of study for combined postgraduate degrees and double degrees must not exceed a value of 12 credit points in each degree.

(4) Faculties may admit candidates to two postgraduate award courses and allow a maximum of 12 credit points to be credited to both awards, provided that:
   (a) where the awards are offered by two faculties, double enrolment is with the permission of the Deans of both faculties; and
   (b) units of study to be cross-credited in both degrees are cross-credited with the written approval of the relevant program directors.

91 Award course requirements for combined degree and double degree programs for the award of a Bachelor and Masters degree

(1) Subject to this clause, faculties may establish combined degree and double degree programs for the award of a Bachelor degree and the award of a Masters degree.

(2) The minimum requirements for a double degree combining the award of a Bachelor degree and a Masters degree is 192 credit points, equating to four years of full-time study.

(3) Candidates may not proceed to units of study at the Masters level without achieving in units contributing to the Bachelor degree at:
   (a) a credit level; or
   (b) such higher level as is set out in the award course resolutions.

91A Award course requirements for vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degrees generally

(1) This section applies to vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degrees approved after 1 January 2018.

(2) All vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degrees must meet:
(a) the applicable course resolutions for each of the integrated award courses; and

(b) the requirements for:
   (i) Research Pathway vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degrees specified in clause 91B; or
   (ii) Specialist or Professional vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degrees specified in clause 91C.

91B Award course requirements for Research Pathway vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degrees

(1) The award course resolutions for a Research Pathway vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degree with a Bachelor degree of 144 credit points must require:
   (a) a total of 216 credit points;
   (b) 72 credit points from the Master of Advanced Studies (discipline) degree, as specified in subclause 91B(2);
   (c) a minimum of 72 credit points at or above -4000 level;
   (d) a minimum of 36 credit points at or above -5000 level; and
   (e) a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 12 credit points from the open learning environment at -5000 level.

(2) The Masters portion of a Research Pathway vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degree with a Bachelor degree of 144 credit points must require:
   (a) a named specialisation that develops research ability in a discipline to a sufficient standard for admission to a Doctor of Philosophy;
   (b) a research project of 24-36 credit points; and
   (c) advanced coursework developing knowledge and research skills in the discipline of the specialisation at or above -4000 level.

(3) The course resolutions for a Research Pathway vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degree with a Bachelor degree of 192 credit points must require:
   (a) a total of 240 credit points:
   (b) 48 credit points from the Master of Advanced Studies (discipline) degree, as specified in subclause 91B(4);
   (c) a minimum of 48 credit points at or above -4000 level;
   (d) a minimum of 36 credit points at or above -5000 credit point level; and
   (e) a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 12 credit points from the open learning environment at -5000 level.

(4) The Masters portion of a Research Pathway vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degree with a Bachelor degree of 192 credit points must require:
   (a) a named specialisation that develops research ability in a discipline to a sufficient standard for admission to a Doctor of Philosophy;
   (b) a research project of 24-26 credit points; and
   (c) advanced coursework developing knowledge and research skills in the discipline of the specialisation at or above -4000 level.
Note: For further discussion of levels, see the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

91C Award course requirements for Professional or Specialist vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degrees

(1) The award course resolutions for a Professional or Specialist vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degree with a Bachelor degree of 144 credit points must require:

(a) a total of 216 credit points;
(b) 72 credit points from the Master of Advanced Studies (discipline) degree, including:
   (i) a project of 12 -36 credit points;
   (ii) a minimum of 72 credit points at or above -4000 level;
   (iii) a minimum of 36 credit points at or above -5000 level; and
   (iv) a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 12 credit points from the open learning environment at -5000 level.

(2) The award course resolutions for a Professional or Specialist vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degree with a Bachelor degree of 192 credit points must require:

(a) a total of 240 credit points;
(b) 48 credit points from the Master of Advanced Studies (discipline) degree, including:
   (i) a project of 12- 36 credit points;
   (ii) a minimum of 48 credit points at or above – 4000 level; and
   (iii) a minimum of 36 credit points at or above – 5000 level; and
   (iv) a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 12 credit points from the open learning environment at -5000 level.

Note: For further discussion of levels, see the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

PART 18 AWARDS

Note: An Undergraduate Diploma may be awarded at one of four grades: pass, pass with merit, pass with distinction, pass with high distinction.

A Bachelor degree may be awarded at one of two grades: pass, or pass with honours.

Degrees of Master by coursework may be conferred, and Graduate Diplomas and Graduate Certificates may be awarded, only at a pass grade.

See clause 6.1 of the Coursework Rule.

92 Transcripts and testamurs

(1) A student who has completed an award course or a unit of study at the University will receive an academic transcript upon application and payment of any required fees.

Note: For information on the circumstances in which the University will apply sanctions for unpaid debts, see the Student Debtor Sanctions Policy 2014.
(2) Testamurs and transcripts will provide the information specified in the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 and the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016.

92A Aegrotat and posthumous awards

The Registrar may, on the recommendation of the relevant Dean, authorise the conferral of an aegrotat or posthumous award in circumstances involving serious illness or the death of a student.

PART 19 AWARDS WITH HONOURS

93 Admission to an award course with honours

(1) On the recommendation of the relevant Head of School or program director, an Associate Dean may admit a student to an appended honours course, if the student has:

(a) met the requirements for a pass degree in the course;
(b) achieved a weighted average of at least 65, calculated from at least 48 credit points of undergraduate study (excluding any 1000-level units if the course is available on a full-time basis to high school graduates); and
(c) met any additional requirements set by the faculty resolutions or award course resolutions for admission to honours in the course.

(2) On the recommendation of the relevant Head of School or program director, an Associate Dean may admit a student to an integrated honours course:

(a) if the student has:

(i) met the requirements for a pass degree in the course;
(ii) achieved a weighted average of at least 65, calculated from at least 48 credit points of undergraduate units of study (excluding any 1000-level units if the course is available on a full-time basis to high school graduates); and
(iii) met any additional requirements set out by the faculty resolutions or award course resolutions; or

(b) from the commencement of the award course if:

(i) the Academic Board has approved the award course as one that meets the learning outcomes of an AQF Level 8 honours qualification; and
(ii) the award course resolutions incorporate explicit requirements for completion of the award course that are consistent with the awarding of honours as prescribed in this policy.

(3) On the recommendation of the relevant Heads of Schools or program directors of faculties that offer and administer the proposed honours courses, an Associate Dean may admit a student to honours or double honours in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies if the student has:

(a) completed:
(i) 144 credit points in the combined degree program;
(ii) a Liberal Studies undergraduate degree program at the University; or
(iii) a program of study deemed by the relevant Heads of Schools or program directors to be the equivalent of such study;

(b) achieved a weighted average mark of at least 65, as specified in the award course resolutions, in the first three years (144 credit points) of the combined degree;

(c) completed:
   (i) requirements for a major in the intended area of honours specialisations; or
   (ii) study of equivalent depth in the intended area as set out in the award course resolutions; and

(d) met any additional requirements for admission to the honours courses set by the faculty or school and approved by the Academic Board.

(4) A student who is enrolled in an appended honours course:
   (a) may not graduate with the pass degree; and
   (b) may not enrol part-time except in accordance with the award course resolutions.

(5) A student who fails or discontinues an appended honours year may not re-enrol in it, except with the approval of the Associate Dean.

94 Principles for the award of honours

The principles for the University’s offering degrees with honours are:

(a) the award of honours is reserved to indicate special proficiency;
(b) the University offers courses leading to a degree with honours to provide research training opportunities to students who demonstrate special proficiency and the ability to undertake further study and research within a discipline;
(c) a course leading to a degree with honours is intended to attract and stimulate students of high ability;
(d) honours awards are in classes, to recognise and reward outstanding academic ability;
(e) an honours course:
   (i) will provide the foundations of research training within the relevant discipline; and
   (ii) will have an identifiable, discipline-specific individual research, scholarly or creative component that is allocated at least 12 credit points; and
(f) the assessment tasks for research units of study will comprise, at least in part, a dissertation.
95 **Qualifying for an award with honours**

(1) To qualify for an award with honours, a student must meet the requirements set out in the faculty resolutions and award course resolutions.

(2) The award of a degree with honours, and the grade of honours awarded, will be assessed and calculated according to two mechanisms:

   (a) for appended honours and for honours taken as an embedded component in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies - by an honours mark; or

   (b) for integrated honours - by a grade average calculated across at least 48 credit points of study.

(3) Each faculty will publish the grading systems and criteria for the award of honours in that faculty.

96 **Determining honours awards for appended honours and integrated honours (using a 48+ credit point average)**

(1) This clause applies to:

   (a) an appended honours course; and

   (b) an integrated honours course where, under the award course resolutions, the conferral of the degree with honours, and the class of honours, is determined using a mark calculated across units of study attracting at least 48 credit points but less than 96 credit points.

(2) A student who achieves a mark within a range set out in the following table is to be awarded honours in the class set out in the table for that range.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>A student who achieves an honours mark in the range …</th>
<th>will be awarded honours …</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>80 ≤ honours mark ≤ 100</td>
<td>First Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75 ≤ honours mark &lt; 80</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>70 ≤ honours mark &lt; 75</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>65 ≤ honours mark &lt; 70</td>
<td>Third Class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) A student who achieves a mark of less than 65 is not awarded honours.

97 **Determining honours awards for integrated honours (using a 96+ credit point average)**

(1) This clause applies to an integrated honours course where, under the award course resolutions, the conferral of the degree with honours, and the class of honours, is determined using an honours mark calculated across units of study that together have at least 96 credit points.
(2) A student who achieves an honours mark within a range set out in the following table is to be awarded honours in the class set out in the table for that range.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>A student who achieves an honours mark in the range …</th>
<th>will be awarded honours …</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>75 ≤ honours mark ≤ 100</td>
<td>First Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>70 ≤ honours mark &lt; 75</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>65 ≤ honours mark &lt; 70</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50 ≤ honours mark &lt; 65</td>
<td>Third Class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) The award course resolutions for a course may require a student to achieve higher honours marks for particular classes of honours.

(4) A student who achieves a mark of less than 65 may be awarded Third Class honours where this has been specified as available under the course resolutions.

97A Determining honours awards on the basis of an embedded honours component in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies

(1) This clause applies to honours taken as an embedded component in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies.

(2) Where a student is undertaking a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, the student may be awarded the combined degree with honours on the basis of completion of an honours component embedded within the combined degree.

(3) The requirements for embedded honours in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies will be specified in the combined award course resolutions, and will require the completion of an honours component comprising:

(a) 36-48 credit points of 4000-level work at honours level, including an honours research project of 12–36 credit points included in the 4000-level work; and

(b) honours coursework of 12-36 credit points.

(4) A student may be awarded double honours in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies on completion of a second honours component.

(5) The requirements for double honours in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies will be the completion of:

(a) 36-48 credit points as set out in subclause 97A(3); and

(b) the requirements for the combined degree as set out in the award course resolutions.

(6) The honours mark will be:

(a) calculated according to a method specified in the faculty or school resolutions of the faculty or school offering the honours course; and

(b) based on results from 36-48 credit points of work as specified in subclause 97A(3).
(7) A student who achieves an honours mark within a range set out in the following table is to be awarded honours in the class set out in the table for that range.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>A student who achieves an honours mark in the range …</th>
<th>will be awarded honours …</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>80 ≤ honours mark ≤ 100</td>
<td>First Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75 ≤ honours mark &lt; 80</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>70 ≤ honours mark &lt; 75</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>65 ≤ honours mark &lt; 70</td>
<td>Third Class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8) A student who achieves a mark of less than 65 is not awarded honours.

(9) The honours mark for a student in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies will be determined by the faculty that administers the honours course in the discipline in which it is taken. The faculty administering the student’s candidature will award honours on the basis of the mark determined by the faculty administering the honours course.

(10) Where a student enrolled in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies is admitted to and completes honours requirements, the name of the honours component would replace the major indicated in brackets next to the appropriate degree in the nomenclature for the combined degree.

(a) Where the completed honours component is normally available in the partner degree to the Bachelor of Advanced Studies the nomenclature for the combined award should indicate the honours component in brackets attached to the partner degree as in the following example: Bachelor of Science (Mathematics Honours) / Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Philosophy).

(b) Where the completed honours component is not normally available in the partner degree to the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, the nomenclature for the combined award should indicate the honours component in brackets attached to the Bachelor of Advanced Studies as in the following example: Bachelor of Science (Mathematics) / Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Philosophy Honours).

(c) Where double honours is completed, the nomenclature for the combined award should indicate the honours component in brackets attached to both awards as in the following example: Bachelor of Science (Mathematics Honours) / Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Philosophy Honours).

PART 20 UNIVERSITY MEDALS

98 Qualifying for a University Medal

A student who has qualified for a Bachelor degree with honours with an outstanding academic record throughout the award course may be eligible for the award of a University Medal.
99 Awarding University Medals

(1) Faculties may signal outstanding achievement in a Bachelor degree course with
honours by awarding a University Medal to one or more students.

(2) Faculties will discuss and determine the normal minimum levels of academic
performance required for the award of a University Medal, using broadly
comparable University-wide criteria approved by the Academic Board.

(3) Honours students entering the University with advanced standing will be assessed
for University Medals in the same way as students undertaking their entire award
course within the University.

(4) In the case of students who have completed the requirements for honours as an
embedded component in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced
Studies:

(a) the faculty offering the embedded honours component may recommend to
the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies that a University Medal be awarded to
a student, after considering the student’s honours mark and academic
record for the entire combined award;

(b) the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies will consider all University Medal
recommendations for students in a combined award with the Bachelor of
Advanced Studies and make recommendations to the relevant administering
faculties for candidates for the combined award; and

(c) the administering faculties for candidates for the combined award will award
the University Medal according to the recommendation of the Board of
Interdisciplinary Studies.

PART 21 TERMINATION OF CANDIDATURE

100 Failure to complete within time limits

The candidature of a student who has not completed the course requirements for an
award course within the period prescribed under clause 4.2 of the Coursework Rule, is by
force of this clause, automatically terminated at the end of that period.

Note: The candidature of a student who discontinues their enrolment in a course during their first
year of enrolment in the course, without prior permission from the Dean to re-enrol, is
automatically terminated in accordance with subclause 56(3) of this policy.

Note: The candidature of a student who does not enrol for any unit of study for two consecutive
semesters is automatically terminated in accordance with subclause 58(3) of this policy.

101 Termination of candidature where disqualifying circumstances exist

(1) Subject to this clause, the Registrar may terminate the candidature of a student if
one or more of the following disqualifying circumstances exist:

(a) the student, or someone acting on the student’s behalf, made a material
misrepresentation in applying for admission to an award course;
(b) the student failed to disclose to the University a fact or circumstance material to its decision to admit the person to an award course; or

(c) the student was admitted to an award course on the basis of a degree, diploma or certificate obtained wholly or partly by fraud, academic misconduct or other dishonesty.

(2) Before terminating the candidature of a student in accordance with this clause, the Registrar must give the student written notice of the proposed termination of candidature.

(3) The notice must:

(a) set out the basis on which it is proposed that the student’s candidature be terminated;

(b) inform the student that they may make written submissions to the Registrar on the proposed termination of candidature, and by when to make such submissions;

(c) inform the student that the Registrar will determine, after considering any submissions from the student, whether to terminate the student’s candidature.

(4) The period for making submissions under subclause (3) must be at least 20 working days.

(5) The Registrar will:

(a) consider the student’s submissions within 10 working days of receiving them; and

(b) take all reasonable measures to finalise the process as soon as practicable.

(6) If the Registrar is satisfied, after considering any submissions made by the student, that:

(a) the disqualifying circumstances specified in the notice exist; and

(b) because of those disqualifying circumstances the student’s candidature in the award course should be terminated;

the Registrar will terminate the student’s candidature in the award course.

(7) The Registrar will notify the student of the decision in writing, including reasons, as soon as possible after it is made.

(8) If the Registrar terminates the candidature of a student in accordance with this clause:

(a) any liability of the student to pay fees or charges to the University is not affected in relation to the course; and

(b) the student is not entitled to a refund, repayment or set off of any fee or other amount paid in relation to the course; and

(c) the student will not be eligible for admission to any course at the University for a period of three years from the date of termination of candidature.

Note: A decision made by the Registrar in accordance with this clause is not an ‘academic decision’ and cannot be appealed to the Student Appeals Body in accordance with the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.
102 Rescissions, replacements and transitional arrangements

(1) This document replaces the following, which are rescinded as from the date of commencement of this document:

(a) Admission: Advanced Standing, Credit and Exemption Policy, which commenced on 15 April 1998;
(b) Admission to Undergraduate Courses Policy, which commenced on 16 October 2002;
(c) Assessment Policy 2011, which commenced on 9 November 2011;
(d) Academic Board Policy on Awards with Honours, which commenced on 13 August 2003;
(e) Postgraduate English Language Requirements Policy, which commenced on 24 August 2011; and
(f) Student Academic Progression Policy, which commenced on 13 December 2006.

(2) A reference in any course resolution, faculty resolution or policy to any document rescinded by this policy should be construed as a reference to this policy.

(3) Clauses 83A, 83B and 83C apply to

(a) all new courses approved after 25 July 2016; and
(b) all other courses from 1 January 2018.
SCHEDULE 1

Common Result Grades

(1) The Academic Board has adopted a set of grades that are common to all undergraduate and postgraduate courses that award merit grades for coursework, as set out in the following table.

(2) Learning outcomes for units of study are reported in one of two ways:
   (a) by grade and mark: the mark and grade must correspond as indicated in the Schedule below;
   (b) by grade only: the grade should be either Satisfied Requirements (SR) or Failed Requirements (FR).

(3) Learning outcomes for a unit of study must be reported in the same way for all students enrolled in the unit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mark Range</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Use in WAM</th>
<th>Impact on Progression/at risk status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>Range from 0 to 49</td>
<td>To be awarded to students who fail to demonstrate the learning outcomes for the unit at an acceptable standard through failure to submit or attend compulsory assessment tasks or to attend classes to the required level. In cases where a student receives some marks but fails the unit through failure to attend or submit a compulsory task, the mark entered shall be the marks awarded by the faculty up to a maximum of 49. This grade should not be used in cases where a student attempts all assessment tasks but fails to achieve a mandated minimum standard in one or more task. In such cases a Fail (FA) grade and a mark less than 50 should be awarded.</td>
<td>Included in WAM</td>
<td>To Count as Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Range from 65 to less than 75</td>
<td>To be awarded in cases where a student is too ill to complete a unit but where the Dean is satisfied the student has demonstrated (on a pro rata basis) the learning outcomes for the unit at a good standard as defined by grade descriptors or exemplars established by the faculty. May only be awarded by a Dean.</td>
<td>Included in WAM</td>
<td>To count as Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>No mark</td>
<td>To be used when an enrolment is cancelled.</td>
<td>Not included in WAM</td>
<td>No impact on progression or at risk status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Range from 65 to less than 75</td>
<td>To be awarded to students who, in their performance in assessment tasks, demonstrate the learning outcomes for the unit at a good standard as defined by grade descriptors or exemplars established by the faculty.</td>
<td>Included in WAM</td>
<td>To count as Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Range from 75 to less than 85</td>
<td>To be awarded in cases where a student is too ill to complete a unit but where the Dean is satisfied the student has demonstrated (on a pro rata basis) the learning outcomes for the unit at a very high standard as defined by grade descriptors or exemplars established by the faculty. May only be awarded by a Dean.</td>
<td>Included in WAM</td>
<td>To count as Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>No mark</td>
<td>Recorded on external transcript. This applies in cases of discontinuation from the time DC ceases to be automatically available up to the cessation</td>
<td>Not included in WAM</td>
<td>To count as fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of classes for the unit of study and where a faculty has not determined that a grade of DC is warranted.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>Range from 75 to less than 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Included in WAM</td>
<td>To count as Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Discontinued not to count as failure</td>
<td>No mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not included in WAM</td>
<td>Not to count as fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Range from 0 to less than 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Included in WAM</td>
<td>To count as fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FR*</td>
<td>Failed Requirements</td>
<td>No mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not included in WAM</td>
<td>To count as fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>HA</td>
<td>High Distinction (Aegrotat)</td>
<td>Range from 85 to 100 inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Included in WAM</td>
<td>To count as High Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>HD</td>
<td>High distinction</td>
<td>Range from 85 to 100 inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Included in WAM</td>
<td>To count as High Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>No mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not included in WAM</td>
<td>No impact on progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Pass (Aegrotat)</td>
<td>Range from 50 to less than 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Range from 50 to less than 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SA*</td>
<td>Satisfied Requirements (Aegrotat)</td>
<td>No mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Result incomplete</td>
<td>No mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SR*</td>
<td>Satisfied requirements</td>
<td>No mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Unit of Study Continuing</td>
<td>No mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>No mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Progression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic Quality Committee
30 October 2018
SCHEDULE 2

1 Grade Descriptors for Honours awards

These descriptors are intended to apply to all Honours awards at the University of Sydney. They have been designed to foster collective thinking about standards between disciplines, to assist students, supervisors, staff and disciplinary groups to calibrate their own internal, professional or disciplinary standards with those applied across the University and to promote discussion about standards among students, staff, supervisors and faculties.

2 The University medal

(1) University medal candidates will have produced an outstanding research thesis that has been awarded a Class 1 Honours. Additionally, candidates will have demonstrated an exceptional level of achievement across the whole degree program.

(2) Knowledge: A student who receives First Class Honours and the University Medal will demonstrate commanding breadth and depth of knowledge of the discipline studied, together with a strong understanding of its context and insight into problem solving and into the potential for further inquiry.

(3) Skills: A student who receives First Class Honours and the University Medal will demonstrate:
   (a) advanced skills that equip them to function and solve advanced problems within a profession or discipline under supervision and with autonomy and insight;
   (b) a thorough proficiency in the methods, techniques and subject matter appropriate to the field or fields studied and insight into their application;
   (c) strong skills and insight in the interpretation of results, data and appropriate information sources;
   (d) a capacity for illuminating critical analysis and self-evaluation;
   (e) outstanding skills in written and oral communication and in organisation and documentation;
   (f) exceptionally innovative, creative and imaginative thinking; and
   (g) cognitive and technical skills to carry out a research project with a high level of autonomy.

(4) Application of Knowledge and Skills: A student who receives First Class Honours and the University Medal will demonstrate the application of knowledge and skills by demonstrating the following characteristics:
   (a) competently defending, where appropriate, their research within the chosen academic discipline at an expert level;
   (b) autonomy in thinking and motivation;
   (c) imagination, originality and insight;
   (d) comprehensive and extensive critical analysis and synthesis at an advanced level;
(e) insightful analysis of results and the potential and limitations of their study;
(f) a high degree of intellectual consistency; and
(g) coherent and rigorous design and meticulous execution of projects.

(5) Graduates at this level will demonstrate the capacity to pursue further study, and show the capacity for independent research at doctoral level.

3 First Class Honours

(1) Knowledge: A student who receives First Class Honours will demonstrate breadth and or depth of knowledge of the discipline(s) studied at a very high level, and the ability to place their work in context, appreciating the implications and broader significance.

(2) Skills: A student who receives First Class Honours will demonstrate:
(a) advanced or professional skills that equip them to function and solve advanced problems within a profession or discipline under supervision and with autonomy;
(b) a very high level of proficiency in the methods, techniques and subject matter appropriate to the field or fields studied;
(c) a very high level of skill in the interpretation of results, data and appropriate information sources;
(d) a high degree of sophistication in critical analysis and self-evaluation;
(e) outstanding written and oral expression, organisation, format and documentation;
(f) where relevant, highly innovative, creative and imaginative thinking; and
(g) a very high level of cognitive and technical skills to carry out a research project with considerable independence.

(3) Application of knowledge and skills: A student who receives First Class Honours will demonstrate the application of knowledge and skills by demonstrating the following characteristics:
(a) significant independence in thinking and motivation;
(b) significant evidence of originality and insight;
(c) comprehensive critical analysis and synthesis at an advanced level;
(d) a skilful treatment and analysis of unexpected outcomes or inconsistent results, and or recognition of some limitation of the methodology, if relevant; and
(e) a well-developed logical approach to designing appropriate research strategies.

(4) Graduates at this level will demonstrate the capacity to pursue further study, and show the capacity for independent research at doctoral level.

4 Second Class Honours, Division I

(1) Knowledge: A student who receives Second Class Honours, Division I, will have advanced knowledge in the discipline of study and sound knowledge of the research principles and methodologies appropriate to the field of study.
(2) **Skills:** A student who receives Second Class Honours, Division I, will demonstrate:

(a) advanced or professional skills that equip them to function and solve problems within a profession or discipline under supervision and with independence;

(b) a high level of proficiency in the methods, techniques and subject matter of the field studied;

(c) a high level of cognitive skills to interpret results, data and other information sources;

(d) mastery of the modes of expression appropriate to the field of study, enabling fluent and succinct presentation of knowledge; and

(e) technical skills to plan a solid research project under supervision and execute it with some independence.

(3) **Application of knowledge and skills:** A student who receives Second Class Honours, Division I, will demonstrate the application of knowledge and skills by demonstrating the following characteristics:

(a) design and plan a solid piece of research and scholarship;

(b) critically evaluate and synthesise material; and

(c) contextualize their work within the broader discipline of study.

(4) Graduates at this level will demonstrate the capacity to pursue further study, and pursue independent research at postgraduate level.

5 **Second Class Honours, Division II**

(1) **Knowledge:** A student who receives Second Class Honours, Division II will have advanced knowledge of an area of, or a problem in, a discipline in sufficient depth to understand the range of scope of a defined topic, have a broad grasp of its theoretical underpinnings and understand the general range of principal issues facing that area of the discipline.

(2) **Skills:** A student who receives Second Class Honours, Division II will demonstrate:

(a) advanced or professional skills that equip them to understand problems within a profession or discipline under supervision and with some independence;

(b) a broad understanding of the methods, techniques and subject matter of the field studied and some proficiency;

(c) advanced cognitive skills to understand the interpretation of results and data and the ability to apply this understanding with supervision;

(d) effective skills in the modes of expression appropriate to the field of study; and

(e) technical skills to contribute to the planning of a research project and to execute it with direct supervision.

(3) **Application of knowledge and skills:** A student who receives Second Class Honours, Division II, will demonstrate the application of knowledge and skills by demonstrating the following characteristics:

(a) understand and be able to apply methodologies relevant to complex problems in their area of investigation under supervision and have demonstrated some independence of thought and autonomy; and
(b) with the guidance of a supervisor, draw valid conclusions based on investigation, observation and/or experiment, and understand the scope and limitations of those conclusions.

(4) Graduates at this level will demonstrate the capacity to pursue further study and after further research training, demonstrate the potential for independent research.

6 Third Class Honours

(1) Knowledge: A student who receives Third Class Honours will have advanced knowledge of an area of a discipline and understand relevant theory.

(2) Skills: A student who receives Third Class Honours will have

(a) skills that equip them to understand problems;
(b) some understanding of the methods, techniques and subject matter of the field studied;
(c) cognitive skills to understand the interpretation of results and data with supervision;
(d) communication skills that are able to articulate a problem and an approach taken to its solution; and
(e) technical skills to participate in the planning and execution of a research project with direct supervision.

(3) Application of knowledge and skills: A student who receives Third Class Honours will demonstrate the application of knowledge and skills by demonstrating the following characteristics:

(a) understand and be able to apply methodologies relevant to complex problems in their area of investigation under supervision.

(b) with the guidance of a supervisor, graduates will be able to understand and draw conclusions based on investigation, observation and/or experiment.

(4) Graduates at this level, after undertaking further research training, will demonstrate the capacity to pursue further supervised study.

7 Fail

(1) A fail to achieve Honours indicates that the student has not demonstrated the learning outcomes for any of the classes of Honours available.

(2) Students who do not achieve Honours may be awarded a pass degree provided that they have demonstrated the learning outcomes for the degree.
NOTES

Coursework Policy 2014

Date adopted: 3 December 2014
Date commenced: 18 December 2014
Date amended: 28 November 2017, commencing 1 January 2018
Date registered: 17 December 2014
Administrator: Secretariat, Academic Board
Review date: 3 December 2019

Rescinded documents: Admission: Advanced Standing, Credit and Exemption Policy
Assessment to Undergraduate Courses Policy
Assessment Policy 2011
Academic Board Policy on Awards with Honours
Postgraduate English Language Requirements Policy
Student Academic Progression Policy

Related documents: Australian Citizenship Act 2007 (Cth)
Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Cth)
Education Act 1990 (NSW)
Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 (Cth)
University of Sydney Act 1989 (NSW)
Disability Standards for Education (Cth)
University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority - Academic Functions) Rule 2016
University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016
University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014
University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006
Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015
Confirmation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Identity Policy 2015
Learning and Teaching Policy 2015
Assessment Procedures 2011
Recordkeeping Manual
## AMENDMENT HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
<th>Commencing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Updated incorrect hyperlinks and numbering (administrative change only)</td>
<td>12 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92A</td>
<td>Clause added</td>
<td>16 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note 4478</strong></td>
<td>Corrected reference to incorrect clause</td>
<td>16 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Corrected to ensure compliance with <em>Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000</em></td>
<td>13 April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12A</td>
<td>Clause added</td>
<td>25 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Correction of numbering errors (administrative change only)</td>
<td>12 June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 10, 11, 12, 15, 25, 31, 34, 38, 44, 51, 77, 78</td>
<td>Amendments to a range of clauses as requested by Admissions and the Student Centre</td>
<td>1 July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Amendment to align this clause with the ESOS National Code</td>
<td>16 September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Amended to allow deferral by all applicants</td>
<td>1 January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(1), 41 (Note-27), 42, 43, 43A, 43B, 67, 69</td>
<td>Amendments to a range of clauses related to the Student Administrative Services Project, particularly the centralised processing of credit applications and special considerations requests.</td>
<td>1 January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Amendment to include reference to Dux Entry Scheme</td>
<td>1 January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 28(4), 68(1), Related documents</td>
<td>Amended references and hyperlinks to other documents</td>
<td>1 January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 66A</td>
<td>Addition of clause and definition for simple extensions</td>
<td>11 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38, 39, 43A, 57, 60, 101, Schedule 1</td>
<td>Amendments to other clauses as requested by Admissions and the Student Centre</td>
<td>11 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Commencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 (8) (a), 101 (8) (b)</td>
<td>Administrative amendment, correction of typographical amendment.</td>
<td>3 May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Correction of typographical errors and clause references (administrative amendments only).</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Numbering of notes removed.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Definitions added: Bachelor of Advanced Studies; Bachelor degree; graduate qualities; Liberal Studies Bachelor degree; minor; open learning environment; undergraduate degree; Definitions deleted and replaced: department; program; program co-ordinator; stream; unit of study; Definitions deleted: graduate attributes;</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8(a); 8(b); 11(2); 14(2); 16(c); 17(e); 25(2); 42(1); 43(1); 43B(1); 44(6); 44(7); 45(4); 47(1); 47(4); 47(6); 48(2); 51(1); 55(2); 57(3); 71; 75(2); 86(3); 86(4); 87(3); 88(4); 88(5); 89(4); 89(5); 91(3); 93(1); 93(2); 93(4); 95(1); 96(1); 97(1); 97(3)</td>
<td>References to course changed to award course.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Commencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20(2); 65(2); 85(2)(c).</td>
<td>References to graduate attributes changed to graduate qualities.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26A(1); 26A(2)</td>
<td>References to Dux Entry Scheme changed to Future Leaders Scheme.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26A(3)</td>
<td>Subclause deleted.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44(1)</td>
<td>Cross reference to clauses 42 and 43 deleted.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44(7) note</td>
<td>Reference to Senate resolutions changed to award course resolutions.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 17 note</td>
<td>Note added.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83A; 83B; 83C</td>
<td>New clauses added.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93(3)</td>
<td>New subclause(3) added, remaining subclauses renumbered.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97A</td>
<td>New clause added.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99(2)</td>
<td>Subclause deleted and replaced.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99(4)</td>
<td>Subclause deleted and replaced.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102(3)</td>
<td>New subclause added.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Amendments related to the award of 3rd Class Honours</td>
<td>1 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Deleted</td>
<td>1 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 1</td>
<td>Administrative amendment to remove reference to obsolete grades.</td>
<td>1 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60(1)(b)</td>
<td>Administrative amendment to remove reference to graduate attributes and replace with reference to graduate qualities.</td>
<td>2 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 1</td>
<td>Administrative amendment – minor typographical error</td>
<td>18 July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(2); 21(3) note; Notes</td>
<td>Administrative amendment - updated references to <em>University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016</em></td>
<td>18 September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(1)</td>
<td>Administrative amendment - updated hyperlink to <em>University of Sydney Act 1989</em></td>
<td>18 September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Commencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21(9) note; 49(3)</td>
<td>Administrative amendment – updated hyperlink to Academic Board Standards website</td>
<td>18 September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(1)</td>
<td>Deleted reference to <em>University of Sydney By-law 1999 (as amended)</em></td>
<td>18 September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26A(2)(a)</td>
<td>Administrative amendment – replacing “NSW” with “relevant state or territory”</td>
<td>18 September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Administrative amendment – replaced “<em>University of Sydney By-law</em>” with <em>University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016</em></td>
<td>18 September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7(1); 10(5); 11(5)(c); 16(a); 16(b); 17(a) – 17(d); 18(a) – (c); 19(a) – (c); 21(5) – (6); 21(9); 24(3)(a); 27(5); 28(6); 28(6)(a)(ii); 28(6)(b) (i) and (iii); 28(7); 29(2) – (5); 30(2); 30(7) – (9); 31(7); 31(2); 31(6) 38(4); 38(6); 42(6); 43(1) – 43(4); 43A(4); 43B(1) – (2); 44(7); 46(1) – (2); 47(6); 52(1)- (2); 54(1)-2; 55(3); 55(4); 56(3)(a); 58(2); 72(2)-3; 59(2); 70(3); 73(1) – (3); 74(1); 75(1); 76(1); 76(3); 77(2);</td>
<td>1 January 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 4.9 English Language Proficiency

Academic Quality Committee
30 October 2018

Item 4.9 English Language Proficiency
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
<th>Commencing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77(5); 82(2); 90(4)(b); 93(1); 93(2); 93(3); 93(3)(a)(iii); 93(5); 100 note; 5; 21(7); 21(8); 70(3)(c); 70(4); 70(4)(a); 70(5)</td>
<td>Consequential amendments arising from organisational design change</td>
<td>1 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12A(2); 92A</td>
<td>Replacing Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) with Registrar – for consistency within document</td>
<td>1 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24(2)</td>
<td>Insert “Chair of the” before Graduate Studies Committee</td>
<td>1 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6; 83A(2)(a)(i); 83B; 83B(1) – (3); 83C; 83C(1)-2</td>
<td>Replacing “Degree” with “degree”</td>
<td>1 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2; 3; 6; 7note; 8(a); 9(3); 24(1)(a)(1)- (ii); 24(1)(b); 24(4)(b); 26(b); 35(4) note; 41(2); 41(1); 47(5); 71; 100 notes</td>
<td>Replacing “Policy” with “policy”</td>
<td>1 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(1)(b); 9(2); 11(6)(b); 25(3); 28(4); 28(6)(a)(ii); 37(2); 39(1)–(8); 41(4) and note; 43(1); 43A(2)(a); 48(1); 50(2);</td>
<td>Replacing “he or she” with “they” or “their” and matching associated verbs – gender equity requirements.</td>
<td>1 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Commencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51(1)(a); 56(2)-(3); 57(1); 58(3); 77(4)(b); 78(1); 78(8); 80(1); 81(3); 82(1)-(2); 83(1)-(3); 100 notes; 101(3)(b); Schedule 2 2(3)(a); 2(4)(a); 4(2)(a); 4(3)(c); 5(2)(a); 6(2)(a)</td>
<td>Amended definitions for “combined degree course”; “double degree course”; “learning outcome”; Liberal Studies Bachelor degree”</td>
<td>1 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58(3)</td>
<td>“automatically terminated” now reads “terminated automatically”</td>
<td>1 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60(1)(b)</td>
<td>“as defined in the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015” deleted</td>
<td>1 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79(2)</td>
<td>Delete “outlined” after process and replace with “set out”</td>
<td>1 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 17 note</td>
<td>Clause reference now reads “see also clauses 18(1)-(10) of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015”</td>
<td>1 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87A; 91A; 91B; 91C</td>
<td>New clauses inserted</td>
<td>1 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90(4)</td>
<td>Delete “will”; replace with “must not”</td>
<td>1 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92(2)-(3)</td>
<td>Clauses deleted</td>
<td>1 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Commencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92(2)</td>
<td>New clause added to replace clauses 92(2)-(3)</td>
<td>1 January 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADMISSIONS STANDARDS – ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

1 Definitions

(1) Words and phrases used in these standards and not otherwise defined in this document have the meanings they have in the Coursework Policy 2014.

(2) In these standards:

- **IB** means the International Baccalaureate
- **CAE** means Cambridge English: Advanced
- **CPE** means Cambridge English: Proficiency
- **GCE** means the General Certificate of Education
- **HKDSE** means the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education
- **IELTS** means the International English Language Testing System
- **IGCSE** means the International General Certificate of Secondary Education
- **IGCSE English** means IGCSE First language English, IGCSE Second language English, IGCSE Literature, Singapore-Cambridge O-level, UK OCR level English
- **STPM** means the Sijil Tinggi Persekolahan Malaysia
- **TOEFL** means the Test of English as a Foreign Language
- **TOEFL IBT** means internet based TOEFL
- **TWE** means the Test of Written English (completed as part of a paper-based TOEFL)
- **UK A Level English** means the GCE English subject that has been undertaken at full Advanced (A2) level
- **UK AS Level English** means English Language and Literature, English Language
- **UK A Levels Humanities** means any of the following GCE A Level humanities subjects: History, Humanities, Philosophy – Critical Thinking, Politics, Law, Religion, Sociology and Psychology

2 Applicants whose first language is English

(1) In order to satisfy the requirement of 21A(1) and 23A(1) of the Coursework Policy 2014, or 7.1 of the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011
the applicant must have citizenship or permanent long-term residency (minimum ten years) from one or more of the following countries and completed secondary or tertiary study from one of them:

(a) American Samoa  
(b) Australia  
(c) Botswana  
(d) Canada (excluding Quebec)  
(e) Fiji  
(f) Ghana  
(g) Guyana  
(h) Ireland  
(i) Jamaica  
(j) Kenya  
(k) Lesotho  
(l) Liberia  
(m) New Zealand  
(n) Nigeria  
(o) Papua New Guinea  
(p) Samoa  
(q) Singapore  
(r) Solomon Islands  
(s) South Africa  
(t) Tonga  
(u) Trinidad and Tobago  
(v) United Kingdom (including Northern Ireland)  
(w) United States of America  
(x) Zambia  
(y) Zimbabwe

3 Applicants whose first language is not English – Secondary Qualifications

(1) These standards apply to all undergraduate coursework applicants whose first language is not English and are demonstrating English language proficiency via Secondary Qualifications and are commencing studies from 1 January 2019.

(2) A prospective student whose first language is not English must have, within five years of the date on which they will commence the course, achieved a record of satisfactory achievement in secondary studies:

(a) in an English speaking country; or
(b) in which the language of instruction and assessment was English; or
(3) A prospective student whose first language is not English must have, within two years of the date on which they will commence the course, achieved a record of satisfactory achievement in secondary studies:
   (a) not undertaken in English, but meets the requirement is listed in Table 1 or Table 2; or

(4) Applicants seeking admission to an undergraduate award course on the basis of satisfactory achievement in secondary studies must have completed senior secondary study.

(5) An applicant for admission to an undergraduate award course in a faculty that has set English language requirements above the minimum requirements set out in subclause must meet the faculty’s requirements as approved by the Academic Board.

Note: These faculty requirements must be approved by the Academic Board in accordance with the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016.

4 Applicants whose first language is not English – Tertiary Studies

(1) These standards apply to all undergraduate and postgraduate coursework and higher degree by research applicants whose first language is not English and are demonstrating English language proficiency via tertiary studies and are commencing studies from 1 January 2019.

(2) A prospective student whose first language is not English must have, within five years of the date on which they will commence the course, achieved a record of satisfactory achievement in tertiary studies:
   (a) at an approved provider as assessed by the University of Sydney;
   (b) in which the language of instruction and assessment was English; and
   (c) in which the duration was at least one year of full-time (or equivalent part time) study.

(3) Applicants seeking admission to an undergraduate award course on the basis of satisfactory achievement in tertiary studies must have completed at least one year of full-time (or equivalent part-time) tertiary study.

5 Applicants whose first language is not English – English Language Test Scores

(1) These standards apply to all undergraduate and postgraduate coursework and higher degree by research applicants whose first language is not English and are demonstrating English language proficiency via an English Language Skills Test Score and are commencing studies from 1 January 2019.

(2) A prospective student whose first language is not English must have, within two years of the date on which the applicant will commence the course, achieved an IELTS overall band score of 6.5, with at least 6.0 in each band, or an equivalent score as listed in Table 3.

(3) An applicant for admission to an award course in a faculty that has set English language requirements above the minimum requirements set out in subclause (2)
must meet the faculty’s requirements as approved by the Academic Board, listed in Table 4 (undergraduate courses) and Table 5 (postgraduate courses).

Note: These faculty requirements must be approved by the Academic Board in accordance with the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016.

(4) The Head of School and Dean of the Sydney College of the Arts may, on application and at their discretion, admit to the Bachelor of Visual Arts an applicant who has achieved an IELTS overall band score of 6.0.

(5) The Head of School and Dean of the Sydney Conservatorium of Music may, on application and at their discretion, admit to the Diploma of Music an applicant who has achieved an IELTS overall band score of 6.0.

6 Applicants whose first language is not English – Other

(1) These standards apply to all undergraduate and postgraduate coursework and higher degree by research applicants whose first language is not English and are commencing studies from 1 January 2019.

(2) A prospective student whose first language is not English must have:
   (a) lived and worked in an English speaking country, as listed in 2(1)(a), for at least five years continuously prior to the date on which the applicant will commence the course; or
   (b) current registration with an accreditation body that has an English language requirement that is equivalent or greater than the University of Sydney.

7 Exceptional circumstances

(1) In exceptional circumstances only, the Dean may determine that an applicant demonstrates English language proficiency admissions standards requirements by means other than those described in these standards, provided that:

(2) the applicant has an IELTS score or equivalent as determined in Table 3 of this Standard and:

(3) the overall or average band score is no more than 0.5 below the overall or average band score otherwise required by this policy; and

(4) any individual band score is no more than 1.0 below the individual band score otherwise required by this policy; or

(5) the Dean is satisfied that the applicant has enough competence in written and spoken English to complete the course successfully;

(6) In considering whether an applicant has enough competence in written and spoken English to complete the course successfully, the Dean:
   (a) must take into account any advice of the relevant Associate Dean; and
   (b) may consider any other relevant matter, including:
      (i) the applicant’s ability to communicate in an academic environment;
      (ii) whether the applicant has been known to the faculty for at least two years;
      (iii) any appropriate work experience that the applicant has had in an English language environment; and
(iv) any oral discussions between faculty members and the applicant.

(7) The Dean must record in writing on the student file any approval to waive English language requirements, including:

(a) the proof of proficiency in English provided by the applicant; and

(b) the reasons, in accordance with this policy, that the Dean approved the waiver.
### TABLE 1

Concordance estimates for qualifications used to provide evidence of English language proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IELTS Score</th>
<th>UK A Level English</th>
<th>Singapore-Cambridge A Levels: English Language and Linguistics</th>
<th>HKDSE English Language and Literature in English</th>
<th>STPM Literature (920)</th>
<th>UK A Levels Humanities</th>
<th>UK AS Levels English</th>
<th>IGCSE English</th>
<th>IB English A – Higher Level</th>
<th>IB English A – Standard Level</th>
<th>IB English B – Higher Level</th>
<th>IB English B – Standard Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A/B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>B/C</td>
<td>B/C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>B/C</td>
<td>A/B</td>
<td>A/B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5**</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>5**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2

Subject and grade requirements guide for accepted secondary qualifications not undertaken in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification/subject</th>
<th>Grade requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark Studentereksamen</td>
<td>8 in English A or 10 in English B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland Upper Secondary School Certificate</td>
<td>8 in English or English A Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany Abitur</td>
<td>3 in Advanced Level English (LF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands VWO</td>
<td>8 in Level 6 High School English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway Vitnemal</td>
<td>4 in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STPM Literature</td>
<td>B/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden Avgangsbetyg/Slutbetyg</td>
<td>VG or C in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3

English Language Skills Tests conversion table – Overall scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IELTS Academic</th>
<th>TOEFL Paper Based Test</th>
<th>TOEFL IBT</th>
<th>PTE Academic</th>
<th>Cambridge English Scale: CAE and CPE (From 2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English language Individual skills tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R/L/S/W</th>
<th>TWE</th>
<th>R/L/S</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4

Faculty-specific English Language Requirements – Undergraduate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty/Course</th>
<th>English Language Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All undergraduate courses</td>
<td>IELTS: Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.0 in each of the components (this applies to non-UAC admissions only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Design in Architecture (Honours) / Master of Architecture</td>
<td>IELTS: Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.0 in each of the components (this applies to non-UAC admissions only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts (Media and Communication)</td>
<td>IELTS: Overall band score of 7.5 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Economics</td>
<td>IELTS: Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts / Bachelor of Economics</td>
<td>IELTS: Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Education</td>
<td>IELTS: Minimum overall result of 7.5 Minimum of 8.0 in speaking and listening modules Minimum of 7.0 in reading and writing modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sydney Business School</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All undergraduate courses except combined law and Bachelor of Commerce / Doctor of Medicine (see below)</td>
<td>IELTS: Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours / Bachelor of Commerce</td>
<td>IELTS: Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technologies / Bachelor of Commerce</td>
<td>IELTS: Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Admissions Standards – English Language Proficiency
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>IELTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Civil) /</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.0 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Design in Architecture</td>
<td>each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Health Sciences</td>
<td>IELTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Health Sciences (including</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combined degrees)</td>
<td>each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Applied Science (Speech</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathology)</td>
<td>each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Applied Science (Occupational</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy)</td>
<td>each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Applied Science (Physiotherapy)</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.5 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Sports Science) / Master of Nutrition</td>
<td>each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Dietetics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.5 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology)</td>
<td>each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td>IELTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All undergraduate courses</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.5 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Medicine and Health</td>
<td>IELTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Commerce / Doctor of Medicine</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Economics / Doctor of Medicine</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Music Studies / Doctor of</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) / Doctor of</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Medical Science / Doctor of</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>IELTS Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Midwifery combined degrees</td>
<td>IELTS: Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Nursing (Advanced Studies)</td>
<td>IELTS: Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) / Doctor of Dental Medicine</td>
<td>IELTS: Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Oral Health</td>
<td>IELTS: Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science / Master of Nutrition and Dietetics</td>
<td>IELTS: Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.5 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Veterinary Biology / Doctor of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>IELTS: Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5**

**Faculty-specific English Language Requirements – Postgraduate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Program</th>
<th>IELTS Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>For students without a Bachelor’s Degree from an English language university, and who have studied less than two years in an institution of English instruction, an IELTS score of a minimum average of 7.0 with no section below 6.0 must be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Applied Linguistics, Graduate Diploma of Applied Linguistics, Graduate Certificate of Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Art Curating, Graduate Diploma in Art Curating, Graduate Certificate in Art Curating</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of China Studies,</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>IELTS Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in China Studies, Graduate Certificate in China Studies, Master of China Public Administration</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 with a minimum of 7.0 in the Writing band and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Creative Writing, Graduate Diploma in Creative Writing, Graduate Certificate in Creative Writing</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Crosscultural Communication</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Cultural Studies, Graduate Diploma in Cultural Studies, Graduate Certificate in Cultural Studies</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Development Studies, Graduate Diploma in Development Studies, Graduate Certificate in Development Studies</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Digital Communication and Culture, Graduate Diploma in Digital Communication and Culture, Graduate Certificate in Digital Communication and Culture</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Economic Analysis, Graduate Diploma in Economic Analysis</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.5 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Economics (and embedded sequences)</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of English Studies, Graduate Diploma in English Studies, Graduate Certificate in English Studies</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Health Communication, Graduate Diploma in Health Communication, Graduate Certificate in Health Communication</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Health Security, Graduate Diploma in Health Security, Graduate Certificate in Health Security</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Human Rights, Graduate Diploma in Human Rights, Graduate Certificate in Human Rights</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Name</td>
<td>English Language Proficiency Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of International Relations, Graduate Diploma in International Relations, Graduate Certificate in International Relations, Graduate Certificate in Economics</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of International Security (and embedded sequences)</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of International Studies, Graduate Diploma in International Studies, Graduate Certificate in International Studies</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Media Practice, Graduate Diploma in Media Practice, Graduate Certificate in Media Practice</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Museum and Heritage Studies, Graduate Diploma in Museum and Heritage Studies, Graduate Certificate in Museum and Heritage Studies</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Peace and Conflict Studies, Graduate Diploma in Peace and Conflict Studies, Graduate Certificate in Peace and Conflict Studies</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Political Economy, Graduate Diploma in Political Economy, Graduate Certificate in Political Economy</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Public Policy, Graduate Diploma in Public Policy, Graduate Certificate in Public Policy</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Publishing, Graduate Diploma in Publishing, Graduate Certificate in Publishing</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Strategic Public Relations, Graduate Diploma in Strategic Public Relations, Graduate Certificate in Strategic Public Relations</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of US Studies, Graduate Diploma in US Studies, Graduate Certificate in US Studies</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or above with a result of a minimum of 6.5 in Speaking and Writing and a minimum of 6.0 in Listening and Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Teaching</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.5 or better with minimum of 8.0 in speaking and listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>IELTS Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Social Work (Qualifying)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.5 or better with minimum of 7.0 in each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sydney Business School</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Commerce (and embedded sequences)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations (and embedded sequences)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Innovation and Enterprise</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of International Business (and embedded sequences)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Logistics and Supply Chain Management (and embedded sequences)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Logistics Management (and embedded sequences)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Management, Master of Management (CEMS)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Marketing (and embedded sequences)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Professional Accounting</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Transport Management (and embedded sequences)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All research degrees</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with a section minimum of 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Complex Systems, Graduate Diploma in Complex Systems</td>
<td>IELTS – A minimum result of 7.0 overall and a minimum result of 6.0 in each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty of Health Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Diagnostic Radiography</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with at least 6.5 for Speaking and for Writing on each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>IELTS Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Exercise Physiology</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with at least 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with at least 7 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Physiotherapy</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with at least 7 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Speech Language Pathology</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with at least 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All postgraduate award course except for those below</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 with no band less than 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Music Studies (Composition)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band of 6.5 with no band less than 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Music Studies (Opera Performance), Graduate Diploma in Music (Opera Performance)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 with no band less than 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Music (Performance)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 with no band less than 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Music Studies (Performance)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 with no band less than 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juris Doctor</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.5 or better with a minimum of 7.0 in each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other postgraduate award courses</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with at least 6.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Medicine and Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Clinical Dentistry, Graduate Diploma in Clinical Dentistry</td>
<td>IELTS 7 with no band below 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Dental Medicine</td>
<td>IELTS 7 with no band below 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Medicine</td>
<td>IELTS – overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum of 7.0 in each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Clinical Trials Research, Graduate Diploma in Clinical Trials Research</td>
<td>IELTS – overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum of 7.0 in each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Genetic Counselling, Graduate Diploma in Genetic Counselling</td>
<td>IELTS – overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum of 6.5 in each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Medicine (stream), Master of Medicine (Advanced) (stream), Master of Science in Medicine (stream), Master of</td>
<td>IELTS – overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum of 6.5 in each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>IELTS Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science in Medicine (Advanced) (stream), Master of Medicine (stream)/Master of Philosophy, Master of Science in Medicine (stream)/Master of Philosophy, Graduate Diploma in Medicine (stream), Graduate Diploma in Science in Medicine (stream), Graduate Certificate in Medicine (stream), Graduate Certificate in Science in Medicine (stream)</td>
<td>This applies only to the following streams: Critical Care Medicine, HIV, STIs and Sexual Health, Metabolic Health, Paediatric Medicine, Psychiatry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Qualitative Health Research, Graduate Certificate in Qualitative Health Research</td>
<td>IELTS – overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum of 6.5 in each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Midwifery - All postgraduate award courses</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with at least 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All postgraduate award courses, with the exception of the Master of Philosophy and Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty of Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Clinical Psychology Master of Clinical Psychology/Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 with no band less than 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional English language requirements apply under the current Australian Health Practitioners Regulation Agency (AHPRA) standards for registration. Where these are inconsistent with University of Sydney standards, the higher standard will apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Science in Coaching Psychology; Graduate Diploma in Coaching Psychology; Graduate Certificate in Coaching Psychology</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.5 as a minimum on each band with no band falling below a score of 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Environmental Science and Law Master of Environmental Law</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 with no band less than 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Nutrition and Dietetics</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.5 or better, with at least 6.5 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science - All postgraduate award courses except those below</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 with no band falling below a score of 6.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Graduate Diploma in Veterinary Public Health Graduate Certificate in Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>IELTS – A minimum result of 7.0 overall including a minimum result of 6.0 in Reading and Listening and 7.0 in Writing and Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>IELTS Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management; Graduate Diploma in Veterinary Public Health Management; Graduate Certificate in Veterinary Public Health Management; Master of Animal Science Graduate Diploma in Animal Science; Graduate Certificate in Animal Science</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with at least 7.0 for Speaking and 7.0 for Writing on each band.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Quality Committee note the report: Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS): 2017 Addendum: Further results by international/ domestic student status

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Introduction
This report is an addendum to the 2017 Graduate Outcomes Survey report published in April 2018. The aim of this report is to show how participating graduates responded to the questionnaire, based on their citizenship status (domestic or international). Where space allows we present both 2016 and 2017 results.

The number of responses in 2017 are noticeably lower than in 2016. So please interpret any changes across years cautiously. A PDF of this report together with all QA reports is available at https://intranet.sydney.edu.au/teaching-support/quality-analytics/curriculum-quality/qa-reports.html. Please direct any queries regarding this report to qa.survey@sydney.edu.au.

1.2 Key Outcomes and Issues

1.2.1 Employability

- International UG and PGCW full-time employment rates are worryingly lower than domestic students (UG – 77% vs 63%; PGCW – 88% vs 62%, and this disparity holds across the sector. However, Sydney's international UG and PGCW students enjoy higher employment rates than the Go8 and UA averages (54% and 50%).
- Employment rates are similar for HDR international and domestic students (both at 82%). Further, our international HDR full-time employment rate (82%) is higher than Go8 and UA averages (73% and 71%).
- International UG and PGCW students (37% and 11%) are much more likely than domestic students (26% and 6%) to go on to further full-time study. There is an indication that our HDR international students go on to further study in higher numbers than domestic HDR students. This matches the pattern across the sector.

1.2.2 UG and PGCW student experience (CEQ)

- Overall satisfaction is comparable between UG and PGCW international and domestic students although 2017 PGCW satisfaction dropped for international students (from 85% to 81%).
- Sydney's international students (both UG & PGCW – 70% and 70%) regard teaching quality more highly than domestic students (59% and 64%). This also applies across the Go8 and UA.
- International students (UG – 85%; PGCW – 85%) also regard their development of generic skills more favourably than domestic students (UG – 80%; PGCW – 75%).
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• However, both types of students rate their development of graduate qualities very similarly at around 83% agreement.

1.2.3 HDR student experience (PREQ)

• Overall satisfaction is very similar between international and domestic students (86% and 87%), as is skills development (both 95%). These are close to Go8 and UA averages.
• In the latest data available (2017), domestic students (89%) rated their supervision experience more highly than international students (81%), although it was on par in the previous year. Our domestic student experience is higher than Go8 and UA averages (79% and 80%), whereas Sydney’s international figure varies little from benchmarks.
• International students’ perceptions of both quality of infrastructure (81% vs 71%) and intellectual climate (70% vs 65%) are higher than their domestic counterparts. This is consistent with the rest of the sector.
• Thesis examination experiences are similar for our international and domestic students (79% vs 78%). However, we slightly fall below Go8 and UA benchmarks.
• Along with the rest of the sector, our HDR students feel goals and expectations are clear (95%).

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS): 2017 Addendum: Further results by international/domestic student status
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Introduction

This report is an addendum to the 2017 Graduate Outcomes Survey report published in April 2018. The aim of this report is to show how participating graduates responded to the questionnaire, based on their citizenship status (domestic or international). Where space allows we present both 2016 and 2017 results.

The report is structured as follows: the remainder of this section highlights the main outcomes at the university and faculty levels (Section 1.2 and 2.3 respectively). Sections 2 and 3 of this report contain results for undergraduates (UG) and coursework postgraduates (PGCW) respectively. Section 4 presents results for research postgraduates (HDR).

The number of responses in 2017 are noticeably lower than in 2016. So please interpret any changes across years cautiously. A PDF of this report together with all QA reports is available at https://intranet.sydney.edu.au/teaching-support/quality-analytics/curriculum-quality/qa-reports.html. Please direct any queries regarding this report to qa.survey@sydney.edu.au.

1.2 Key Outcomes and Issues

1.2.1 Employability

- International UG and PGCW full-time employment rates are worryingly lower than domestic students (UG – 77% vs 63%; PGCW – 88% vs 62%), and this disparity holds across the sector. However, Sydney's international UG and PGCW students enjoy higher employment rates than the Go8 and UA averages (54% and 50%).
- Employment rates are similar for HDR international and domestic students (both at 82%). Further, our international HDR full-time employment rate (82%) is higher than Go8 and UA averages (73% and 71%).
- International UG and PGCW students (37% and 11%) are much more likely than domestic students (26% and 6%) to go on to further full-time study. There is an indication that our HDR international students go on to further study in higher numbers than domestic HDR students. This matches the pattern across the sector.
1.2.2 UG and PGCW student experience (CEQ)

- Overall satisfaction is comparable between UG and PGCW international and domestic students although 2017 PGCW satisfaction dropped for international students (from 85% to 81%).
- Sydney’s international students (both UG & PGCW – 70% and 70%) regard teaching quality more highly than domestic students (59% and 64%). This also applies across the Go8 and UA.
- International students (UG – 85%; PGCW – 85%) also regard their development of generic skills more favourably than domestic students (UG – 80%; PGCW – 75%).
- However, both types of students rate their development of graduate qualities very similarly at around 83% agreement.

1.2.3 HDR student experience (PREQ)

- Overall satisfaction is very similar between international and domestic students (86% and 87%), as is skills development (both 95%). These are close to Go8 and UA averages.
- In the latest data available (2017), domestic students (89%) rated their supervision experience more highly than international students (81%), although it was on par in the previous year. Our domestic student experience is higher than Go8 and UA averages (79% and 80%), whereas Sydney’s international figure varies little from benchmarks.
- International students’ perceptions of both quality of infrastructure (81% vs 71%) and intellectual climate (70% vs 65%) are higher than their domestic counterparts. This is consistent with the rest of the sector.
- Thesis examination experiences are similar for our international and domestic students (79% vs 78%). However, we slightly fall below Go8 and UA benchmarks.
- Along with the rest of the sector, our HDR students feel goals and expectations are clear (95%).

1.3 Detailed Outcomes

1.3.1 Undergraduates

- Overall employment rates reflect strong demand for the university graduates. The breakdown the results by student citizenship status reveals a significant gap between domestic and international graduate employment outcomes in many disciplines. Graduates from faculties such as Arts and Social Sciences, Business, Engineering and Information Technology have a wider gap between the two cohorts.
- Further fulltime study shows improved outcome for both international and domestic graduates. This is evident in most study areas, particularly in Architecture, Design and Planning*, Business, Engineering & Information Tech., and Health Sciences.
- Both domestic and international graduates reported similar rates of Overall Satisfaction (80%) at the university level.
- Drilling down to faculty level, some differences are witnessed, for example, noticeably in showing greater satisfaction for domestic graduates in areas like Arts and Social Sciences, Education and Social Work, Medicine and Pharmacy. International graduates have reported higher levels of satisfaction in areas such as Architecture, Design & Planning*, Business, Health Sciences* and Nursing. Year on year results reveal strong overall satisfaction improvement in Architecture, Design & Planning* climbing up 18 percentage points for domestic graduates and 24 percentage points for international graduates (see table 2d). Another impressive jump can be seen in Dentistry, leaping 14 percentage points to the full mark for domestic graduates. Health Sciences tells a divergent story. Their international graduates have shown

* Figures based on less than 20 responses
impressive improvement in overall satisfaction with their course experiences, jumping 15 percentage points from 78% to 93%, their domestic graduates expressed lower satisfaction level, down 5 percentage points from 79% to 74%. This pattern can also be seen in the Nursing faculty, where international graduates reached 81% overall satisfaction, up from 67% in 2016. This contrasts with a shrinking satisfaction of their domestic peers, down from 86% to 78%. The year-on-year results of Faculty of Science have conveyed a declining trend on the overall satisfaction scale across the two graduate groups.

- In the year-on-year results for domestic graduates, the following faculties and university schools show at least 3 percentage points satisfaction increase from 2016 to 2017: Agriculture and Environment*, Architecture, Design & Planning, Arts and Social Sciences, Dentistry*, Medicine, Sydney College of the Arts, and Sydney Conservatorium of Music. While for international graduates, these were the faculties and university schools that raised the bar, improving 3 percentage points or more: Architecture, Design & Planning*, Business, Health Sciences*, Nursing, Veterinary Science*. On the other hand, domestic graduates signalled 3 percentage points or more decrease in satisfaction in these faculties and university schools: Education and Social Work, Engineering & Information Tech., Health Sciences, Nursing, Pharmacy, Science, and Veterinary Science. Similarly, international graduates reported decrease in satisfaction in the following faculties in 2017: Arts and Social Sciences, Law*, Medicine, Pharmacy*, and Science.

- The Good Teaching scale results at the university level reflect poor performance. The breakdown into domestic and international groups tells another story. Domestic graduates were the least satisfied on this scale (59%), while international graduates conveyed more positive responses (70%), bringing the combined overall mean percentage to 61%. Big gaps between the two groups in favour of the international graduates can be found in most university schools and faculties such as Architecture, Design & Planning*, Business, Education and Social Work*, Engineering & Information Tech., Health Sciences*, Law, Nursing, Pharmacy, and Science.

- However, some faculties and university schools show better performance on the Good Teaching scale, it is especially worth noting the leap Sydney College of the Arts, and Dentistry* took, jumping from 58% to 78%, and from 71% to 91% respectively. Despite a small number of response, it is also worth noting the great improvement faculty of Agriculture and Environment* has made, leaping from a humble 40% to 63% in 2017. On the other hand, Pharmacy and Faculty of Education and Social Work dropped from 61% to 42% and 70% to 56% respectively in domestic graduates’ rating. Additionally, some faculties and university schools still score well below the combined average of 61%, including Business, Engineering & Information Tech., and Medicine.

- The Generic Skills scale provides more positive figures than the Good Teaching scale, showing noticeable improvement for international graduates jumping from 79% to 85% at the university level. The international graduate results are clearly ahead of the domestic graduate results, in Architecture, Design & Planning*, Business, Engineering & Information Tech., Health Sciences*, and Nursing. On the other hand, domestic graduates are more satisfied in the Law school, than their international peers. Domestic graduates show significant improvement in faculties and university schools, including Agriculture and Environment*, Architecture, Design & Planning, Sydney College of the Arts, and Sydney Conservatorium of Music. On the other side, Pharmacy has dwindled sharply from an impressive 94% in 2016 to a shy 72% in 2017.

- International students’ rating on Graduate Qualities scale improved from 83% to 86% in 2017, while the domestic remained unchanged. Noticeable improvement at faculty level is seen in Business. Domestic student rated Architecture, Design & Planning, Sydney Conservatorium of Music more favourably this year. Engineering and Information Technology experienced a noticeably decline from 79% to 69% over the year.

* Figures based on less than 20 responses
1.3.2 Coursework Postgraduates

- A larger proportion (93%) of domestic coursework postgraduates are in the labour force at the time of the survey, compared to 68% international graduates.
- Strong growth in fulltime employment for Engineering & Information Tech. domestic graduates from 81% to 96% was neutralised by decline for international graduates 63% to 54%.
- Education and Social Work* experienced sharp growth in international graduate full-time employment jumping from 56% to 88% in 2017. Health Sciences rose 15 percent points from 70% to 85% in 2017.
- Nursing (98%), Engineering & Information Tech. (96%), and Dentistry (94%) have the highest rates of domestic full-time employment in 2017.
- Similar to the UG Good teaching scale, PGCW’s good teaching scale results slightly dropped from 2016 to 2017 for both domestic (from 66% to 64%) and international participants (from 73% to 70%). Both groups are on par with Go8 and UA results.
- Performance on the Generic Skills scale shows international graduates rated their satisfaction well above their domestic peers (85% vs 75%). Although the results slightly dropped from 2016 to 2017, both are par with UA and Go8.
- Performance on the new Graduate Qualities scale provide very close satisfaction rates among the domestic (85%) and international (87%) participants. Results are slightly down from 2016 (86% and 88%). Good performance is witnessed in most faculties, scoring 80% or over, with the exception of domestic results in Engineering & Information Tech., and Pharmacy* as well as international results in Dentistry and Health Sciences.

1.3.3 Research Postgraduates

- A large proportion (92% and 90%) of both domestic and international research postgraduates respectively are in some form of employment at the time of the survey.
- Of the research postgraduates in labour force, 82% are in full-time employment (both domestic and international). This is an increase from 79% and 70% in 2016 for both graduate groups respectively. International graduates mean score (82%) is well above the Go8 and UA (73% and 71%) respectively. Faculty of Science clearly shows significant year-on-year improvement.
- There was an increase in the proportion of international research postgraduates in further full-time study at the time of this survey from 10% in 2016 to 14% in 2017.
- The Overall Satisfaction of research postgraduates was 87% for domestic and 86% for international participants. Domestic graduates have conveyed higher satisfaction than international graduates in the Science, Engineering & Information Technology*, and Medicine*. 100% satisfaction is reported for domestic graduates is reported in Health Sciences* and in Sydney Conservatorium of Music*.
- Performance on the Quality of Supervision scale was 87% for both domestic and international participants combined. However, domestic graduates signalled a higher satisfaction of 89% up from 85% in 2016, while international graduates dropped 5 percentage points to 81% in 2017. It’s great to see Faculty of Science again topped the 100% score* for international and 92% for domestic in 2017, up from 83% and 80% respectively. Education and Social Work* numbers convey a different story, showing declining satisfaction from 100% to 75% for domestic graduates*.
- The performance on the Skill Development scale is 95% (both domestic and international) which is no change from 2016. Science* topped the scale for both domestic and international participants with 100% satisfaction. Health Sciences* also scored 100% satisfaction for domestic graduates.
- Performance on the Quality of Infrastructure scale was 71% for domestic and 81% for international graduates, on par with previous year. Engineering & Information Technologies, Medicine, Science, the
Sydney Conservatorium of Music*, and Veterinary Science* were the highest performers on this scale (all above 80%) for domestic graduates.

- Performance on the Intellectual Climate scale for domestic graduates improved from 58% in 2016 to 65% in 2017, well above Go8 (60%) and UA (56%). Engineering & Information Technologies, Health Science and Faculty of Science were the highest performers on this scale, leaping over 20 percentage points. While for international research graduates the scores dropped for Engineering & Information Tech., and Medicine dropped over 20 percentage points in 2017.

- The mean score on the Thesis Examination scale was 78% for domestic participants which is up from 72% in 2016. International graduate results increased from 75% in 2016 to 79% in 2017. Health Sciences*, the Sydney College of the Arts* and Veterinary Science* were the highest performers on this scale (all above 85%) for domestic graduates.

- The results for Goals and Expectations scale has slightly improved in 2017 (92% for domestic and 95% for international), on par with Go8 and UA results.

* Figures based on less than 20 responses
2. UNDERGRADUATES

2.1 Labour Force

Table 2a presents a headline summary of the GOS 2017 Labour Force indicators for undergraduates by faculty and citizenship status (Domestic or International).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduates: Labour Force summary</th>
<th>Full-time Employed Domestic</th>
<th>Full-time Employed International</th>
<th>Overall Employed Domestic</th>
<th>Overall Employed International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>78%*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>47%*</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>90%*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>36%*</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>92%*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>38%*</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>50%*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78%*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>10,384</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>39,775</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5,268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
### Table 2a. Undergraduates – 2017 Labour Force Summary (Contd...)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>AU$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In the Labour Force</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$67,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50%*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55%*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>$56,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$62,600*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Further full-time study</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>83%*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>33%*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>82%*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>27%*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$55,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0%*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$63,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$63,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$59,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>93%*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8%*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$47,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$50,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$67,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90%*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0%*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$53,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Sydney</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92%</td>
<td>2,163</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>$58,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group of Eight</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89%</td>
<td>16,796</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>3,558</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15,497</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3,254</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Universities Australia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92%</td>
<td>57,606</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>9,063</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>52,964</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8,134</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
2.1.1 Full-time employment

Trend data for the proportion of undergraduates in full-time employment grouped by faculty and citizenship status (Domestic or International), at the time of the study (as a percentage of those available for full-time employment) are presented in Table 2b. Fulltime employment status is based on working at least 35 hours per week.

Table 2b. Undergraduates – Percentage in full-time employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>89%* 9</td>
<td>.** 0</td>
<td>78%* 9</td>
<td>.** 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>76% 50</td>
<td>.** 1</td>
<td>75% 48</td>
<td>.** 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>65% 276</td>
<td>44% 25</td>
<td>69% 311</td>
<td>47%* 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>80% 166</td>
<td>44% 54</td>
<td>85% 139</td>
<td>48% 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>58%* 19</td>
<td>.** 0</td>
<td>90%* 10</td>
<td>.** 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>82% 138</td>
<td>.** 0</td>
<td>84% 109</td>
<td>.** 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>80% 232</td>
<td>54% 39</td>
<td>80% 99</td>
<td>48% 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>73% 220</td>
<td>74% 34</td>
<td>79% 135</td>
<td>36%* 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>89% 63</td>
<td>83%* 6</td>
<td>95% 21</td>
<td>100%* 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>99% 89</td>
<td>87%* 15</td>
<td>100% 95</td>
<td>85% 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>97% 71</td>
<td>40%* 5</td>
<td>98% 50</td>
<td>85% 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>95% 58</td>
<td>75% 8</td>
<td>98% 63</td>
<td>92%* 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>62% 196</td>
<td>64%* 11</td>
<td>57% 212</td>
<td>38%* 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>50% 28</td>
<td>.** 1</td>
<td>50%* 16</td>
<td>.** 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>59% 22</td>
<td>.** 2</td>
<td>42% 24</td>
<td>.** 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>84% 49</td>
<td>62%* 13</td>
<td>78% 77</td>
<td>78%* 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>76% 1,686</td>
<td>57% 214</td>
<td>77% 1,418</td>
<td>63% 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>71% 9,960</td>
<td>57% 1,663</td>
<td>72% 10,384</td>
<td>54% 2,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>71% 34,773</td>
<td>51% 4,317</td>
<td>72% 39,775</td>
<td>50% 5,268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
### 2.1.2 Further full-time study

Table 2c presents the proportion of undergraduates in further full-time study at the time of the survey (as a proportion of the entire graduating cohort).

#### Table 2c. Undergraduates – Percentage in full-time study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Domestic 2016</th>
<th>International 2016</th>
<th>Domestic 2017</th>
<th>International 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>0%*</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>9%*</td>
<td>-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>67%*</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>55%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%*</td>
<td>-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>33%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>27%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
2.2 Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ)

Trend data for all CEQ scales are presented in Tables 2d-2g. Under the GOS, the University of Sydney collected data for the three key scales of the CEQ, Good Teaching, Generic Skills and Graduate Qualities scale, along with the single Overall Satisfaction item.

Table 2d. CEQ: Undergraduates – Overall Satisfaction item – Percentage agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Domestic 2016 %</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>International 2016 %</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Domestic 2017 %</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>International 2017 %</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>70%*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75%*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67%*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>91%*</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>71%*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>93%*</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>86%*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>78%*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>63%*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>67%*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70%*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62%*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>80%*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2,417</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1,981</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>16,027</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2,511</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>16,599</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>3,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>49,545</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>6,173</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>55,099</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>7,899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table 2e. CEQ: Undergraduates – Good Teaching scale – Percentage agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Domestic 2016 %</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>International 2016 %</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Domestic 2017 %</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>International 2017 %</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and Environment</td>
<td>40%*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63%*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67%*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>82%*</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91%*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>83%*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>73%*</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>86%*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>37%*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67%*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70%*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54%*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>47%*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>56%*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2,146</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>14,338</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>2,454</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>15,048</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>45,984</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>6,084</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>51,411</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>7,837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.  
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table 2f. CEQ: Undergraduates – Generic Skills scale – Percentage agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Domestic 2016</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>70%*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67%*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>82%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>86%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>87%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>71%*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>63%*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>56%*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>80%*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>2,418</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1,983</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>16,035</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>2,514</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>16,620</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>49,580</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>55,186</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Domestic 2016</th>
<th>% N</th>
<th>International 2016</th>
<th>% N</th>
<th>Domestic 2017</th>
<th>% N</th>
<th>International 2017</th>
<th>% N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>70%* 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>75%* 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>75%* 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>91%* 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>76% 54</td>
<td>75%* 12</td>
<td>84% 50</td>
<td>91%* 11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>88% 444</td>
<td>83% 46</td>
<td>89% 494</td>
<td>82% 44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>83% 192</td>
<td>87% 99</td>
<td>76% 128</td>
<td>92% 108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>100% 21</td>
<td>100%* 11</td>
<td>100%* 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%* 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>88% 185</td>
<td>80%* 19</td>
<td>90% 126</td>
<td>86%* 7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>79% 295</td>
<td>79% 47</td>
<td>69% 123</td>
<td>77% 44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>87% 282</td>
<td>88% 40</td>
<td>80% 211</td>
<td>87%* 15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>81% 126</td>
<td>79%* 14</td>
<td>80% 45</td>
<td>100%* 10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>79% 82</td>
<td>74%* 19</td>
<td>76% 91</td>
<td>73% 26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>86% 103</td>
<td>67%* 9</td>
<td>84% 74</td>
<td>86% 37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>87% 54</td>
<td>80%* 10</td>
<td>82% 60</td>
<td>77%* 13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>84% 404</td>
<td>89% 28</td>
<td>86% 403</td>
<td>88% 33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>85% 40</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
<td>87% 23</td>
<td>-** 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>76% 62</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>89% 46</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>91% 64</td>
<td>86%* 14</td>
<td>88% 90</td>
<td>89%* 9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>84% 2,418</td>
<td>83% 341</td>
<td>84% 1,983</td>
<td>86% 364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>83% 16,024</td>
<td>84% 2,509</td>
<td>82% 16,612</td>
<td>84% 3,198</td>
<td>3,198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>84% 49,543</td>
<td>84% 6,165</td>
<td>83% 55,158</td>
<td>85% 7,917</td>
<td>7,917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
3. COURSEWORK POSTGRADUATES

3.1 Labour Force

Table 3a presents a headline summary of the GOS 2017 Labour Force indicators for coursework postgraduates by faculty and citizenship status (Domestic or International).

Table 3a. Coursework Postgraduates – 2017 Labour Force Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursework Postgraduates: Labour Force summary</th>
<th>Full-time Employed Domestic</th>
<th>Full-time Employed International</th>
<th>Overall Employed Domestic</th>
<th>Overall Employed International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>86%*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58%*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>8,346</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>4,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>23,398</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>9,871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.

** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table 3a. Coursework Postgraduates – 2017 Labour Force Summary (Contd...)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursework Postgraduates: Labour Force summary</th>
<th>In the Labour Force Domestic</th>
<th>In the Labour Force International</th>
<th>Further full-time study Domestic</th>
<th>Further full-time study International</th>
<th>Median salary AU$</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>-.**</td>
<td>-.**</td>
<td>-.**</td>
<td>-.**</td>
<td>-.**</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>87,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>117,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>76%*</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>-.**</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>89%*</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-** 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>86%*</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>12,991</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11,602</td>
<td>82,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
**Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
3.1.1 Full-time employment

Trend data for the proportion of coursework postgraduates in full-time employment at the time of the survey (as a percentage of those available for full-time employment) are presented in Table 3b. Fulltime employment status is based on working at least 35 hours per week.

Table 3b. Coursework Postgraduates – Percentage in full-time employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employment</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63%*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>94%*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75%*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>56%*</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>88%*</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63%*</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>71%*</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>54%*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62%*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86%*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71%*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>86%*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58%*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>80%* 5</td>
<td>** 2</td>
<td>68%*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>** 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>** 4</td>
<td>** 3</td>
<td>** 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>** 4</td>
<td>** 1</td>
<td>** 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>7,972</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>8,346</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>4,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>21,831</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>7,611</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>23,398</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>9,871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
### 3.1.2 Further full-time study

Table 3c presents the proportion of coursework postgraduates in further full-time study at the time of the survey (as a proportion of the entire graduating cohort).

Table 3c. Coursework Postgraduates – Percentage in full-time study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0%*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0%*</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>11%*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>13%*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>17%*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20%*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1,669</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9,080</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25,567</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8,924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
3.2 Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ)

Trend data for all CEQ scales are presented in Tables 3d-3g. Under the GOS, the University of Sydney collected data for the three key scales of the CEQ, Good Teaching, Generic Skills and Graduate Qualities scale, along with the single Overall Satisfaction item.

Table 3d. CEQ: Coursework Postgraduates – Overall Satisfaction item – Percentage agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>2016 Domestic</th>
<th>2016 International</th>
<th>2017 Domestic</th>
<th>2017 International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.

**Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table 3e. CEQ: Coursework Postgraduates – Good Teaching scale – Percentage agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursework Postgraduates: Good Teaching scale</th>
<th>Domestic 2016 %</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>International 2016 %</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Domestic 2017 %</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>International 2017 %</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Domestic 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>International 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>International 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67%*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56%*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67%*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56%*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60%*</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57%*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67%*</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>59%*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>59%*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73%*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>71%*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77%*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>67%*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>67%*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73%*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73%*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>80%*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80%*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>86%*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>86%*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>80%*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80%*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>8,883</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>4,009</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>9,244</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>4,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25,074</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>8,659</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>26,396</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>11,247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table 3f. CEQ: Coursework Postgraduates – Generic Skills scale – Percentage agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>79%*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>79%*</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>82%*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>78%*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>80%*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>80%*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>8,875</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>4,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>25,065</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>8,651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Domestic 2016 %</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>International 2016 %</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Domestic 2017 %</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>International 2017 %</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78%*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>87%*</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>79%*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>80%*</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73%*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>86%*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>85%*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>89%*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>80%*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>86%*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>60%*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>8,870</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>3,996</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>9,229</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>4,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>25,042</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>8,632</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>26,352</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>11,215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
### 4. RESEARCH POSTGRADUATES

#### 4.1 Labour Force

Table 4a presents a headline summary of the GOS 2017 Labour Force indicators for research postgraduates by faculty and citizenship status (Domestic or International).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Postgraduates: Labour Force summary</th>
<th>Full-time Employed Domestic</th>
<th>Full-time Employed International</th>
<th>Overall Employed Domestic</th>
<th>Overall Employed International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>72%* 18</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>87%* 30</td>
<td>-** 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>87%* 3</td>
<td>-** 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
<td>87%* 4</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>92%* 12</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
<td>100%* 13</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>69%* 13</td>
<td>79%* 14</td>
<td>93%* 14</td>
<td>93%* 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>100%* 6</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>90%* 9</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>90%* 9</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>88% 32</td>
<td>-** 4</td>
<td>94% 35</td>
<td>90%* 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>87%* 3</td>
<td>-** 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>87%* 2</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>85% 26</td>
<td>83%* 6</td>
<td>88% 26</td>
<td>83%* 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>60%* 10</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>90%* 10</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>-** 4</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>83%* 6</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>-** 4</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>80%* 5</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>82% 139</td>
<td>82% 39</td>
<td>92% 163</td>
<td>90% 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>82% 1,474</td>
<td>73% 842</td>
<td>91% 1,740</td>
<td>84% 918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>80% 2,968</td>
<td>71% 1,729</td>
<td>91% 3,543</td>
<td>83% 1,901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table 4a. Research Postgraduates – 2017 Labour Force Summary (Contd...)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Postgraduates: Labour Force summary</th>
<th>In the Labour Force Domestic</th>
<th>In the Labour Force International</th>
<th>Further full-time study Domestic</th>
<th>Further full-time study International</th>
<th>Median salary AU$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>91% 33</td>
<td>4 6%* 31</td>
<td>4 6%* 31</td>
<td>4 6%* 31</td>
<td>-** 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>100%* 13</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
<td>0%* 12</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
<td>$100,000* 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>100%* 14</td>
<td>16 0%* 12</td>
<td>13%* 15</td>
<td>5 $17,400* 20%* 15</td>
<td>6 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>100%* 9</td>
<td>3 13%* 8</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>-** 4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>92% 38</td>
<td>5 11% 35</td>
<td>20%* 5</td>
<td>5 $17,400* 5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>100%* 26</td>
<td>8 4%* 25</td>
<td>14%* 7</td>
<td>7 $89,500* 12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>91%* 11</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0%* 9</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>** 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>100%* 6</td>
<td>0 17%* 6</td>
<td>0 3</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>100%* 5</td>
<td>3 0%* 5</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>95% 171</td>
<td>89% 46</td>
<td>6% 158</td>
<td>14% 44</td>
<td>$90,100 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>95% 1,829</td>
<td>96% 957</td>
<td>5% 1,720</td>
<td>8% 902</td>
<td>$84,500 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>94% 3,753</td>
<td>96% 1,980</td>
<td>6% 3,521</td>
<td>10% 1,857</td>
<td>$88,000 1,690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
### 4.1.1 Full-time employment

Trend data for the proportion of research postgraduates in full-time employment at the time of the survey (as a percentage of those available for full-time employment) are presented in Table 4b. Full-time employment status is based on working at least 35 hours per week.

Table 4b. Research Postgraduates – Percentage in full-time employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71%*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>70%*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>75%*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>58%*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>68%*</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>88%*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89%*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67%*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>77%*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>94%*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>73%*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2,939</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>1,383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
### 4.1.2 Further full-time study

Table 4c presents the proportion of research postgraduates in further full-time study at the time of the survey (as a proportion of the entire graduating cohort).

#### Table 4c. Research Postgraduates – Percentage in full-time study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>20%*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23%*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0%*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>14%*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0%*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0%*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>0%*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>0%*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20%*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17%*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>0%*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3,588</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1,489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.

** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
4.2 Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ)

Trend data regarding research postgraduates who completed the 2017 PREQ are presented below. As part of the GOS, the University of Sydney collects data for all six scales of the PREQ, along with the single Overall Satisfaction item. Tables 4d-4j present PREQ scale scores by faculty.

Table 4d. PREQ: Research Postgraduates – Overall Satisfaction – Percentage agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>77%*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>80%*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>78%*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>71%*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>90%*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>92%*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>79%*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>3,517</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>1,444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
  ** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Postgraduates: Quality of Supervision</th>
<th>Domestic 2016 %</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>International 2016 %</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Domestic 2017 %</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>International 2017 %</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>100%* 5</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>88% 57</td>
<td>85%* 13</td>
<td>87% 31</td>
<td>-** 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>100%* 7</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>100%* 14</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>75%* 12</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>79% 34</td>
<td>91% 22</td>
<td>83%* 12</td>
<td>71%* 14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>88% 26</td>
<td>80%* 5</td>
<td>100%* 8</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>67%* 9</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>85% 94</td>
<td>86% 22</td>
<td>88% 33</td>
<td>60%* 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>-** 2</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>86%* 7</td>
<td>80%* 10</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>80% 64</td>
<td>83%* 12</td>
<td>92% 24</td>
<td>100%* 7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>90% 20</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
<td>100%* 9</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>95% 21</td>
<td>-** 1</td>
<td>83%* 6</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>71%* 14</td>
<td>-** 4</td>
<td>100%* 5</td>
<td>-** 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>85% 378</td>
<td>86% 111</td>
<td>89% 154</td>
<td>81% 43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>80% 1,845</td>
<td>82% 733</td>
<td>79% 1,382</td>
<td>82% 722</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>80% 3,519</td>
<td>84% 1,448</td>
<td>80% 3,051</td>
<td>83% 1,602</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-** 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>89%*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>83%*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>86%*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>3,507</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>1,442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table 4g: PREQ: Research Postgraduates – Quality of Infrastructure scale – Percentage agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>*<em>1 1 88%</em></td>
<td>2 45%</td>
<td>**2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>*<em>4 57 62%</em></td>
<td>2 45%</td>
<td>**2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>**58% 94 90%*</td>
<td>13 12</td>
<td>**2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Business School)</td>
<td>*<em>100%</em> 7 7</td>
<td>**3 22</td>
<td>**3 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>*<em>3 2 83%</em></td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>**1 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>*<em>77%</em> 13 10</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>**2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>79% 34 91%</td>
<td>22 82%</td>
<td>**3 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>*<em>44%</em> 9 9</td>
<td>**1 21</td>
<td>**1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law (Sydney Law School)</td>
<td>**82% 94 59%*</td>
<td>21 12</td>
<td>**3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (Sydney Medical School)</td>
<td>*<em>67%</em> 21 7</td>
<td>**1 12</td>
<td>**1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (Sydney Nursing School)</td>
<td>*<em>71%</em> 7 7</td>
<td>**1 12</td>
<td>**1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>*<em>73% 64 83%</em></td>
<td>12 12</td>
<td>**4 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>*<em>45% 20 82%</em></td>
<td>12 12</td>
<td>**3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>**67% 21 26%*</td>
<td>12 26</td>
<td>**3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>*<em>57%</em> 14 5</td>
<td>**2 2</td>
<td>**1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>**70% 376 21</td>
<td>12 85</td>
<td>**2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>**72% 1,837 87%</td>
<td>731 75%</td>
<td>**4 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>**71% 3,507 78%</td>
<td>1,443 73%</td>
<td>**3 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>**71% 3,507 78%</td>
<td>1,443 73%</td>
<td>**3 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.

** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table 4h. PREQ: Research Postgraduates – Intellectual Climate scale – Percentage agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75%*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62%*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>71%*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>79%*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>44%*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>43%*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80%*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58%*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>43%*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1,843</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>3,517</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>1,445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table 4i. PREQ: Research Postgraduates – Thesis Examination scale – Percentage agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Domestic 2016</th>
<th>International 2016</th>
<th>Domestic 2017</th>
<th>International 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75%*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62%*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>79%*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>80%*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>78%*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>86%*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60%*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75%*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>64%*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>1,843</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>3,518</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>1,447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table 4j. PREQ: Research Postgraduates – Goals and Expectations scale – Percentage agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>80%*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>78%*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>86%*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>90%*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>83%*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>71%*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities Australia</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3,521</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>1,448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
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**RECOMMENDATION**

*That the Academic Quality Committee note the reports on 2017 Faculty-level appeals data, as presented.*

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

At its meeting of 10 July 2018, the Committee received and noted reports from eight faculties and University schools regarding student appeals for 2017 that were resolved at faculty level (that is, those appeals that did not proceed to the Registrar for consideration). Two further reports were considered at the meeting of 4 September 2018 (Business School and Faculty of Science), and a revised version of the Science report is now circulated for noting, as attached.
ACADEMIC QUALITY COMMITTEE

Report of: Formal appeals of academic decisions
Reporting year: 2017

Prepared by: Helen Agus
On behalf of Academic Panel
Date prepared: 7 September 2018

Use the table below (type directly into empty cells) to report 2017 data for “Appeals to the Faculty,” as described in clause 3.2 of the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006. These appeals are frequently referred to as “formal appeals.”

Only appeals relating to academic decisions should be reported. According to the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006, Academic Decision means a decision by the University that affects the academic assessment or progress of a person within his or her Award Course, including a decision:

- to exclude a Student in accordance with the Coursework Policy 2014;
- not to readmit or re-enrol a person following exclusion in accordance with the Coursework Policy 2014;
- to terminate a Student’s candidature for a postgraduate award.

The above referenced Rule and Policy provide additional relevant definitions and information on appeals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appeals types</th>
<th>Total number lodged</th>
<th>Number rejected</th>
<th>Number upheld</th>
<th>Number with other outcomes (withdrawn, partially upheld, etc.)</th>
<th>Appeals submitted at wrong level</th>
<th>Appeals submitted incorrectly to Spec Cons (Mark appeals/ appeals of Credit/other processes)</th>
<th>Duplicate Appeals (Invalid)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2 Appeals of academic decisions</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: If more granular data is conveniently available, additional rows may be added to the table to make additional distinctions about the types of appeals submitted (e.g. appeals of educational integrity decisions; appeals of decisions related to credit applications; appeals submitted by undergraduate, postgraduate coursework and higher degree by research students; etc.).

Briefly describe what students are required to do to submit a formal appeal of an academic decision in your faculty/university school. This should include any requirements related to the actual submission (e.g. forms that must be completed, etc.), as well as anything that must be done prior to the submission of the formal appeal (e.g. informal appeal process, etc.). If this is described elsewhere, simply provide a web link or attach a document.

Appeals of academic decisions

- The Academic Panel appeals process requires students to lodge a Tier 1 informal appeal resolution initially at: [https://sydney.edu.au/students/academic-appeals/informal-appeal.html](https://sydney.edu.au/students/academic-appeals/informal-appeal.html) where the link

Respect is a core value of the Academic Board
provided allows a student to open an appeal process and to upload the case statement and supporting documentation.

- Following Tier 1 informal outcomes, students can lodge a Tier 2 Formal Appeal at: https://sydney.edu.au/students/academic-appeals/faculty-academic-panel-appeal.html

Briefly describe the process used in your faculty/University school for making decisions on formal appeals of academic decisions. If this is described elsewhere, simply provide a web link or attach a document.

The Academic Panel processes are as per the following University weblink: https://sydney.edu.au/students/academic-appeals/faculty-or-academic-panel-level-appeal.html

The Chair of the Academic Panel managed the appeal process. Appeals related to Special Consideration were investigated, outcomes decided, decisions made and signed off by two members of the Academic Panel. Panel members were assigned in order of prior activity. If the Panel member had a conflict of interest, the appeal was escalated to an alternative Panel member.

The Senior Administrative Officer in the SAS Special Consideration Team gathered all information and documentation required to fully understand the student’s concerns and consulted with the Unit of Study Coordinator/Academic Staff member in gathering the facts. The Panel member reviewed the appeal and supporting documents and made the decision. The student was informed of the outcome of the appeal to the Panel and informed of the escalation appeal process to the Student Appeals Body as well as support networks on campus and community-based.

The outcome was scanned and uploaded to the appeals file in Trim.

(Optional) Do you have any other comments about formal appeals of academic decisions? They may include problems that you’ve encountered with appeals, concerns you have about policy requirements, or other observations about the process that you’d like to share.

Tier 2 Formal Appeal outcomes that progressed to appeals to the Student Appeals Body:

Five appeals were lodged with the SAB against decisions made by the Academic Panel:

- Three were heard, of which one was successful, one was unsuccessful and one was referred back to the Faculty.
- Two were referred back to Special Consideration, as they had not exhausted all appeal rights prior to appealing to SAB – these cases were resolved at lower tier appeal level and did not subsequently escalate to an appeal to the SAB.

Comments:

- The number of invalid appeals could be minimised to improve the student experience by:
  - improving the website:
    - improve page view, clearly display information etc.
    - incorporate a privacy notice with redirection links and with a specific direction for students who are not submitting requests that relate to Special Consideration.
  - improving the in-system templates/comments to students with clearer information on how to appeal a decision, e.g. instead of providing the Appeals webpage link, to provide the direct link to the Informal Resolution Request portal, accompanied with additional information.
- There are some concerns about the target 10-day processing time which is not realistic considering:
  - the complexity of appeal cases;
  - competing workload priorities and availability of members of the Academic Panel; and
  - sensitive negotiations with unit of study SC decision makers in overturning or amending their original decisions on the basis of further evidence provided at the appeal level, as well as
supporting reasonable decision-making that is fair and consistent University-wide. This impacted final results and further assessment in some cases.

• The consultative process of decision-making supported consistency across the Panel and provided important mentoring for Panel members. However, in retrospect, this dual decision-making process is not compliant with the Appeals Rule and has been modified for 2018.

• Also noteworthy is the experience that some academics are more hard-line than others in their decision-making and that this contributes to inconsistent outcomes for students. This is a difficult issue as it is based on personal perspective. Guidelines and exemplar cases would assist achieving uniformity of decision-making.

• The Panel needs to provide opportunities for members to share and discuss appeal issues.