Academic Standards and Policy Committee - Terms of Reference

Purpose
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee assists and advises the Academic Board in ensuring the maintenance of the highest standards and quality in teaching, scholarship and research in the University of Sydney.

Terms of Reference
1. To play an active role in assuring the quality of teaching, scholarship and research in the University and coordinate and maintain an overview of the academic activities of all academic units.
2. To formulate and review policies, guidelines and procedures in relation to academic matters, particularly with respect to academic issues that have scope across the University, including equity and access initiatives.
3. To determine policy concerning the programs of study or examinations in any Faculty, college or Board of Studies.
4. To advise the Academic Board and Vice Chancellor on policies concerning the academic aspects of the conditions of appointment and employment of academic staff.
5. To play an active role in assuring the quality of teaching, scholarship and research in the University by ensuring the body of academic policies and degree resolutions are self-consistent, incorporate the best ideas and are aligned with the strategic goals of the University.
6. In pursuit of the above objectives,
   6.1. request reports from, or refer matters to academic units 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 Senior Executive Group, a formal and regular program of review of academic activities of all academic units.
7. To actively seek and evaluate opportunities to improve the University’s pursuit of high standards in all academic activities.
8. To ensure proper communication channels are established with other committees of the Academic Board and SEG to promote cross-referencing and discussion of matters pertaining to academic standards and policy.
9. To receive regular reports from, and provide advice to the Deputy Vice-Chancellors pursuant to maintaining the highest standards in teaching, scholarship and research.
10. To exercise all reasonable means to provide and receive advice from the Senior Executive Group and its relevant subcommittees.
11. To provide regular reports on its activities under its terms of reference to the Academic Board.
12. To consider and report on any matter referred to it by the Academic Board, the Vice Chancellor or the Deputy Vice-Chancellors.

Respect is a core value of the Academic Board
AGENDA

Non-confidential items

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS
2.1 Minutes of Meeting 2016/1 (9 March 2016) Chair Attached
2.2 Actions Arising

3 STANDING ITEMS
3.1 Report of the Chair Chair Verbal
3.2 Report of the Academic Board meeting, 30 March 2016 Associate Professor Tony Masters Attached

4 ITEMS FOR APPROVAL
4.1 Assessment types risk evaluation Chair Attached
4.2 Anonymous and De-Identified Marking Dr Leah Schwartz Attached
4.3 Board of Interdisciplinary Studies – Terms of reference and governance issues Dr Leah Schwartz Attached

5 ITEMS FOR NOTING
5.1 Curriculum Framework – Policy Amendments Dr Leah Schwartz Attached
5.2 Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016 Dr Leah Schwartz Attached
5.3 Review of Policies in 2016 Chair Attached
5.4 2015 Annual Reports on Cases of Academic Dishonesty Chair/Dr Leah Schwartz Attached
5.5 Academic Honesty Procedures 2016 Dr Leah Schwartz Attached

6 OTHER BUSINESS
6.1 Any Other Business
6.2 Next meeting 8 June 2016
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Author | Ms Megan Kemmis, Executive Officer to Academic Board
Reviewer/Approver | Professor Jane Hanrahan, Chair of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee
Paper title | Minutes of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee meeting held 9th March 2016
Purpose | To recommend that the Academic Standards and Policy Committee accept the draft minutes of the meeting held 9th March 2016.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee accept the minutes of the previous meeting held on 9th March 2016 as a true and accurate record.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY COMMITTEE OF 9 MARCH 2016

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY COMMITTEE
2:00 pm, Wednesday 9th March 2016
Senate Room, Quadrangle (A14)

Members Present: The Chair (Professor J Hanrahan), Mrs H Agus, Associate Professor T Allender, Professor A Bridgeman, Dr Frances Di Lauro, Associate Professor A Elias, Associate Professor G Frost, Associate Professor T Gerzina, Associate Professor P Gibbens, Associate Professor R Gibson, Professor M Graeber, Mr T Greenwell, Ms K Hartman-Warren, Ms K Henderson, Associate Professor G Hill, Dr P Knight, Associate Professor T Masters, Associate Professor P McCallum (for Professor P Pattison), Associate Professor M Peat, Associate Professor J Rowley, Dr D Shirley, Ms C Smith, Professor G Tolhurst and Ms S Vimalarajah.

Attendees: Ms A Hush (SRC), Associate Professor V Keyser and Associate Professor M Melatos

Apologies: Associate Professor T Bishop, Professor P Pattison (Associate Professor P McCallum attending in her stead).

MINUTES

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES
The Chair welcomed members to the first meeting of the year.

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS
2.1 Minutes of Meeting 2015/8, 11 November 2015
Members confirmed the minutes of the last meeting held on 11 November 2015.

ASPC16/1-1
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolved that the minutes of meeting 2015/8, held on 11 November 2015, be confirmed as a true record.

2.2 Matters Arising
There were no matters arising from the previous meeting.

3 STANDING ITEMS
3.1 Report of the Chair
The Chair advised members that she had chaired a small working party to develop integrity
assurance procedures for units of study. The recommendations of this group are presented under item 4.2.

**ASPC16/1-2**
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the report of the Chair.

### 3.2 Reports of the Academic Board meetings held 2 December 2015 and 24 February 2016

Associate Professor Masters referred to the reports in the agenda and congratulated Professor Hanrahan on her appointment as Chair of the committee. The Chair asked Professor Masters to update members on the Special Considerations Decisions Matrix as discussed at the February meeting of the Board. He advised a small working group, with representatives from the Student Administrative Services (SAS) program, the Faculty of Health Sciences, the Faculty of Science and the student representative groups has been continuing this discussion and that he will be sending a memo to Board members with the outcomes of these talks. The group agreed that the matrix itself is well understood but communication on the processes needs to be refined. The SAS program team indicated that they will be monitoring the new process and will deal with any issues that crop up, and have undertaken to add further information to the special considerations website and in communications with students.

**ASPC16/1-3**
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the reports of the Academic Board meetings held on 2 December 2015 and 24 February 2016.

## 4 ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

### 4.1 Simple Extensions Working Group report

Mrs Agus advised members that this group had been established following discussions at the Academic Board’s meeting in December 2015. The Committee had recommended an amendment to the Assessment Procedures which was referred to this meeting of the Board, and further changes were put forward at the meeting regarding the proposed terminology and issues of equity and fairness, plus the duration of any agreed arrangement. The working group was formed to further discuss these changes with representatives from the Student Administrative Services Program (SAS), Disability Services, Student Support and student organisations, and she noted the meeting summary had been circulated with the agenda. The summary concludes that simple extensions:

- should be implemented across campus consistently and transparently by negotiation between the student and the relevant academic;
- would be awarded for cases explained to a relevant academic but not necessarily attested;
- would need to be tracked outside the Special Consideration system and the relevant academic must acknowledge the extension due date awarded via email to the student’s formal USYD email address with ‘Simple Extension’ in the subject line;
- would be up to two days from the assessment due date, determined by the relevant academic;
- would sit within, and not affect, the time frame for lodgement of a formal Special Consideration application of three working days from the assessment due date, leaving a minimum of one day thereafter for submission of a Special Consideration application, i.e. the granting of a simple extension does not change the assessment due date for purposes of Special Consideration; any gap in documentation from the due date would result in the Special Consideration application being refused unless a case is made for delay in submission; academic staff should assist students seeking simple extension to determine if special consideration is more appropriate to their circumstances and, where illness is the issue, academics would encourage students to use the Special Consideration process.

The working group also recommends that definitions and examples be developed to assist students to determine the process most appropriate for their circumstances (i.e. simple extension; Special Consideration; disability adjustment). Mrs Agus advised that Ms Henderson has developed a draft amendment to the Coursework Policy based on the working group’s discussions with Ms Henderson pointing out that the proposed amendments will invalidate any local provision that bans the use of simple extensions.
Members raised the following issues:

- Associate Professor Frost pointed out the potential increase in workload for some academic staff under this proposal, but Mrs Agus countered that each academic can decide whether or not to offer simple extensions; Professor Frost expressed concern that this would lead to a lack of consistency in student experience across faculties and the University; Ms Vimalarajah added that there is already a culture (as opposed to mandated policy) in some faculties of not providing simple extensions, while in others they have been available for some years and she did not see the proposed changes affecting these faculty positions; she added that the important issue is advising students of the current policy position;

- Associate Professor Gibbens pointed out that an academic looking after a unit of study with large student numbers could lose track of these arrangements and suggested they be captured in a system; Mrs Agus agreed, adding this was why the working group suggested using emails with the title “Simple Extension”; the Chair added that the email title could also use the unit of study code;

- Associate Professor Melatos suggested including the grounds on which an academic can refuse a request; Ms Henderson advised that the process is based on informal and individual discretion and cautioned against making the policy change too detailed as this will increase the potential for the arrangement to be viewed as an academic decision which would be subject to the University’s policy on student appeals; Associate Professor McCallum pointed out that Assessment Procedures refer to not disadvantaging students by modifying the assessment requirements for a unit of study which could be used as grounds for not providing a simple extension;

- Professor McCallum added that the amendment referred to the December meeting of the Academic Board referred to more than simple extensions, but also dealt with protecting disability service arrangements;

- Professor Masters pointed out that the Academic Board agreed that simple extensions should be explicitly referenced in University policy and/or procedures at its December meeting and that the Committee’s role is to recommend a definition and how the process will operate so that there is some consistency across the institution in how these requests are handled; he agreed that information regarding these requests needs to be recorded and tracked, and the process also needs to ensure students will use special consideration if this is the more appropriate process for them;

- Mr Greenwell suggested amending clause 66A(1) to read “in circumstances deemed appropriate”, and Ms Henderson suggested this be “A member of academic staff who is satisfied that it is appropriate may..”;

- Members also discussed the term “relevant teacher” with some suggesting this be the unit of study co-ordinator; Ms Henderson suggested leaving the phrase as is but clarifying the definition in the related procedures; Ms Hartman-Warren suggested the procedures should also outline how the details of this person will be communicated to students;

- Ms Hartman-Warren expressed concern that some faculties are already advising students that simple extensions are no longer available; members discussed what should be communicated to faculties about this and the Chair undertook to discuss this further with Ms Henderson and Professor Masters;

- Members raised the issue of when students should ask for a simple extension, with some arguing that it should be before the due date and others arguing after the due date could be considered so long as the request falls within the three day period for applying for special consideration; there was some agreement that this should be left to individual academics discretion.

Members endorsed forwarding the working group recommendations and the proposed policy amendment to the Academic Board for approval. Ms Henderson undertook to revise the amendments to the Coursework Policy based on these discussions, adding that the Chair of the Academic Board has delegated authority to approve any changes to the related procedures. Professor McCallum pointed out that the proposal that went to the December meeting of the Academic Board will need to be reviewed and possibly amended. Professor Masters thanked Mrs Agus and the members of the working group for their efforts.
ASPC16/1-4
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommends the Academic Board accept the findings of the Simple Extensions Working Group outlined in the attached report.

4.2 Unit of Study Integrity Assurance procedures
The Chair advised members that this issue had been considered by a small working group in the last month, adding that the development of these procedures was one of the recommendations from the Taskforce on Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism. The suggested process will provide evidence that faculties have thought through the risk issues associated with specific types of assessment. She added that the information presented had incorporated as many types of assessment and risk as possible, but also was meant to be as simple as possible given the additional workload for unit of study co-ordinators created by recent policy and process changes.

Members discussed the proposed procedures and commented as follows:
- Professor Gibbens asked what would prevent academics from simply marking assessments as low risk; the Chair advised that the type of assessment would be recorded as well as other information on mitigation strategies, and this information would be used to determine whether the level of risk assessment was warranted or not; Professor McCallum added that if a report on cases of academic dishonesty shows a spike in cases for a unit of study where the assessment has been deemed low risk, the co-ordinator could be instructed to revisit the risk assessment and provide additional information;
- Professor Peat asked how this would intersect with the curriculum renewal strategy, and the Chair advised that this should form part of that work, adding that once the risk assessment has been done it only needs to be revisited if there are changes to the way the unit of study is assessed;
- The matrix was discussed, with members agreeing that the likelihood level “may occur” should be reworded, with the alternative wording “unlikely but may occur” suggested, and another suggestion that the levels be simplified to High, Medium and Low;
- Professor Graeber asked that the word “risk” be rethought, adding that the terminology could lead academics to view students as a risk factor; the Chair advised that the term is not being applied to students but used in the context of institutional risk.

Members expressed general support for the procedures. Professor McCallum suggested they be presented to the Academic Board following the Committee’s next meeting in April so that the Academic Honesty Procedures could be presented at the same time. Members endorsed this suggestion.

ASPC16/1-5
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommends the Academic Board adopt the draft guidelines for assessment types risk evaluation.

Note: this item will be presented to the Academic Board’s meeting of 18th May 2016 to allow the Academic Honesty Procedures to be presented at the same time.

5 ITEMS FOR NOTING

5.1 Anonymous Marking Policy at Sydney University (for discussion)
Ms Vimalarajah advised members the SRC had submitted this paper to the Student Consultative Committee last year after noting that the University has no policy on anonymous marking. She pointed out that it is a common practice at other universities, adding that Monash has the clearest policy on this. Research in the UK suggests anonymous marking can mitigate against unconscious bias in markers, and the SRC has received support from a number of academics at the University, particularly Dr Olivia Dixon in the Faculty of Law. Ms Hush added that Dr Graham Hendry from the Institute for Teaching and Learning is also in support, and has advised that anonymous marking assists with standards-based assessment and can improve student satisfaction with their courses. Ms Vimalarajah added that more consultation is needed with faculties and that the SRC’s proposal would be most easily applied to final examinations.
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Associate Professor McCallum advised that the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) has held a meeting on this issue and is supportive of the concept. There are some technical issues with examinations that would need to be worked out, and not all types of assessment would work with this process, so the current idea is that anonymous marking would be mandatory for examinations but discretionary for other types of assessment. Professor Bridgeman advised that anonymous marking can be used with Turnitin but that there are some issues e.g. if a student has been granted an extension they will be identifiable, and if academics print out the assignments from Turnitin it is difficult to link the assignment back to the correct student.

Members expressed general support for the idea but raised a number of issues, such as the need to identify students in practical examinations, and the potential for divisions between various faculties because of different approaches to this issue driven by the types of assessment each faculty uses. Ms Vimalarajah agreed that these and other issues need to be considered. The Chair advised that the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) is presenting a paper to SEG on examination procedures and the issue of anonymous marking will be raised in that paper. She suggested the Committee advise the Academic Board that it supports the use of anonymous marking for examinations. Professor Masters thanked the SRC for raising the issue.

ASPC16/1-6
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee discussed the SRC report on anonymous marking at the University of Sydney and resolved to advise the Academic Board that it supports the use of anonymous marking for examinations.

5.2 Update on Academic Integrity Implementation Group
Professor McCallum advised that the information circulated with the agenda is not the latest update from this group, and offered to send the latest report made to the SEG Education Committee for circulation. The Academic Honesty modules have been rolled out and the online reporting module is live. He urged members to let him know of any issues or problems, adding that a test of the system and review will be undertaken mid-year – the report of this review will also come to the committee.

ASPC16/1-7
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the report on the Academic Integrity Implementation Group.

5.3 Learning and Teaching Policy implementation report
Professor McCallum advised that the draft Learning and Teaching Procedures will be submitted to the Committee’s next meeting. Professor Peat advised that during the recent Summer School session he had used some slides to outline the new system to students, and had repeated this information just before assessments were due. Professor McCallum agreed this was a useful process, adding some of the slides from his faculty roadshow could be used by lecturers.

ASPC16/1-8
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the report on the implementation of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

6 OTHER BUSINESS
6.1 Any Other Business
There was no other business raised.

6.2 Next meeting 20th April 2016

Remaining Meeting Dates for 2016
2:00 pm Wednesday, 20th April 2016
2:00 pm Wednesday, 8th June 2016
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2:00 pm Wednesday, 20\textsuperscript{th} July 2016
2:00 pm Wednesday, 24\textsuperscript{th} August 2016
2:00 pm Wednesday, 12\textsuperscript{th} October 2016
2:00 pm Wednesday, 9\textsuperscript{th} November 2016

A full copy of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee papers is available at:
http://sydney.edu.au/ab/committees/ac_stands/ac_stands_agendas.shtml
Report of the Academic Board meeting, held 30th March 2016

REPORT OF ACADEMIC BOARD MEETING

Items related to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee
The Academic Board:
- approved the appointment of academic staff members to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee, noting that the term of membership will be until 31 December 2017; and
- accepted the findings of the Simple Extensions Working Group, including related amendments to the Coursework Policy 2014 and the Assessment Procedures 2011; and
- noted the Academic Standards and Policy Committee’s advice that it supports the use of anonymous marking for examinations.

Other matters
The Academic Board also:
- discussed the composition of the Academic Board under the University’s proposed new organisational structure;
- approved the appointment or co-option of academic staff and student members to the Admissions Committee, Graduate Studies Committee and Undergraduate Studies Committee, noting that the term of membership will be until 31 December 2016 for student members and until 31 December 2017 for staff members, and the amendment of the terms of reference for the Admissions Committee;
- noted the report on the Inherent Requirements 2016 Renewal, and the invitation to faculties to make recommendations to the Inherent Requirements Advisory Committee (IRAC) by 11th April 2016;
- noted the report from Dr Saleeba on the formation of the Equity and Diversity working group;
- noted the report of the student members of the Academic Board on anonymous marking, simple extensions, the centralised University phone line and the NTEU and Student Rally;
- noted the report from the Vice-Chancellor on the approval of the 2016-2020 Strategic Plan by Senate and current national debates in the Higher Education sector;
- approved the request from the University of Sydney Business School to amend its semester dates for 2017 for the Master of Business Administration;
- approved amendments to the Dux Entry Scheme to broaden the scheme to become the Future Leaders Scheme;
- approved a proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to correct the assumed knowledge details for the Bachelor Information Technology/Bachelor of Commerce combined degree;
- approved proposals from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Development Studies, the Master of US Studies and its Faculty Resolutions;
- approved proposals from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours to include majors in Humanitarian Engineering and Internet of Things, and amend the Master of Engineering to include a major in Risk Management; and
- approved proposals from the Faculty of Science to amend the Board’s resolution made at its meeting of 2 July 2014 to allow the Faculty of Science to continue offering the Graduate Diploma in Psychology with its...
existing table of units of study until 2018, and to amend the Board's resolution made at its meeting of 24 February 2016 to allow the Faculty of Science to introduce amendments to the Master of Nutrition and Dietetics from 1 January 2018, and changes to the Bachelor of Science/Master of Nutrition and Dietetics from 1 January 2017.
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<table>
<thead>
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</thead>
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<tr>
<td>Paper title</td>
<td>Assessment Types Risk Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To present the recommendations of the working group formed to consider the recommendation from the VC’s Taskforce on Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism regarding risk evaluation of assessment types</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION**

*That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend the Academic Board adopt the draft guidelines for assessment types risk evaluation.*

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

At the Committee’s previous meeting, it considered and endorsed the draft guidelines for assessment types risk evaluation. It was agreed that the guidelines would be revised to reflect the discussion at the meeting.

The final version of the guidelines is attached for the advice of members.
Two aspects of risk are associated with plagiarism or academic misconduct of assessments. Firstly, plagiarism or misconduct is unfair to students who make a genuine attempt at the assessment. Therefore minimizing plagiarism and awarding marks only for original work is an inherent requirement for fair assessment. Secondly, there is also a level of risk associated with the educational integrity of the degree and therefore to the institution.

The risk to educational integrity is related to the overall risk of students who, due to plagiarism or academic misconduct in assessments, are able to graduate without actually obtaining the requisite skills and knowledge for the degree that they are awarded. The risk to educational integrity is determined by the likelihood of the misconduct occurring in a particular assessment, and the overall weighting or contribution of the mark for a particular assessment to the final mark for a unit of study. In essence, lower weighted in-semester assessments, which are often also teaching & learning activities in addition to summative assessments, are usually more at risk of academic misconduct or plagiarism, however they constitute a lower overall risk to the educational integrity of a program. Conversely, major assessments such as formal examinations, dissertations or off campus assessments (such as work integrated learning) usually contribute the highest weighting to the overall final mark for each unit of study and/or degree and are usually less likely to result in plagiarism or academic misconduct. However, if this does occur it poses a significant risk to the educational integrity of the degree.

Good assessment practice requires that assessments are regularly reviewed, revised and renewed. In reality, it is noted that in many units of study, the same content is essentially taught each year and therefore the assessment tasks are likely to be similar in nature, even if they are not identical.

As part of reviewing and revising assessments, it is good practice for staff to give consideration to the degree of risk of educational integrity inherent in each assessment type (how likely it is to occur versus the contribution of that particular assessment to the overall mark), and implementing appropriate mitigating measures.

Policy
ACADEMIC HONESTY IN COURSEWORK POLICY 2015
12 Requirements for assessment
The design and development of assessment tasks by unit of study co-ordinators and faculties must include an assessment of the degree of risk to academic integrity inherent in each assessment type.

Procedures
All faculties should develop guidelines to that give consideration to the degree of risk to educational integrity of the assessment types used within their faculty. A recommended process would be

1. UoS co-ordinators complete a template using the Assessment Risk and Mitigation Table and Risk Assessment Matrix, and submit these template(s) to the Learning & Teaching committee for review.

2. In cases where an assessment has a risk that is high or very high, the Learning & Teaching committee may wish to discuss the use of particular assessments with the UoS coordinators and the implementation of mitigating strategies.

3. Learning & Teaching committees should ensure that there is follow up at the end of semester, to confirm the initial risk assessment, the success of mitigating strategies, and discuss what may be implemented in the future if the initial strategy was not successful.

4. Faculties should report any issues that have been identified with particular assessments/assessment types, including any proposed changes and further strategies to mitigate these issues to the Academic Board on a yearly basis.
**Summary of Assessment Types, Risks and Mitigating Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Type</th>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Suggested Mitigating Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invigilated Quiz</td>
<td>Identity of student</td>
<td>Identity Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-exam room setting, or poor spacing in room</td>
<td>Multiple versions of same paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Randomisation of the question order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Try to book bigger room or even 2 rooms to spread class out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple quizzes run on different days with similar but not identical questions (may be electronic or paper based)</td>
<td>Questions with answers likely to be memorized and shared through social media – ensure no mobile phones, difficult to totally mitigate for, content should be retested in formal examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Password protected entry to quiz if electronically accessed. Automatic closure of exam after time is completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Invigilated Exam</td>
<td>Identity of student</td>
<td>Identity Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confidential papers removed from exam room</td>
<td>Maintain strict exam conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t use confidential papers if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Always change at least some questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions from confidential papers memorized and then reproduced</td>
<td>Don’t use confidential papers if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Always change at least some questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Give sample, practice or past papers/questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Identity of student</td>
<td>Identity Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invigilated Oral Exam (vivas, OSCEs, patient examinations)</td>
<td>Identity of student</td>
<td>Identity Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuse of questions</td>
<td>Quarantine students before/after exam until all students with same questions have finished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re-test work in a formal (preferably barrier) exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have a test bank of suitable questions/scenarios to reduce the likelihood of students been given “the same” question.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-invigilated Quiz</td>
<td>No assurance of identity of student at all</td>
<td>Impossible to assure identity, therefore ensure that it is a low weighted assessment and re-test work in a formal (preferably barrier) exam. Consider the use of technology such as Examity (??)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identity of student completing work</td>
<td>Include an oral component with detailed questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment (as above) with scaffolding or periodic submission of sections</td>
<td>Identity of student completing work</td>
<td>Include an oral component with detailed questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Presentation</td>
<td>Identity of student of who prepared presentation and speech?</td>
<td>Include detailed oral questions about topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-lab/pre-tutorial work</td>
<td>Identity of student who completed work</td>
<td>Ensure that weighting of pre-class work is low, retest in formal (preferably barrier) exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lab class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of results were used for write up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism of Lab report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require students to submit results or product before leaving the class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Turnitin for submitted written work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If lab is a repeat no assurance of identity of person who obtained results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include 5 min viva on lab experiment with detailed questions, and/or retest in final barrier exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Practical exams</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity of student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple exams run on different days with similar but not identical questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions with answers likely to be shared through social media – ensure no mobile phones, difficult to totally mitigate for, ensure content is retested in formal barrier examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a test bank of suitable questions/scenarios to reduce the likelihood of students been given “the same” question.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Participation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If repeat class no assurance of identity of person who prepared work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep weighting low, ensure content is retested in formal barrier examination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Placement</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did student attend placement at all?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit or Skype call to placement site, at least once during course of placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a mid-way “check” of student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require student to produce ID card to placement site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism of report or reflective diary used to assess placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Turnitin for submitted work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All assessment pieces with educator signature to be duplicated and forward to University for cross check.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Performances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UoS Assessment Integrity Risk Assessment and Mitigation Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Type</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigating Strategy</th>
<th>% Weighting of assessment</th>
<th>Overall Risk (low, medium, high, very high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for not using a particular mitigating strategy:

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning &amp; Teaching Activity</th>
<th>Potential Significance</th>
<th>Not Significant</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Highly Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low weighted assessment e.g. short quiz. Content can be retested in formal exam</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment that contributes to a significant proportion of marks (~30%). Content can be retested in formal exam</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major assessment (~50%) but content can be retested in a formal exam or OSCE.</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major assessment e.g. final exam Honours thesis, dissertation, test of essential professional skills. Cannot be further examined.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Expected to occur regularly</th>
<th>Expected to occur</th>
<th>Moderately likely</th>
<th>Not likely to occur</th>
<th>May happen, but not often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected to occur regularly</td>
<td>Almost Certain</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected to occur</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately likely</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not likely to occur</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May happen, but not often</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee:
(1) endorse de-identified marking (identification by SID only) for all assignments and examinations; and
(2) note that consequent amendments to the Coursework Policy 2014 and Assessment Procedures 2011 will be submitted to the Academic Board for its approval.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper investigates the possibilities of anonymous and de-identified marking. The paper concludes with recommendations towards policy amendment that will allow the implementation of de-identified marking where possible and other markings methods where de-identification is not possible.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

A paper on anonymous marking was prepared by the SRC (SRC Discussion Paper) and discussed at the Student Consultative Committee. The Deputy Vice Chancellor Education, Deputy Vice Chancellor Registrar, Deputy Registrar, Chair Academic Board, Director Education Strategy and Director Education Innovation met to discuss the paper. The paper was discussed at the SEG Education Committee and the Academic Standards and Policy Committee in March which endorsed the intention to move towards anonymous marking in examinations and in assignments where appropriate.

TERMS

It is important to have clarity regarding what is to be provided. In this paper:
- **Anonymous marking** means a marking environment in which no information about the student’s identity is known. This means neither the name or Student Identity Number (SID) is available to the marker prior to, or during the marking of assessment work.
- **De-identified marking** means a marking environment in which students are not identified by name before or during the marking process, but are identified by SID on the script or the assignment. De-identified marking is said to removes the possibility of a marker making assumptions about a student’s identity, gender or background on the basis of name.

In both anonymous marking and de-identified marking, an individual examiner may nevertheless know the identity of the student on the basis of the topic covered or information that the student provides. If a student writes their name, despite instruction not to do so, any attempt at anonymity is lost. Other features such as English usage and handwriting styles may convey information that may cause an examiner to draw inferences on gender and background. Any process leading towards anonymous or de-identified marks must be understood to be a best-efforts process and must be supported by both staff and students.
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NOTE: The SRC Discussion Paper made reference to anonymous marking in comparator universities. Using the terminology adopted in this paper, the practice of comparator universities would be seen as de-identified marking. For instance:

- Monash University: ‘Blind marking is anonymous marking. Instead of using your name, we use your student ID and desk number to identify you. This policy has been introduced to ensure equality of the marking process. We apply the blind marking process to end of semester exams.’

- University of Melbourne. “Anonymous marking requires that staff members mark students’ work without knowing the identity of the students. Information identifying students (other than student numbers) must not be combined with the marks allocated to their work until the end of the marking process.”
  [https://policy.unimelb.edu.au/MPF1200#section-3.9](https://policy.unimelb.edu.au/MPF1200#section-3.9)

- University of Bradford “Assessed work which is to be anonymously marked will be identified by the use of the student’s UB Number. Names must not appear on the cover sheet or anywhere in the work.”

RATIONALE

Conscious bias in assessment is contrary to universal academic values and to University policy. In particular 64 (3) of the Coursework Policy requires that student work is “evaluated solely on the basis of students’ achievement against criteria and standards specified to align with learning outcomes.” Striving to eliminate unconscious bias is also implicit in fairness and enshrined in University policy.

Currently the University has insufficient data to support any conclusion about the absence or presence of bias, conscious or unconscious, in assessment. The absence of data arises from the absence, to date, of systematic study of the issue within the University. Studies of bias in other settings, including educational settings, suggest it would be unwise to assume that University policy and culture alone makes it immune from the possibility of bias. Student organisations have expressed concern about the perception of bias. Anonymous or de-identified marking can assist in removing the perception of unconscious or conscious bias in assessment. Provided it is managed in a way that does not interfere with good pedagogy and feedback, the use of anonymous or de-identified marking should be investigated further.

ISSUES

Anonymous marking for assignments
Anonymous marking is currently only feasible using online or machine marking. This would mean every marker would be forced to alter marking practices and commence to mark online.

Turnitin, on the Blackboard System, allows individual academics to select anonymous marking, provided that the marking is done online. If selected the marker will see

In order to maintain this anonymity, students must not enter name or SID data in the body of the assignment.

While anonymous marking is in operation, it will have a significant impact on administration of assignments.
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- With anonymous marking enabled all students assignments must be marked completely on-line. There is no option for individual markers to decide how to mark.
- Grades transferred from GradeMark, then modified in Blackboard do NOT transfer back into Turnitin GradeMark. Adding a grade via GradeMark is a one way only process.
- Staff need to consider what is to be done about late submissions, as student identities will be often known for late assignments. (Further checking would be needed to see if we can undo this by permitting late assignments and then adjusting settings within TII.)
- Where a tutor suspects collusion or academic dishonesty in the process, they will have to wait until after the post-date for identities to be revealed. This may delay action against students significantly.
- A post date must be set when the assignment is created. All marking must be completed before this date. If marking is not completed before the Post Date, anonymity will be switched off and student names will be visible. This will add significant pressure into the marking process.
- Recording non-submissions or checking and reminding students who may have forgotten to submit will not be possible. Anonymity is absolute – when turned on, there is no way for academics, administrators or even Blackboard system administrators to determine which students have submitted, or not submitted, until the assignment Post Date.
- Independent double marking will not be possible. If you need to record grades for individual students during the marking and moderation process (e.g. to record first marker's grade, second marker's grade) it will be impossible. Only one marker can mark. After that any other marker must wait for the post date and identity to be known before they can mark.

There is also a pedagogic or practical difficulty with anonymous marking. There are a large number of academics who are not able and or willing to mark online. Unless all markers agree to mark anonymously and learn how to do so, a new bias will arise between assessments that were marked anonymously and those that were not.

Anonymous marking for exams

There is no system available to effectively make exam marking anonymous.

There are systems in place which attempt to provide anonymity. York University in Canada uses a system of double envelopes. The exam script contains no name or SID. The script is placed in an envelope which contains the name and SID of the student. This envelope is placed into another slightly large envelop that has no identity details. Markers are instructed to carefully reach into the inner envelope without pulling it out and extract the script. The script is marked and returned to the inner envelope. A different person collects all marked scripts, removes them from the outer envelope and then enters the marks into a spreadsheet. The process is cumbersome, environmentally not friendly and not really effective since a slip of movement will reveal names. Durham University issues students with a unique exam number for each exam. Individual markers have no ability to lookup the identify of student who holds that exam number. Exams are marked and then an administrator with access to the exam number enters the marks for the exams. Identity issues where students have forgotten their unique exam number has proven an issue with this system.

There are other systems in place in other universities, each with their own good points but all with drawbacks.

Anonymous marking for presentations, labs etc.

There is no system to allow anonymous marking of presentations or lab type assessments.

De-Identified marking for assignments

De-identified marking uses the SID only. All other features of identification are removed. The SID contained within the assignment allows de-identified marking if carried out either online or when printed.

Students are directed to only use the SID, or group name for group assignments, as a header on all pages of the assignment. Coversheets only use SID and limit other identifying features as which tutorial. The file name should similarly only contain the SID. Any aspect that could serve as identity is replaced with SID. 31012345BUSS1000SEM12016ESSAY
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If marking online, all a marker will see is

If printed for paper marking, the marker will see

In this hypothetical case, there are several legal issues that arise. This essay will analyze facts in accordance with contractual law in order to give Candy advices for her right and obligations and three main issues will be discussed as followed.

**Consideration and negligent misrepresentation**
The main issue of this scenario is whether the oral promise from Blair, the offerer, that

There is no chance of losing an assignment or not knowing who belongs to an assignment. While online, the system tracks the assignment which can always be matched to a student. There can be no "unnamed" or orphaned assignments. If printed, as long as the author added their SID as a header, the SID will appear on each page. Should an author forget to add the SID, a print and spool tool, developed by the Business School, will add the SID to the assignment as part of the printing process.

De-identified marking of assignments is easily achieved following training of academics and students.

**De-identified marking for exams**

De-identified marking for exam scripts could be achieved by having students write only their SID and not their name on scripts. Identity checks by Exam Invigilators will remain the same using the SID, if necessary.

Data entry of marks using SID is ultimately more effective than by name since each SID can refer to one and only one student. At the moment anecdotal evidence suggests a proportion of requests to change marks are on the basis that the person entering the data confused two students with the same or similar name. However, some staff involved in data entry find names easier to recognize at sight than SIDs, and checking may be necessary. A change to data entry by SID is feasible with minimal change to processes or training.

**De-identified marking for presentations, labs etc.**

There is no system to allow de-identified marking of presentations or lab type assessments where the teacher is also the marker. Alternate methods of marking can be used that will achieve greater transparency and certainty of the marks obtained. Use of external markers for these assessments may serve as a partial removal of any potential bias due to knowledge of individual students. Use of two markers, marking independently or ‘blind’ will increase transparency.
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Recommendation

Amend the Coursework Policy 2014 and associated procedures to require that all assignment and examination marking be de-identified. Students should identify themselves by SID only on examination papers and written assignments and filename protocols.

Policies should be brought into line with a rule:
- All coursework that contributes to the final grade for any unit at any level shall be marked de-identified, wherever possible.
- Where marking cannot de-identified, other methods should be used that increase the accuracy and transparency of the marking process.

IMPLEMENTATION

Following discussion at SEG Education and the SEG, this proposal will be forwarded to the ASPC, Undergraduate Studies Committee and Academic Board for approval. Once agreement has been reached, the Education Portfolio will consult with faculties, and assist and provide resources for the development of revised and new policies and procedures. These will be combined with other recommendations on the conduct of examinations currently being conducted in the DVC Registrar portfolio and brought to SEG Education, SEG and the Academic Board in 2016 for approval by the end of the year, with the intention to introduce the new policy in 2017. This recommendation provides the policy framework for the development of those procedures.

COMMUNICATION

The de-identified marking framework will be discussed at the Academic Board and in ongoing consultation between the Education Portfolio and faculties in revision of existing policy and procedures.
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<td>It is proposed to reform the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies (BIS) by changing its constitution such that the new BIS would have oversight of interdisciplinary non-award courses (as per the Continuing Education Strategy), the new degree proposed in the University Strategy, and the new interdisciplinary units to be developed under that Strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee approve and recommend to the Academic Board:

- the attached proposed changes to the Constitution of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies, and
- the corollary changes to the course approvals process

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper proposes a changed Constitution and membership for the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies to accommodate the University Strategic Plan 2016-2020’s ambition to embed more interdisciplinary experiences across the undergraduate curriculum, including the development of the proposed Bachelor of Advanced Studies and its attendant Open Learning Environment, Sydney Research Seminars and projects. In addition, the changes to the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies are key to delivering the implementation of the University’s Continuing Education Strategy.
BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

The University Strategic Plan 2016-2020, endorsed by Senate in March, outlines an intention to manage interdisciplinary degrees, in particular the proposed new Bachelor of Advanced Studies, via the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies (BIS). It is envisaged that the BIS will also have responsibility for the proposed interdisciplinary components of the new curriculum, such as the Open Learning Environment the Sydney Research Seminars and any interdisciplinary projects.

In addition, the Continuing Education Strategy, which was fully endorsed by SEG in 2015, recommends that:

- The Dean of each Faculty (or delegate) should assume responsibility for the strategic value and quality of continuing education courses in the domain of faculty expertise, either directly where a program is wholly within the orbit of their expertise, or jointly through the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies, where programs touch on the expertise of multiple faculties. This should include:
  - Formal approval for the appointment of staff to teach in a non-award course;
  - Approval of the purpose and educational approach for the course;
  - A systematic closed-loop approach to monitoring course quality (e.g. use of a brief feedback tool with some standard University items).

The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education) should be given overall responsibility for coordination and whole-of-University monitoring of quality and strategic fit, ensuring that information is collected from faculties and the BIS and reported through to the Senior Executive Group and the Academic Board.

As it is currently constituted, the BIS may only supervise the award of cross-faculty qualifications as listed in the related Senate resolutions and has no current responsibilities for non-award courses. At present, only an interdisciplinary PhD is overseen by the BIS. The Board has met five times since its establishment in 2013, with the last two meetings occurring by circulation. It has dealt almost exclusively with PhD admission to the China Studies Centre, although in late 2015 it also approved the pan-faculty online HDR Units of Study.

ISSUES

As the University moves to increase the interdisciplinary focus of the undergraduate curriculum, and to introduce the proposed new Bachelor of Advanced Studies, the governance of these academic programs will need to be considered. In particular, the BIS will be required to:

- Supervise the award of the Bachelor of Advanced Studies
- Maintain oversight of the Open Learning Environment and its curriculum
- Provide academic oversight of the interdisciplinary Sydney Research Seminars and projects offered in the new curriculum

The BIS would operate in the same manner in regards to these responsibilities as faculty boards currently operate in regards to their discipline-specific courses. Thus, it would become the functional equivalent of a faculty board in relation to the course approval process. In this role, it would formulate and approve the curriculum, approve the degree resolutions for the Bachelor of Advanced Studies and recommend them to the Academic Board. Under the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015, it would have approval authority for units of study and would report these to the Board for noting. It would also have responsibility for assessment of the units. Unless a contrary indication is made in the degree resolutions, the Chair of the BIS would consider faculty level appeals against academic decisions (this matter should, in any event, be clarified in the degree resolutions).

In addition, the BIS is required, under the Continuing Education Strategy, to have academic oversight of interdisciplinary non-award courses. This could be done via a subcommittee of the BIS, which would make recommendations to the BIS on non-award courses, with BIS approval the final step in any non-award course approval process.

These changes are reflected in the revised Constitution at Attachment 1 and the course approval process in the diagram at Attachment 2.

Changes to the membership of the BIS are also necessary to reflect its redesigned role. Representatives of the Deans of Faculties who offer units within the proposed Bachelor of Advanced Studies should be added to
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the membership. In addition, faculties who deliver non-award courses should be added to the membership of the non-award subcommittee, with the chair of that subcommittee also sitting on the BIS, along with the Director of the Centre for Continuing Education.

CONSULTATION

Broad consultation was undertaken during the development of the University Strategy and by the Continuing Education Working Party to develop the Continuing Education Strategy. The proposal as regards non-award courses and the structure of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies has also been discussed with the Continuing Education Steering Group, which includes the Chair of the Academic Board and the Director of the Centre for Continuing Education.

IMPLEMENTATION

Following ASPC and Academic Board endorsement, this proposal will go to Senate for agreement as it affects the constitution of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies. Once agreement has been reached, the Board will be established and the secretariat to the Board provided by the Provost’s portfolio. Establishing the BIS as early as possible in 2016 is key to consultation on the proposal for the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, the development of the new units of study through the Curriculum Development Fund, and the concurrent audit and transition of courses from the Centre of Continuing Education.

COMMUNICATION

Changes to the Board and its new role will be communicated to faculties and portfolios via staff news and to Deans at SEG and its relevant committees. Relevant Deans will be asked to nominate members to the Board.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Proposed Constitution for the new Board of Interdisciplinary Studies
Attachment 2 – Schematic of Board of Interdisciplinary Studies’ role in the course approval process
Resolutions of Senate

Board of Studies in Interdisciplinary Studies

1. The Board of Interdisciplinary Studies shall comprise the following persons:
   (a) the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor or his/her nominee, who will be the Chair of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies;
   (b) the deans or their nominees a member of every faculty that offers interdisciplinary units or units available for credit towards the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, appointed by the faculty board faculties contributing to cross-faculty degrees, diplomas and certificates administered by the Board;
   (c) the course coordinator(s) of the cross-faculty degrees, diplomas and certificates administered by the Board;
   (d) the directors or their nominees of the Charles Perkins Centre, the China Studies Centre and the Southeast Asian Studies Centre;
   (e) the Director of the Centre for Continuing Education and the Head of the Open Learning Environment;
   (f) a representative of the academic administrators of the faculties contributing to cross-faculty degrees, diplomas and certificates administered by the Board who will be appointed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) and Registrar;
   (g) the course co-ordinator(s) of the cross-faculty degrees, diplomas and certificates administered by the Board;
   (h) the Chair of the Non-Award Sub-Committee of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies as set out in clause 9(c);
   (i) not more than two students enrolled in those cross-faculty degrees, diplomas and certificates administered by the Board, appointed by the Academic Board on the nomination of the Chair of the Academic Board elected annually in the manner prescribed by resolution of the Senate; and
   (j) co-opted members appointed by resolution of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.

2. The Members:
   (a) are appointed in accordance with sections 1 (d)-(h) and (e) and (f) shall hold office for a period of two years commencing on 1 January following their appointment;
   (b) Members shall be eligible for reappointment or re-election;
   (c) A person shall cease to hold office if that person ceases to hold the qualifications in respect of which he or she was eligible to hold office.
   (d) If a vacancy occurs in the office of a member appointed in accordance with sections 1(d) (b), (e) and (f) the vacancy may be filled in like manner to the appointment and the person so appointed shall hold office for the balance of the term of the person being replaced.
   (e) The members of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies may elect a deputy chair from amongst the members appointed in accordance with section 1(b) who shall in the event of the absence or inability of the Chair to act through illness or any other cause, be deemed to be, and have the powers and duties of the Chair.

NOTE: As section 1(b) has been amended, the Committee may want to consider whether a different description is required regarding the election of a deputy chair.

Quorum

3. At any meeting of the Board, six members shall form a quorum.

The functions of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies

4. The Board shall supervise the award of the cross-faculty qualifications listed in the related Senate resolutions (Degrees, diplomas and certificates of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies) and shall:
   (a) provide academic oversight for the quality and outcomes of the teaching, curriculum, supervision, progression and assessment in the cross-faculty degrees, diplomas and certificates;
   (b) admit to and determine candidature for the cross-faculty degrees, diplomas and certificates;
   (c) admit to candidature, appoint supervisors and examiners of candidates for those higher degrees by research listed in the related Senate resolutions;
   (d) ensure the appropriate provision of course and candidature management, student support and advice is provided through the office of one or more of the participating faculties or academic units;
make recommendations to the Academic Board on matters relating to the cross-faculty qualifications; and

consider and report on all matters referred to it by Senate, the Academic Board, or the Vice-Chancellor.

5. In relation to the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, the Board shall have the following responsibilities:

(a) supervise the award of Bachelor of Advanced Studies;
(b) provide academic oversight for the quality and outcomes of the teaching, curriculum, supervision, progression and assessment in the Bachelor of Advanced Studies;
(c) approve units of study and majors available for credit in the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, and make recommendations on the curriculum and course resolutions for the Bachelor of Advanced Studies to the Academic Board;
(d) subject to provisions in the award resolutions, admit to and determine candidature for the Bachelor of Advanced Studies or endorse admissions made by Deans of faculties offering award courses as combined programs with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies;
(e) provide academic oversight for the quality and outcomes of the teaching, curriculum and assessment of interdisciplinary non-award courses offered via the Centre for Continuing Education and approve the offering of those courses;
(f) provide academic oversight for the quality and outcomes of the teaching, curriculum and assessment of interdisciplinary courses offered via: the Open Learning Environment; the Sydney Research Seminars; and any interdisciplinary projects offered and approve such units;
(g) ensure, for students enrolled in the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, the appropriate provision of course and candidature management, student support and advice is provided through the office of one or more of the participating faculties or academic units; and
(h) make recommendations to the Academic Board on matters relating to the Bachelor of Advanced Studies.

6. In relation to other qualifications, the Board shall have the following responsibilities:

(a) approve units, minors and majors to be made available in the shared pool for all generalist degrees as defined in the Coursework Policy;
(b) report to the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education) on non-award courses approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies; and
(c) consider and report on all matters referred to it by Senate, the Academic Board, or the Vice-Chancellor.

Sub-committees

7. The Board of Interdisciplinary Studies may create sub-committees and delegate to those sub-committees, the authority to make recommendations to the Board in connection with certain of its functions.

(a) There shall be a Non-Award Sub-Committee.

8. The Non-Award Sub-Committee shall have the following responsibilities:

(a) provide academic oversight for the quality and outcomes of the teaching, curriculum, supervision, progression and assessment in interdisciplinary non-award courses; and
(b) report to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) on the quality and strategic fit of interdisciplinary non-award courses.

9. The Non-Award Sub-Committee shall comprise the following persons:

(a) the Deans or their nominees of every faculty that offers interdisciplinary non-award courses; and
(b) the Director of the Centre for Continuing Education.
(c) The Chair, elected by the sub-committee, will serve on the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies as a representative of the sub-committee.
Attachment 2 – Schematic of Board of Interdisciplinary Studies’ role in the course approval process

- **Academic Board**
  - **Undergraduate Studies Committee**
  - **Postgraduate Studies Committee**
  - **SEG**
  - **CCPC**

- **Award courses**

- **Faculty Boards**
  - (Faculty degrees, and discipline award courses)

- **Board of Interdisciplinary Studies**
  - (B. Adv Studies and interdisciplinary non-award courses)

- **Interdisciplinary Non-award subcommittee**

- **No further approvals needed for non-award courses**
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Paper title
Curriculum Framework – Policy Amendments

Purpose
To adjust the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 and the Coursework Policy 2014 to the curriculum framework in the Strategic Plan 2016-2020

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the report on policy amendments required to implement the curriculum framework outlined in the University’s Strategic Plan 2016-2020. The Committee is further asked to note that a final set of amendments will be presented to the Committee’s next meeting on 8th June 2016.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The discussion paper “Towards a distinctive undergraduate education” (June 2015) canvassed 5 proposals on undergraduate education which, following consultation were further refined in the follow-up paper A Distinctive Undergraduate Education: Next Steps. These proposals were:

- The adoption of a common set of Graduate Qualities
- The development of a common set of definitions for course components and course rules for liberal studies degrees
- A proposed curriculum framework for bachelor degrees
- A four-year combined-degree model for liberal studied education
- Development of vertical double degree pathways

Proposals 1 and parts of proposal 3 were adopted by the Academic Board in December 2015, in the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015. This paper recommends the adoption of common definitions of course components and course rules (proposal 2) and of a four-year combined degree model (proposal 4). Proposal 5 on vertical double degrees is contingent of wider consultation with government and will be the subject of a later paper.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

In December 2015, the Academic Board approved the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015, incorporating the graduate qualities and some elements of the curriculum framework enunciated in the discussion paper “Towards a distinctive undergraduate education” (June 2015) and in the follow-up paper A Distinctive Undergraduate Education: Next Steps. The curriculum framework was discussed and it was noted that further details of the curriculum framework were the subject of ongoing development and would be brought back for further discussion and approval in the first half of 2016. Those elements have been developed further in the Generalist Undergraduate Degree Working Party and the Specialist and Professional Undergraduate Degree Working Party established by the SEG in 2015 after the release of the first discussion paper. As a result of those consultation amendments to the Coursework Policy and the Learning and Teaching Policy are proposed in order to adopt a common set of definitions (proposal 2) and a four-year combined degree model (proposal 4). Those elements are contained in the attached amendments to the Coursework Policy and the Learning and Teaching Policy as set out below.
The categorisation of bachelor degrees into two broad categories: Liberal Studies, and Specialist/Professional

Towards a Distinctive Undergraduate Education proposed a degree architecture based on Liberal Studies and Specialist/Professional degrees. While both degree would achieve the Graduate Qualities, the different educational demands necessitated a different curriculum framework. The Coursework Policy currently contains requirements for different types of Masters by Coursework (Advanced Learning and Professional). This proposal adopts a comparable framework for Bachelor degrees.

Combined degrees with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies

Towards a Distinctive Undergraduate Education proposed a combined degree model. Incorporating a common framework for the four-year combined degree model flexibility to students and allows efficiency and responsiveness in the creation of new programs, tailored to student needs

Curriculum components (Stream, Program, Major, Minor, Degree Core)

Towards a Distinctive Undergraduate Education proposed the adoption of common definitions for curriculum components which were developed further in A Distinctive Undergraduate Education: next steps and in consultation with the Generalist Undergraduate Degree working group of SEG.

Coursework Policy. Definitions now include Bachelor of Advanced Studies

- Specify two types of Bachelor Degree
- Part 17, Clause 84 (p. 62) gives requirements for both types

Learning and Teaching Policy Definitions of both types of undergraduate degree in Coursework Policy included in Learning and Teaching Policy

- Part 18 of the Policy gives detailed definitions of the components.

An earlier draft of these policies was discussed at the SEG - Education committee of 11 April and some changes have been made. The changes include:

- improvements to wording suggested by Megan Kemmis
- clarification that graduates of liberal studies degrees must also demonstrate the graduate qualities (Coursework Policy 84, (1) (b): the same stipulation is already made for Professional/Specialist degrees at 84 (2) (b)
  Note: a whether a bachelor degree i
- a draft definition of the concept of "1000" level, "2000" level, etc. units (L & T Policy Part 18 (11), (f))
- definitions for graduate qualities and changes to the definition of unit of study, major, minor

ISSUES

Governance. The interdisciplinary aspects of the new curriculum (the governance and administration of the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, the governance of the shared pool of majors, minors and electives, and the Open Learning Environment) will be through the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies and this is canvassed in a separate proposal.

Review of Existing Programs. Review of existing programs to align with common curriculum components and degree architecture. The Education Portfolio will consult with faculties during April/May to revise existing programs to align with the curriculum framework and four-year combined model. Part of this consultation will be agreement on support and resources needed to implement the framework for 2018. Ongoing coordination and consultation will take place through the Generalist Undergraduate Degree Working Party and the Specialist and Professional Undergraduate Degree Working Party.

Creation of Bachelor of Advanced Studies. The Bachelor of Advanced Studies is an interdisciplinary degree and will be administered by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies. Development will take place as part of the
consultations described above and will be managed by the Education Portfolio. Consultation will take place through the SEG Education Committee, the SEG, the Generalist Undergraduate Degree Working Party and the Specialist and Professional Undergraduate Degree Working Party and the Academic Board.

Common components. The Discussion Paper Towards a Distinctive Sydney Undergraduate Education (2015) Proposed the development of common components as part of the curriculum framework. The follow-up paper A Distinctive Undergraduate Education: Next Steps refined the definition of program, major, minor for liberal studies degrees. During the next consultation round it is proposed that the question of whether these definitions can also be adopted for professional/specialist degrees that use majors, minors and/or programs as part of their curriculum framework.

These changes are reflected in the revised Coursework Policy at Attachment 1 and the revised Learning and Teaching Policy in Attachment 2.

CONSULTATION

There was university-wide and widespread stakeholder consultation and market research following release of the discussion paper, Towards a Distinctive Undergraduate Education. The Academic Board gave in-principle support to the curriculum framework including the development of common components and four-year combined degree model in December 2015, noting that further proposals would come back for approval in the first half of 2016. These elements have now been developed further by the Generalist Undergraduate Degree and Specialist/Professional Undergraduate Degree working parties established by SEG in 2015 and the results of this consultation are presented for discussion and approval.

IMPLEMENTATION

Following discussion at SEG Education and the SEG, this proposal will be forwarded to the ASPC, Undergraduate Studies Committee and Academic Board for approval. Once agreement has been reached, the Education Portfolio will consult with faculties, and assist and provide resources for the development of revised and new degree resolutions reflecting the graduate qualities, common curriculum components and four-year combined degree model. These will be brought to CCPC, SEG Education, SEG, the Undergraduate Studies Committee and the Academic Board in August 2016 for approval by the end of the year, with the intention to introduce the new degrees in 2018. This recommendation provides the policy framework for the development of those programs.

COMMUNICATION

The new curriculum framework will be discussed at the Academic Board and in ongoing consultation between the Education Portfolio and faculties in revision of existing programs, creation of the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, writing of revised and new Degree Resolutions, and the embedding and assessment of the Graduate Qualities.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Proposed amendments to the Coursework Policy
Attachment 2 – Proposed amendments to the Learning and Teaching Policy
Attachment 1 – Proposed amendments to the Coursework Policy

5 Definitions

(1) In this policy:

**Bachelor of Advanced Studies** means the Bachelor degree available as a combined degree with every Liberal Studies and Specialist/Professional bachelor degree as set out in the degree resolutions.

**major** means a defined sequence of units of study, which develops depth of expertise in a field of study program of study, generally comprising specified units of study from the later stages of an award course as specified in Clause 18 of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

**minor** means a defined set of units of study, which develops coherent knowledge and skills in a field of study as set out in Clause 18 the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

**open learning environment** means a shared pool of units of study of 0, 2 or 6 credit points approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies and available to all students according to the degree resolutions of the award in which they are enrolled.

**program** each award course is composed of various units of study. The way the units are put together for an award course is referred to as a student’s ‘program’. Means a combination of units of study that develops expertise in a multi-disciplinary domain or professional or specialist field and includes at least one recognised major in a field of study as set out in clause 18 of the Learning and Teaching Policy.

**undergraduate degree** means an undergraduate award course at Bachelor level that achieves at least the earning outcomes specified for level 9 of the AQF. The University offers two types of Bachelor degrees:

- **Liberal Studies Degrees**: a program of study at Bachelor level of three years developing disciplinary expertise and broader skills
- **Professional/Specialist Bachelor Degrees**: a program of study at Bachelor level developing disciplinary or professional expertise for a specific profession or career specialisation and broader skills.

**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 6 credit points (except in the case of units in the open learning environment as defined in the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015).

Units of study are offered at different levels indicated by the first integer of the numeric part of the alpha numeric code, and are referred to as ‘1000’ level, ‘2000’ level.

**Note:** Further discussion of units of study and levels is contained in clause 18 of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.
PART 17 AWARD COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Note 50: 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 course resolutions; and
- satisfy the requirements of the Coursework Rule and any applicable policy
See clause 5.1 of the Coursework Rule.

84 Bachelor degrees

(1) The Bachelor degree:
   (a) is a program of liberal, specialist or professional learning and education; and
   (b) builds on prior secondary or tertiary study.

(2) All Bachelor award courses will meet the requirements for Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees, or Specialist/Professional Bachelor Degrees, or the requirements of the Bachelor of Advanced Studies as set out in the degree resolutions.

(3) Award course requirements for Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees
   (a) All students enrolled in a Liberal Studies Bachelor Degree must complete a total of 144 credit points including
      (i) the units of study in the degree core (to a maximum of 24 credit points);
      (ii) a major or a program from the degree’s list of available majors in degree resolutions;
      (iii) elective modules from the open learning environment (12 credit points); and
      (iv) a minor from a shared pool of minors offered across Liberal Studies degrees.
   (b) Every Liberal Studies degree should offer the opportunity for students to complete:
      (i) a second major from a shared pool of majors offered across Liberal Studies degrees;
      (ii) elective units of study from a shared pool available across all Liberal Studies degrees;
      (iii) elective modules from a shared on-demand pool in the open learning environment (0-2 credit points, recognised on transcript); and
      (iv) combine the Liberal Studies degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies as set out in the degree resolutions for the Bachelor of Advanced Studies.

(4) Award course requirements for Specialist/Professional Bachelor Degree
   (a) Every student must achieve a minimum of 144 credit points and demonstrate the graduate qualities.
   (b) Specialist/Professional Bachelor degrees may offer the opportunity for students to complete a combined degree program with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies as set out in the degree resolutions for the Bachelor of Advanced Studies.

84A Masters by coursework

The Masters by coursework degree:...
Non-Confidential

Attachment 2 – Proposed amendments to the Learning and Teaching Policy

6 Definitions
(1) In this policy:

- **Bachelor of Advanced Studies**
  means the Bachelor degree available as a combined degree with every Liberal Studies and Specialist/Professional bachelor degree as set out in the degree resolutions.

- **graduate qualities**
  are the qualities the University has agreed are necessary to contribute effectively to contemporary society as set out in Part 2 Section 7 of this policy.
  means the outcomes of a University of Sydney education. It is synonymous with the term graduate attributes.

- **major**
  means a defined sequence of units of study, which develops depth of expertise in a field of study.

  **Note:** Further discussion of major is contained in clause 18

- **minor**
  means a defined set of units of study, which develops coherent knowledge and skills in a field of study.

  **Note:** Further discussion of minor is contained in clause 18

- **open learning environment**
  means a shared pool of units of study of 0, 2 or 6 credit points approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies and available to all students according to the degree resolutions of the award in which they are enrolled.

- **undergraduate award course**
  means a coursework award course leading to the award of an Associate Diploma, Diploma, Advanced Diploma or Bachelor degree.

- **undergraduate degree**
  means an undergraduate award course at Bachelor level that achieves at least the learning outcome specified for Level 7 of the AQF. The University offers two types of Bachelor degrees:
  - Liberal Studies Degrees: a program of study at Bachelor level of three years developing disciplinary expertise and broader skills.
  - Professional/Specialist Bachelor Degrees: a program of study at Bachelor level developing expertise and skills for a specific profession or career specialisation.

- **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 6 credit points (except in the case of units in the open learning environment).

  Units of study are offered at different levels indicated by the first integer of the numeric part of the alpha numeric code, and are referred to as “1000” level, “2000” level.

  **Note:** Further discussion of units of study and levels is contained in clause 18.
16 Curriculum framework for undergraduate education

(1) The curriculum framework for new and revised undergraduate awards must include the following core components:.....

18 Components of award courses for undergraduate degrees

(1) A stream consists of a program of related units of study which are structured to provide the student with a depth of specialist knowledge of a discipline or field.

(2) Streams:
   (a) are identified by the name of the stream of the award;
   (b) are recorded on the testamur upon graduation;
   (c) apply to both senior and junior levels; and
   (d) are not restricted to a specific number of credit points.

(3) Streams can be conceptualised as separate pathways within an award course for admission purposes but are linked to a set of other streams within the award course through shared nomenclature, shared course components and/or shared rules. Examples of specialist award courses include: Civil Engineering; Physiotherapy; Music Performance; and Oral Health.

(4) A program must develop expertise in a multi-disciplinary domain or a professional field and include at least one major in a field of study.

Programs:
   (a) are a combination of units of study that develops expertise in a multi-disciplinary domain or a professional or specialist field and includes a recognised major in a field of study.
   (b) in undergraduate degrees, a program comprises up to $4 \times 1000$-level + $4 \times 2000$-level + $4 \times 3000$-level + $8 \times 4000$-level units ($\leq 24+24+24+48$ credit points) and includes:
      (i) an embedded major; and
      (ii) at least 2 units in any core degree block;
   (c) are recorded on the student transcript upon graduation.

(5) Majors:
   (a) comprise a defined number of units in a field of study including, for undergraduate award courses, at a minimum 36 credit points at 2000 and 3000 level; and
   (b) in undergraduate degree programs, comprise 8 units of study (48 credit points), of which two are at 1000-level and the eight units overall fit within the envelope of a major template of $2 \times 1000$-level + $3 \times 2000$-level + $4 \times 3000$-level units and include:
      (i) 1 unit at 3000-level involving completion of a project requiring the integration and application of disciplinary knowledge and skills; and
      (ii) 1 unit at 3000-level requiring the application of disciplinary skills and knowledge in an interdisciplinary context; and
      (iii) are recorded on the student transcript upon graduation.

(6) Minors:
   (a) comprise a defined number of units of study in a field of study sequence of units of study that develops foundational expertise in a field of study.
   (b) in undergraduate degree programs, comprise 6 units of study (36 credit points), of which two are at 1000-level and the six units overall fit within the envelope of a major template of $2 \times 1000$-level + $3 \times 2000$-level + $2 \times 3000$-level units; and

Respect is a core value of the Academic Board
(c) are recorded on the student transcript at the completion of the award course.

(7) **A Degree core**

(a) is a set of units of study that develops required knowledge and skills for the degree.

(b) in Liberal Studies undergraduate degree, comprises no more than 4 units of study at 1000-, 2000 or 3000-level (≤ 24 credit points).

(8) **A capstone experience** should be integrative, foster student autonomy and, where appropriate, include a cross-disciplinary perspective.

**Note:** See Coursework Policy 2014

(9) **Combined degrees and double degrees** must meet the learning outcomes of both component award courses.

(a) All Liberal Studies and Specialist/Professional bachelor degrees may be combined with the Bachelor of Advanced studies as set out in the degree resolutions.

(10) Award courses may achieve depth and breadth of learning by the specification of core units and elective units.

(a) Units of study may be specified as core units if the faculty determines them to be essential to achieve the learning outcomes of the award course, major or specialisation. Core units must be completed by all students enrolled in the award course, relevant major or specialisation.

(b) Elective units are units chosen by students in order to extend their degree requirements according to their need or interests and contribute to graduate qualities. Electives are chosen from a list defined by the faculty and approved by the Academic Board.

(11) **Units of study**

(a) Units of study follow a programmed set of coherent learning experiences that lead progressively to the achievement of the learning outcomes for the unit.

(b) Units of study must be completed over one or two teaching sessions.

(c) Faculties must define learning outcomes for each unit of study which are aligned with those of the award courses in which the unit of study is offered and those of other components of award courses of which it is a part.

(d) Except in the case of ‘shell’ units, used for students undertaking study at another institution and other purposes, the learning outcomes, requirements and assessment of a unit of study must be the same for all students taking that unit of study, regardless of the award course in which they are enrolled.

(e) Student transcripts and student record files must record a single result and a single credit point value for each unit of study attempted by a student.

(f) Units of study are given an alpha-numeric code of which the first four letters indicate a code assigned to the school, department or discipline with responsibility for offering the unit, and the final four integers are a unique number identifying the unit and the level at which it is offered.

(g) The final four integers of the alpha-numeric code commence with a number that indicates the level.

(i) ‘1000’ level units are units with the generic alphanumeric code ****1xxx and indicate a unit with learning outcomes of a foundational or introductory nature designed for students in the first year of an undergraduate degree.

(ii) ‘2000’ level units are units with the generic alphanumeric code ****2xxx and indicate a unit with learning outcomes which build on prior foundational or introductory study designed for students who have completed in the first year of an undergraduate degree.

(iii) ‘3000’ level units are units with the generic alphanumeric code ****3xxx and indicate a unit with learning outcomes designed for students in the final or third year of an undergraduate
degree. Such units should enable students to demonstrate learning outcomes at a level expected for those completing an initial undergraduate degree.

(iv) ‘4000’ level units are units with the generic alphanumeric code ****4xxx and indicate advanced or honours units with learning outcomes designed for students who have already achieved the learning outcomes of students for a pass-level bachelor degree.

(v) ‘5000’ and ‘6000’ level units are units with the generic alphanumeric code ****5xxx and ****6xxx and indicate units with learning outcomes for the first and second year respectively of a postgraduate award course.

(12) Credit points and student workload

(a) Credit points measure the relative quantitative contribution of a unit of study to an award course.

(b) The full time credit point load for undergraduate and postgraduate coursework award courses is 24 credit points per semester, or 12 credit points for summer session and six credit points for the winter session. A full time credit point load for a year is 48 credit points equating to a student workload of 1500 -1800 hours per year including class time, private study and assessment preparation.

(c) The normal credit point load for a unit of study is six credit points (except in the case of units offered in the open learning environment).

(d) Units of study shared across different award courses and between different faculties must have the same credit point value in every course.

(e) Where units of study are core units in more than one award course, faculties must design units of study to meet the learning needs of students in all award courses for which the unit is a core unit.

(f) The relationship between the level of student effort in a unit of study and the credit point value of that unit must take account of all courses sharing that unit of study.

(g) Faculties must consider overall student workload in assigning credit point value as follows:

(h) 24 credit points equates to the effort expected of a full-time student, studying 36 – 48 hours per week or pro-rata for part-time students.

(i) A single credit point should therefore equate notionally to a minimum expectation of 1.5 – 2 hours of student effort per week for units of study offered over a semester.

(j) Flexibility between different units may be exercised in the allocation of credit point value to accommodate any tensions between the duration of core learning experiences and their perceived importance in achieving learning outcomes for the award course.

(k) Faculties introducing new units of study with a credit point value other than six must inform the Academic Board, explaining the rationale for deviating from the standard and addressing issues of compatibility.

(13) On academic grounds, a faculty may propose to the Undergraduate or Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board units of study with 0, 1 or 2 credit points.

(14) Units offered in the open learning environment must be 0, 2 or 6 credit points.

(15) Teaching sessions

(a) Teaching and learning in award courses must take place in standard teaching sessions or in special teaching sessions determined by faculties in a faculty calendar and approved by the Academic Board.

(b) The standard teachings sessions are first semester, second semester summer session and winter session.

(c) A semester comprises 13 weeks of programmed learning, one study week and 1 - 2 weeks for examination and assignment preparation.

(d) University semester dates, and dates for summer and winter sessions and teaching blocks must be approved by the Academic Board.
(e) A faculty may offer teaching in sessions that vary from those specified in the University Calendar, subject to the approval of the Academic Board.
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the proposed Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016, and further note that a final version will be submitted to the Committee’s next meeting.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In December 2015, the Academic Board approved the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 and noted that Procedures accompanying the Policy would be forthcoming. The Procedures update course approval processes in line with procedure agreed by the Academic Board.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

In December 2015, the Academic Board approved the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 drawing together a range of prior policies including the Management and Evaluation of Teaching Policy and the Creation, Variation and Deletion of Award Courses and Units of Study Policy. The Learning and Teaching Policy also incorporated the graduate qualities and some elements of the curriculum framework enunciated in the discussion paper “Towards a distinctive undergraduate education” (June 2015).

The Procedures were considered by the SEG Education Committee on 11 April along with proposed changes to the Coursework Policy and the Learning and Teaching Policy made in line with the Education Strategy 2016-2020. Following that discussion the current procedures have been amended to clarify that the decision as to whether a Bachelor degree is of the Liberal Studies type or the Professional/Specialist type is one which is made by the faculty and approved by the Academic Board. A final version of the procedures will come to the June meeting of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee.

ISSUES

The Procedures update course approval process to include a description of the role of the Curriculum Course and Profile Committee of SEG. This was agreed by the Academic Board but had not previously been described in Policy. Some parts of the Learning and Teaching Policy have been moved to the Procedures in line with recommendations made at the time of approval of the Policy in December 2015. If adopted consequent changes to the Policy deleting those items will be presented. Since other changes are being proposed to the Learning and Teaching Policy as part of implementing the curriculum framework of the Education Strategy, these have not been included in this proposal in order not to confuse the other issues with procedural changes.

The proposed Procedures accommodate changes in governance made under a separate proposal relating to governance of the Bachelor of Advanced Studies and interdisciplinary components in the undergraduate curriculum framework of the strategic plan.

These changes are in Attachment 1.
CONSULTATION

The Learning and Teaching Policy was developed by a working party and approved by the Academic Board in December 2015. This paper is part of the consultation for the development of the Procedures for that policy.

IMPLEMENTATION

Following discussion at the SEG Education Committee, the proposed Procedures will be forwarded to the original Learning and Teaching Working Party, the Academic Standards and Policy Committee, the Undergraduate Studies Committee and the Graduate Studies Committee and Academic Board for endorsement. After this process they will be adopted by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education) as the Policy Manager.

COMMUNICATION

The Procedures will be communicated as part of the communication strategy for the revisions to the Learning and Teaching Policy 2014.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Learning and Teaching Procedures
LEARNING AND TEACHING PROCEDURES 2016

Part 1 Preliminary

1 Purpose and application

(1) These procedures are to give effect to the Learning and Teaching Policy (“the policy”).

(2) Except to the extent that a contrary intention is expressed, these procedures bind the University, staff, students and affiliates.

2 Commencement

These procedures commence on the day after the date on which they are registered.

3 Interpretation

(1) Words and phrases used in these procedures and not otherwise defined in this document have the meanings they have in the policy.

Note: See Clause 6 of the policy.

Award name stem means

CCPC means the Curriculum and Course Planning Committee

Term means

Part 2 The nature of education at the University of Sydney

4 Learning environment

(1) Standards are monitored and set by the DVC Education portfolio. At the time of writing, learning space standards were available at http://sydney.edu.au/elearning/learningSpace/standards.shtml

Part 3 Curriculum Structure

5 Award courses

(1) The title of an award course must include the qualification type and the discipline.

(2) All award course titles must include an award name stem giving the qualification type and discipline.

(3) Award course titles may also include a stream in brackets following the stem title.
(4) Bachelor award courses must be either Liberal Studies degrees or Professional/Specialist degrees: Masters award courses must be either advanced learning degrees by coursework, professional degrees by coursework, or degrees by research.

6 Role of the Curriculum and Course Planning Committee

(1) The Curriculum and Course Planning Committee (CCPC):

(a) reviews the business case for all new course proposals from faculties with a view to encouraging collaboration between faculties and assessing financial viability, load implications and fit for the wider University strategy.

(b) provides advice to SEG to assist in its deliberations over whether to endorse the course for consideration by the Academic Board.

(2) In reviewing and recommending a new course proposal the CCPC must consider:

(i) strategic positioning,

(ii) how a proposal will meet faculty and University goals,

(iii) how it maximises potential internal collaborations,

(iv) its load implications and

(v) financial sustainability; and

(b) recommends the endorsement of new courses to the Senior Executive Group.

7 Role of Academic Board

(1) Subject to endorsement by Senate, the Academic Board approves award courses and other matters as determined in the Coursework Policy 2014 and set out in award course resolutions and tables of units of study

(2) The Academic Board may provide advice on all matters relating to the University courses and units of study.

(3) In approving a course, the Academic Board must consider the:

(a) academic need for and merit of the proposed change;

(b) aims of the program;

(c) the learning outcomes of the program, and the effectiveness of the plan for the outcomes to be developed and assessed.

(d) the alignment of the learning outcomes with the graduate qualities approved by the Academic Board, and the manner by which the graduate qualities will be developed and assessed.

(e) extent to which a proposed change has been the subject of appropriate consultation and approval within faculties and between all faculties having an academic interest in the proposed change, and with external bodies regarding accreditation;
(f) consistency of the proposal with relevant university and other relevant policies and regulation;

(g) potential impact of the proposed new course or change on university resources including the library, central information technology resources and the resources of other faculties and schools department; and

(h) presence of appropriate mechanisms to evaluate the quality delivery and academic outcomes of the proposal and to make any improvements if required.

(4) The Academic Board will normally receive proposals from its standing committees with a recommendation to approve the new course or changes.

(5) Chairs of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies Committees of Academic Board may form small working parties to consider proposals.

8 Creation, amendment and deletion of award courses and units of study

(1) When considering the introduction of a new course, the amendment of an existing course, or the deletion of an existing course or unit of study, faculties must:

(a) give adequate notification of changes given to all other faculties, including those which are offering award courses in which the unit of study is listed in the unit of study table;

(b) submit the proposal for new courses by the deadlines specified by the Academic Board and the Course and Curriculum Planning Committee

Note: the deadlines for new course submissions are given at:


(c) submit proposal that are not for new courses in time to meet requirements for inclusion in

(i) the following year’s faculty handbook;

Note: see also Clause 9 (9)

(d) consult the Curriculum and Course Planning Committee website for submission requirements, the approval process, and relevant dates; and

(e) use the approved templates for:

(i) expression of interest; and

(ii) course management.

(2) Faculties must also consider the implications for students enrolled in existing courses who may be affected by the changes and include detailed information the transitional arrangements which will apply for student already in the course in the proposal.

(3) No student can be disadvantaged by the deletion of an existing course.

9 Levels of approval

(1) The following approval process relates to all coursework award courses.
(2) Units of Study

(a) Unit coordinators recommend and faculties approve all additions, modifications or deletions to units of study under the academic direction of the faculty as they relate to award courses governed by the faculty (including interdisciplinary units within this category).

(b) Faculties recommend and the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies approves the inclusion of units of study that are under the faculty’s academic direction in the shared pool of units of study available across all liberal studies degrees.

(c) The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education) recommends, and the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies approves units of study that are not under the direction of a faculty, and the inclusion of such units in the shared pool of units of study available across all liberal studies degree.

(d) Faculties or the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education) recommend, and the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies approves units of study in the Open Learning Environment, the Sydney Research Seminars and interdisciplinary units offered to students in all liberal studies degrees, or to all students in any degree.

(e) Faculties and the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies must report approved variations to units of to the shared pool of units available across all generalist degrees to the Undergraduate or Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board as appropriate.

(3) Majors and Minors

(a) Faculties recommend and the Academic Board approves the creation or deletion of a major or minor within an award course governed by the faculty.

(b) The Board of Interdisciplinary Studies recommends and the Academic Board approves the list of majors and minors available in the Bachelor of Advanced Studies or in the shared pool of majors and minors available to all generalist degrees.

(4) Faculties or the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies recommend and the Academic Board approves:

(a) new award courses, including combined and double degrees;

(b) in the case of bachelor and masters degrees, the type of bachelor degree (liberal studies or professional/specialist degrees) or the type of masters degree (advanced learning by coursework, professional by coursework, research);

(c) alterations to existing award courses;

(d) Tables of Units of Study referred to in Degree Resolutions;

(e) substantial revision to the academic content of an award course;

(f) changes having an impact on the study options available to prospective students; and
(g) changes to the mode of delivery of a course or unit of study.

Note: Changes to the mode of delivery include changes from face to face, or blended learning to fully online learning; changes of location from a University campus to an campus operated by a third party, and changes from onshore to offshore delivery.

(5) The terms of reference of Academic Board Standing Committees must specify

(a) the functions it has the authority to approve
(b) the functions it has the authority to recommend to faculty board
(c) monitoring and oversight responsibilities
(d) any other functions

(6) The Academic Board only considers course proposals that have been endorsed by faculty boards or standing committees and by SEG.

(7) Faculty approved variations must be reported to the Undergraduate or Graduate studies Committee as appropriate and simultaneously with the finalisation of unit of study master file for the following year.

(8) Preliminary approval may be requested for new award course or changes to existing award course where proposed changes may affect students’ subject choices for Year 11 and year 12 (for example, the establishment of a pre-requisite). This provision reflects the long lead time required to give notice to year 10 students about changes to University admission requirements.

10 Course approval process

(1) All proposals for new courses require the early submission of an Expression of Interest to the SEG Curriculum and Course Planning Committee.

(2) The University has established the following process for the approval of new courses:

(a) submission by the faculty of an Expression of Interest (EOI) prior to commencement of course development. The EOI will

   (i) include the strategic rationale for introducing the course and a brief outline of the business case; and

   (ii) assist in flagging potential issues at the commencement of the development phase.

(b) the Dean of the faculty or their delegate presents the Expression of Interest to the CCPC;

(c) the CCPC considers the Expression of Interest and recommends it to SEG for endorsement;

(d) the faculty proceeds with the development of the full course proposal, using the Course Management Template.

Note: the Course Management Template is available on the Academic Board website at http://sydney.edu.au/ab/committees/courses.shtml
(e) the Dean of the faculty, or their delegate, submits the full business case for the proposal to CCPC for review;

(f) the proposal, including strategic alignment, maximising internal collaboration, financial viability, and load impacts is reviewed by the CCPC who make a recommendation to SEG;

(g) the proposal is reviewed and endorsed by SEG;

(h) the proposal is reviewed by either the Undergraduate Studies Committee or the Graduate Studies Committee and referred to the Academic Board for review and approval.

(i) the proposal is reviewed and approved by the Academic Board.

(3) Course amendments and deletions are approved by the Academic Board after consideration by the relevant standing committee of the Academic Board.

(4) Major course amendments are considered by the Academic Board and its standing committees according to the same procedure as for new course proposals but are not required to be considered by CCPC and SEG.

(5) No course or unit of study may be advertised or offered until it has been approved.

11 Time scales and key dates

(1) Proposed changes requiring approval by the Academic Board will be considered at any time.

(2) The time scale for approval is dependent upon the calendar of meeting dates for the Curriculum and Course Planning Committee, and of the relevant Academic Board standing committee (Undergraduate or Graduate Studies) and the following meeting of the Academic Board. The Calendar of meeting dates is published on the internet at:

(a) Academic Board: http://sydney.edu.au/ab/about/dates.shtml

(b) Undergraduate Studies Committee: http://sydney.edu.au/ab/committees/UG_studies/meeting_dates.shtml

(c) Graduate Studies Committee: http://sydney.edu.au/ab/committees/grad_studies/grad_studies_mtg_dates.shtml

(d) Curriculum and Course Planning Committee (CCPC): http://s1.sydney.edu.au/staff/planning/internal/ccpc/index.php

(3) It is the responsibility of faculty managers and deans to monitor the calendar of meeting dates, to take account of the consideration of proposals by working parties, and to ensure that approvals are in place by appropriate key dates.

(4) Key dates are normally established by the Academic Board and the CCPC, and include:

(a) cut-off date for notification to Year 10 students of changes that may impact on the selection of HSC subjects (e.g. changes to, or introduction of, assumed knowledge, recommended studies and/or flexible entry criteria). Proposals of this kind may be the subject of Preliminary Approval by the Provost [normally, 34 months prior to the introduction of the change];
(b) cut-off date for the UAC Guide for admissions in the subsequent calendar year [normally, 10 months prior to the introduction of the change]; and

(c) finalisation of the Units of Study Master File for the subsequent year [normally, by the end of September in the year preceding the year in which the change will apply]. After this date the Units of Study Master File may be altered only with the approval of the Registrar.

12 Course approval documentation

(1) Faculties are required to complete the Academic Board approved templates for:

(a) Expressions of Interest for new and amended courses; and

(b) Course management proposals for new courses of study, amendments to existing courses of study and the deletion of a course of study are submitted.

(2) Templates and information about the completion of the templates can be found at http://s1.sydney.edu.au/staff/planning/internal/ccpc/index.php#expofint

Part 4 Management and evaluation of learning and teaching

13 Roles and responsibilities

(1) Academic Performance and Development supervisors are responsible for the management of the overall performance of academic staff within their academic area. They ensure that academic staff are achieving the expected standards of performance, including teaching.

(2) Unit of study coordinators

(a) There is one named unit of study coordinator per unit of study.

(b) Unit of study coordinators must be available for the whole of the teaching period in which a unit of study is being provided.

(c) The unit of study coordinator who is intending an absence of one month or more must ensure that the head of department is informed that alternative arrangements should be put in place.

(d) Where an absence is foreseeable, the unit of study coordinator must notify the head of department at least one month before the intended departure date so that appropriate alternate arrangements can be put in place.

(e) If the unit of study coordinator is leaving the University, the head of department must appoint another unit of study coordinator and inform all members of academic staff who teach the unit in question.

14 Documentation and communication

(1) This part of the procedures states

(a) the standards for institutional record keeping;

(b) appropriate standards for communicating with students and staff; and

(c) managing the development of units of study, curricula and award courses.

(2) The University will publish at least annually:
(a) a University Calendar, which must publish at a minimum:
   (i) Rules made by Senate; and
   (ii) Resolutions of Senate relating to faculties and award courses.

(b) faculty handbooks, which must contain, at a minimum:
   (i) the faculty teaching calendar for the year;
   (ii) a description of the requirements for each award course offered by the faculty, including learning outcomes and curriculum;
   (iii) award course resolutions approved by the Academic Board for each award course offered by the faculty;
   (iv) faculty resolutions approved by the Academic Board for each award course offered by the faculty;
   (v) any local provisions in the faculty relating to University policy and procedures;
   (vi) a brief description of assessment and pre- and co-requisites for each unit of study offered by the faculty; and
   (vii) a description of the faculty structure, including schools, disciplines and departments.

(3) The University will maintain and publish a register of all current university policies and procedures.

Note: See the Policy Register and the University of Sydney (Policies Development and Review) Rule 2011.

(4) The Academic Board may make course resolutions which must specify, as a minimum:
   (a) the course code;
   (b) attendance patterns;
   (c) requirements for admission to candidature;
   (d) requirements for the award course, including credit point values, units of study that may be taken for credit, mandatory units of study;
   (e) streams available in the award course;
   (f) programs available in the award course;
   (g) majors available in the award course;
   (h) minors available in the award course;
   (i) degree core for the award course;
   (j) requirements for streams, majors and minors;
   (k) progression rules;
(l) restrictions on enrolment;
(m) time limits, if different from those specified in the faculty resolutions;
(n) cross institutional study or exchange, if not as specified in the faculty resolutions;
(o) requirements for admission to, and for the award of honours, if available;
(p) award of the degree including grades of the degree or grades of honours that may be awarded; and
(q) any transitional arrangements relating to the resolutions.

(5) Subject to Academic Board approval, faculties may make resolutions applying to all degrees within a certain category awarded by the faculty. These may include resolutions on:
(a) course enrolment, including enrolment restrictions, time limits, suspension, discontinuation and lapse of candidature, and recognition of prior learning;
(b) unit of study enrolment, including cross-institutional study, and international exchange;
(c) study and assessment, including attendance and participation, late submission, and arrangements, if any, for assessment;
(d) progression and award, including satisfactory progress, awards, award and grades of honours, medals, weighted average marks used in addition to the provisions of the Coursework Policy 2014; and
(e) transitional arrangements.

(6) The faculty must provide a degree outline for inclusion in the faculty handbook which contains at a minimum:
(a) the degree’s intended learning outcomes;
(b) the approved minimum learning commitments;
(c) the approved learning experiences;
(d) the assessment process and standards for the degree; and
(e) the expected prior learning.

(7) The faculty must provide a description of the award for the Australian Higher Education Statement (AHEGS).

(8) Unit of study coordinators, together with the faculty, must provide a unit of study website on the Learning Management System (LMS) which contains, at a minimum, the unit of study outline and relevant curriculum resources.

(a) Unit of study outlines and the LMS website must be available to students enrolled in the unit no later than one week prior to the commencement of the teaching session in which the unit is offered.

(b) The LMS website must contain the following information regarding the unit of study:
   (i) an introduction and rationale for the unit;
(ii) the aims and learning outcomes;

(iii) the contribution that the aims and learning outcomes of the unit make to the learning outcomes and graduate qualities for the award course;

(iv) an outline of the curriculum for the unit and a schedule of learning activities (lectures, seminars, tutorials, workshops, practicals, laboratories, online learning, field trips, work placement, independent study, other);

(v) minimum learning commitments and attendance requirements for learning activities, and guidelines on time to be allowed for private study and assessment preparation;

(vi) the assessment process, standards and criteria, including a detailed breakdown of each assessment task, its contribution to the final mark, deadlines and closing dates for submission of work;

(vii) any relevant expectations relating to group work, professionalism in work-integrated learning situations and other matters;

(viii) any penalties that apply for poor attendance, late submission;

(ix) mandatory or recommended prior learning;

Note: This information should also be provided to prospective students as early as possible through the University’s Find a course website.

(x) reference to relevant University policies, including as a minimum, procedures for Special Consideration in the Coursework Policy, Assessment Procedures, and Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy;

(xi) a notification to students indicating that participation in the unit of study permits their learning analytics to be used for the purpose of improving their experience of learning;

(xii) information, where relevant, about the recording of lectures delivered and automatically recorded in University owned lecture theatres;

(xiii) the use of the text-matching tool [similarity detecting software] on the University’s LMS for student text-based assignments;

(xiv) changes made to the unit as a result of student feedback and student experience from the previous time the unit was offered; and

(c) The LMS must be designed to include a capacity for the online submission of written assignments and, for text-based assignments, a capacity for these to be checked with similarity detection software.

(d) Unit of study outlines may also contain, where appropriate, assignment questions and assessment tasks.

(e) Changes may only be made to the nature, weighting or due date of assessment tasks after the publication of the unit of study outline in exceptional circumstances.

(f) Read-only access to LMS sites for units of study must be given to:
(i) students;
(ii) unit of study coordinators;
(iii) all teachers and tutors in the course;
(iv) any others specified by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).

Note: the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) has determined that the following shall be by
given access to unit of study LMS sites. Access by such staff is limited to the purpose
stated.

(v) Library staff to facilitate availability of library resources related to the unit of
study;

(vi) Educational Integrity Coordinators for purposes of conducting an
investigation under the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy and
Procedure

(vii) Staff of the Disability Support Office for purposes of recommending
adjustments to students registered with the Office as having a disability.

(g) Editing access to LMS sites for units of study must be provided to those specified by
the unit of study coordinator.

(9) The faculty office must:

(a) communicate the unit of study curriculum as documented in the unit of study
outline to relevant colleagues;

(b) communicate the unit of study curriculum to prospective students through a
handbook that contains:
   (i) a brief description;
   (ii) assessment;
   (iii) pre- and co- requisites;
   (iv) the relationship of the unit of study to the overall degree learning outcomes
and experience.

15 Unit of study outlines

(1) Schools are responsible for providing information about a unit of study to all students and
prospective students.

(2) Unit of study outlines will be available prior to the commencement of the teaching session in
which it is being taught.

(3) The minimum standard requirement for a unit of study outline is:

   (a) a concise statement of the learning outcomes of the unit of study;
   (b) a list of unit objectives expressed in terms of how that knowledge will be assessed;
   (c) a concise statement of the links between learning outcomes and graduate qualities;
(d) a brief description of the contribution to the unit of study of the different programs of study in which the students may be enrolled;

(e) information about academic integrity and the checking of written assignments through similarity detection software;

(f) links to compulsory modules relating to academic honesty;

(g) advice on attendance and class requirements, the methods of assessment to be used and the weighting of each assessment;

(h) basic factual information regarding names and contact details of teaching and administrative staff.

16 Academic records

(1) Upon each student’s graduation the University provides:

(a) a graduation statement (Australian Higher Education Graduation Statement) which must contain, at a minimum:
   (i) a description of the award;
   (ii) any industry or professional accreditation; and
   (iii) any other relevant outcomes.

(b) an academic transcript which is a complete record of a student’s studies at the university. It states:
   (i) the award course;
   (ii) any specialisation, stream, major or minor achieved;
   (iii) each unit of study attempted with the semester and year of the attempt, the credit point value, the mark and the grade; and
   (iv) where relevant, the grade of the degree and the grade of Honours awarded.

(c) a certificate of graduate status which lists the degree name and graduation date but not the units of study.

(d) a degree statement (testamur) which is the legal certification of the student’s degree. It states:
   (i) the degree awarded;
   (ii) the authority under which it is awarded
   (iii) the title of the award
   (iv) the name of the student to whom it is awarded;
   (v) the date of conferral;
   (vi) any specialisation or major; and
   (vii) where relevant, the grade of the degree or of honours awarded.

17 Learning environment management for third-party learning technologies.

(1) Third-party learning technologies:
(a) are web-based and mobile applications that are not managed through a contract between the University and technology suppliers;
(b) allow individuals and groups to create, engage, and share their learning experience and outcomes in the context of their programs and units of study; and
(c) are used to trial new educational functions for the improvement of the student experience.

(2) Ownership, use and influences of third-party learning technologies

(a) The appropriate ownership, use and influence of third-party learning technologies in the curriculum depends on the content in which they are employed.
(b) Ownership and risk management strategies are shared by those responsible for the introduction and use of the third-party learning technology: the University, teachers and students.

(3) Risk management of third-party learning technologies

(a) Third-party learning should not be used for assessment purposes.
(b) When the University introduces a third-party learning technology as part of the students’ learning environment, it will be responsible for:
   (i) an appropriate strategy to deal with support of the system; and
   (ii) the retrieval and storage of student activity generated by the system.
(c) When unit of study co-ordinators introduce a third-party learning technology, they:
   (i) will be responsible for an appropriate strategy to deal with support of the system and for the retrieval and storage of student activity generated by that system;
   (ii) should provide information to students on the educational purpose for the use of the system; and
   (iii) register the use of that system with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) portfolio.

(4) Trialling and evaluation strategies must accompany the use of third-party learning technologies to inform the progress and use of such systems at local, faculty and University levels of operation.

Part 5 Quality assurance processes

18 Evaluation of the student experience

(1) Excellence of the student experience is evaluated through surveys of the student experience at three levels:
   (a) the degree or program level;
   (b) the unit of study level; and
   (c) the individual teacher level.
(2) Degree or program level feedback is captured from both current students and recent graduates through two national surveys, the Student Experience Survey (SES); and the Australian Graduate Survey (AGS). Educational data analytics from these surveys are reported by the Education Portfolio Quality and Analytics Team to the wider university community, including, but not limited to:

(a) Senior Executive Group Education and Research Training Committees;
(b) Academic Board;
(c) Graduate Studies Committee of Academic Board;
(d) Undergraduate Studies Committee of Academic Board;
(e) Faculty Deans, Associate Deans and appropriate boards and committees.

(3) Unit of study level feedback is captured through the Unit of Study Survey (USS).

(a) The USS is administered online, using Sydney Student data to generate the list of units of study to be surveyed each teaching session, and to access the contact details of students enrolled in them.

**Note:** Units with less than five students enrolled will not be surveyed. This is to protect student anonymity.

(b) The USS includes 6 common quantitative items, and 2 common qualitative items and up to four faculty specific quantitative item and one qualitative item.

(c) For each unit of study, a faculty administrator is responsible for
   (i) checking that the unit of study coordinator details are correct;
   (ii) setting appropriate open and close dates for the survey; and
   (iii) indicating which faculty specific variant of the USS is to be used.

(d) Unit of study coordinators must check the details of the survey (sent as a pre-notification email two weeks prior to the survey open date. Changes should be requested through the faculty administrator.

(e) Students are emailed an invitation to participate in the USS on the survey open date. A reminder email will be emailed to all students who have not already completed the survey one week after the survey opens.

(f) Teachers may allow time in class for students to complete the survey on their smartphone, tablet or laptop.

(g) Unit of study coordinators will receive an email notification on the survey open date, and then an update one week later.

(h) Results are made available to the unit of study coordinators, the Dean, the Associate Dean, Education and other nominees of the Dean via the USS results portal.

(i) Results are made available to students. Coordinators can write a comment in response to the ratings and comments given by their students before results are released to students.
(j) Changes made to the unit as a result of student feedback and student experience from the previous time the unit was offered must be included in the LMS website for the unit of study.

19 Reviews of faculties and academic units

(1) The Academic Board and the Senior Executive Group jointly oversee reviews of faculties and academic units.

(2) One of the foci of the reviews is teaching and learning, including curriculum development and research training.

(3) The review process consists of the following stages:

(a) Initiation of the review
(b) Appointment of a review panel
(c) Review visit preparation
(d) Submission by the faculty of a self-evaluation report
(e) Review panel meetings
   (i) Preliminary
   (ii) Consensus
   (iii) Review
(f) Report of the review meeting, prepared by the Provost’s Office, in consultation with the review panel
(g) Development of an implementation plan.

Note: At the time of writing, information about Faculty Review visits is available at http://sydney.edu.au/ab/faculty_review/abr_phase4.shtml

(4) Terms of reference for Academic Board/SEG reviews of Faculties

(a) The aim of this review is to ensure the capacity of faculties to deliver teaching and learning, research and the best outcomes for society at the highest possible standard, and in a manner that is academically and financially sustainable and aligned with the University’s strategic goals.

(b) To achieve these aims the panel is asked to:

   (i) review and report on the faculty’s goals, strategy and achievements in relation to:
   (ii) teaching and learning, including curriculum development and research training,
   (iii) research and development,
   (iv) external relations,
   (v) equity issues, and
(vi) internationalisation;

(vii) assess and report on the alignment of the faculty’s goals with the University’s strategic plan;

(viii) assess and report on the allocation of resources within the faculty and the faculty’s strategies for managing and/or improving its financial performance in relation to teaching, research, other sources of income and controls on expenditure;

(ix) assess and report on the effectiveness of its organisational structure in delivering upon strategy and achieving the faculty’s goals;

(x) make recommendations on the optimisation of teaching, research and benefit to society with respect to the faculty’s goals, strategy, resource allocation and sustainability; and

(xi) assess and make recommendations on the faculty’s course profile in terms of academic excellence, demand, quality, and sustainability.

(5) Membership of the review panel

(a) The review panels will contain five members, plus the chair, and be appointed jointly by the Provost and the Chair of the Academic Board (who reserve the right if they so choose to sit on a review committee or appoint their nominee for the committee). If appropriate an additional two members may be appointed.

(b) Three senior academics with disciplinary knowledge and/or management knowledge relevant to the faculty under review, at least two of whom should be external to the University of Sydney.

(c) A senior academic from within the faculty under review who is not the dean or an associate/pro-dean.

(d) A member of the Academic Board nominated by the Chair of the Academic Board.

20 Evaluation of learning environment

(1) The quality of the educational environment is measured through student and teacher evaluations of learning spaces.

(2) Information about the evaluation of learning spaces can be found at [http://sydney.edu.au/elearning/metrics/evaluation.shtml](http://sydney.edu.au/elearning/metrics/evaluation.shtml)
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the report on the review of policies in 2016.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The University’s Policy Management Unit regularly reminds policy owners of policies and procedures which require review. Attached is the most current list of all policies currently requiring review, with suggestions on how best to deal with each of them. A consolidated pack of the starred policies on this list will be provided separately.

The major policies to be reviewed from the attached list are:

- The Cotutelle Scheme Policy;
- The Establishment and Award of Scholarships and Prizes Policy;
- The Scholarships Policy; and
- Scholarships: Prizes and Scholarships - Academic Board Resolutions

It is suggested that the last three be considered for amalgamation into a single policy and that discussions be held with the Deputy Registrar and the Head of Fees and Scholarships to develop a review strategy. It is recommended that the Cotutelle Scheme Policy be referred to the Graduate Studies Committee and the PhD Award Sub-Committee for their advice.

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) has advised that his portfolio will be submitting amendments to the Assessment Procedures 2011 to the Committee’s meeting on 8th June. These amendments are the result of a review of the University’s examination procedures.

Lastly, it has been suggested that guidelines be developed for the award of degrees aegrotat or posthumously. This would not be a policy document, but would provide guidance to faculties on how to determine whether or not a degree can be awarded in this manner and what advice should be provided to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) in support of a recommendation to award.
Background indicates document presently under review

**ACADEMIC BOARD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>REVIEW STATUS</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDOC2011/215</td>
<td>Code of Conduct for Students 2005</td>
<td>Not started. This is to be reviewed as part of implementing the AMP Taskforce recommendations</td>
<td>Seek advice on review from Director Education Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDOC2011/192</td>
<td>Conjoint Ventures in Postgraduate Courses Policy 1999</td>
<td>Not started</td>
<td>Refer to OGC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDOC2011/221</td>
<td>Cotutelle Scheme Policy 2008</td>
<td>Not started</td>
<td>Refer to Graduate Studies Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDOC2011/71</td>
<td>Delegations of Authority - Academic Functions</td>
<td>Initial review stage only. Work underway on mapping academic governance documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDOC2011/182</td>
<td>Establishment and Award of Scholarships and Prizes Policy 2008</td>
<td>Not started</td>
<td>Meet with Head of Fees and Scholarships to discuss review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDOC2011/166</td>
<td>Research Fellows: Conditions Policy 2007</td>
<td>Not started. Query if this should be with Provost or HR?</td>
<td>Refer to Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDOC2011/211</td>
<td>Scholarships Policy 2005</td>
<td>Not started</td>
<td>Meet with Head of Fees and Scholarships to discuss review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDOC2011/212</td>
<td>Scholarships: Prizes and Scholarships - Academic Board Resolutions 1990</td>
<td>Not started</td>
<td>Meet with Head of Fees and Scholarships to discuss review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDOC2011/217</td>
<td>Stu-Vac Policy 1993</td>
<td>Not started</td>
<td>Recommend removal from Policy Register – to be added to Standards and Guidelines website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDOC2011/218</td>
<td>Sydney Summer School: Policy Document 2001</td>
<td>Not started. Query if this should be with Provost?</td>
<td>Refer to Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDOC2011/54[v2]</td>
<td>University of Sydney (Academic Governance) Rule 2003 (as amended). Last amended 2010</td>
<td>Not started – to be reviewed after delegations and review of Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conjoint Ventures in Postgraduate Courses

Approved by: Academic Board on 11 August 1999
Date of effect: 12 August 1999

1. Preamble

(1) ‘Conjoint ventures', where two or more institutions cooperate to provide a unit or course of study to students, are of especial interest in the rapidly changing area of coursework postgraduate studies.

(2) Conjoint ventures offer the potential for increased flexibility, diversity, and disciplinary specialization of university studies. They are premised in the notion that universities add to the value of their course offerings through a cooperative deployment of their resources across institutional boundaries.

(3) Whilst conjoint ventures undoubtedly raise the potential for difficulties of an academic-logistic nature, and these potential hazards must be addressed in the planning and preparation of such courses, their potential for a positive impact upon university cultures will go some way to redress the difficulties. Conjoint ventures open up their participating institutions to cross-fertilisation, including enhanced reconciliation between the protocols and practices of separate institutions.

(4) The University of Sydney aims to provide the highest quality courses to its postgraduate students and potential postgraduate enrollees. The University is committed to the development of conjoint ventures in the field of postgraduate coursework along lines which are compatible with standing University commitments to equity, administrative transparency and efficiency, and the rigorous pursuit of academic excellence.

2. Background information

(1) The University has been involved in conjoint ventures of varying kinds for many years. The assumption behind the need to develop a University policy is that conjoint ventures are likely to increase in number, due to the substantial academic benefits that may be derived from them, and that there is consequently a pressing need to ensure systematically that courses under such ventures meet basic academic standards.

(2) Arrangements have existed, for example, between individual departments at the University of Sydney and individual departments at UNSW or UTS whereby students enrolled for a degree at one institution could complete one or more units of study at another institution, to count towards the award program at their
Such arrangements have been based upon differing levels of formality: in some instances students have enrolled at the other institution as "non-degree", "non-award" or "miscellaneous" students; in other cases they have enrolled in a unit of study at their "home" institution but have attended classes at another institution and had the result recorded on their transcript (and the "home" department has paid the department in the other institution). These types of arrangements have often been established in order to rationalise resources in the metropolitan area.

In 1997 approval was given by the Academic Board and Senate for the introduction of two innovative conjoint ventures: that in Public History and that of cotutelle arrangements.

The Joint Program of the University of Sydney and the University of Technology, Sydney provides that all candidates for the Master of Letters in Public History, the Master of Arts in Public History, a Graduate Diploma in Public History or the Graduate Certificate in Public History enrol initially at UTS. After one or two semesters candidates may elect to transfer their candidatures to the University of Sydney. The institution at which they complete their award program and from which they receive their award is determined by where they complete the majority of their coursework. The cotutelle framework established by the French Government is designed to establish and develop partnerships between French and other research units which include the facilitation of movement of French and other doctoral candidates under joint supervision arrangements. The outcome of a joint doctoral thesis submission is that the candidate, following an agreed single examining process, receives a doctoral award from each institution, qualified by the statement that the degree was obtained under a "cotutelle" agreement. The candidate benefits under this arrangement in that he or she has the opportunity to work in two countries and obtains awards that are recognised in both the French and English speaking worlds, thus facilitating professional mobility. The advantages of such agreements extend beyond the benefit to the individual candidate, however, and should be seen in the context of enhanced research cooperation between the two institutions and the two supervisors concerned.

3. Policy

University policy on conjoint ventures in postgraduate coursework, as adopted by the Academic Board at its meeting on 11 August 1999, is as follows:

(1) A demonstrable connection between conjoint ventures and the realisation of increased flexibility, diversity, and disciplinary specialisation of university studies must be maintained and understood at all times.

(2) Any conjoint venture proposal must be wholly compatible with minimum standards and practices, as promulgated within the University of Sydney.

(3) A transparent and equitable rationale must be explicitly provided, in the development of any conjoint venture, for associated fees structures and for the allocation to students of academic and administrative support, including facilities.

(4) Administrative structures and academic requirements, including assessment practices, must be clear in any conjoint venture proposal, with any departures
from the policy and/or standard practice of the University of Sydney explicitly acknowledged and directly justified.

4. **Administrative aspects of implementation**

   Any arrangement to offer a unit of study or course under a conjoint venture arrangement is classified as a "major change" and, as such, is subject to:

   (1) the Guidelines for Inter-institutional agreements; and

   (2) the Academic Board's policy on "Proposals for new or amended postgraduate courses".

   These documents are on the Web and are accessible through the "University Policies" index. Copies are also available from Faculty Secretaries.
Cotutelle Scheme

Approved by: Academic Board on 13 October 1999
Last amended: 10 December 2008
Date of effect: 11 December 2008

1. Background

1.1 In February 1998, Senate approved amendments to the PhD resolutions providing for the establishment of cotutelle agreements whereby, if the necessary conditions for joint candidature had been met, a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy could also receive a doctorate from another University in respect of that candidature, each testamur acknowledging the circumstances under which the award was made.

1.2 These arrangements were made in response to an initiative of the French Government designed to establish and develop partnerships between French and other research units which include the facilitation of movement of French and other doctoral candidates under joint supervision arrangements. Cotutelle arrangements exist between French universities and universities in a number of other countries.

1.3 The prime intent of such agreements is that they form part of an ongoing or developing cooperative research collaboration between a department or research group in the University and one elsewhere. If the sole collaboration between the two departments or research groups was to be in respect of a particular candidature, then the net benefit to the University would have to be questioned.

1.4 Evidence of appropriate financial support both for student's and supervisor's/examiners' travel in each case would have to be provided by the School/Faculty concerned. It should be noted that if the agreement is with a French University the student will be required to complete an oral defense of their thesis in order to satisfy French university examination requirements, therefore the cost of airfares and accommodation for external examiners must be taken into consideration by the relevant School at the University of Sydney. The Dean would have to be satisfied that supervision and examination arrangements were satisfactory and fully understood by the potential candidate.

1.5 Cotutelle agreements fall under the Guidelines for Inter-Institutional Agreements and require the approval of the Head of School, Dean and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International) for each individual candidature.

1.6 Agreements should be negotiated prior to the commencement of candidature. Back-dated agreements may be made in exceptional circumstances at the discretion of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International). However students who have completed more than two semesters of their dissertation research are not eligible for the cotutelle scheme.
1.7 Examination arrangements must be approved by the PhD Award Sub-Committee of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board.

2. General principles governing cotutelle arrangements
The following general principles apply to cotutelle agreements.

2.1 A cotutelle agreement must be drawn up between the two participating institutions in respect of each candidate, detailing the particular arrangements pertaining to that particular candidature. Normally such agreements take effect from the beginning of a candidature.

2.2 The agreement lists the two supervisors who are to undertake the joint supervision.

2.3 The candidature is to be divided between the two countries with alternate stays in each of the two countries and a minimum of 30% in each country.

2.3.1 The agreement sets out the arrangements with regard to fees. At the least a candidate should be exempt from fees at one institution. An Australian student would be HECS exempt and an international student would normally receive at least a fees waiver scholarship for the period within Australia. An overseas student proceeding under a cotutelle arrangement would be otherwise subject to the normal requirements and arrangements for international students.

2.3.2 Unless otherwise agreed by the Parties in writing (noting the potential impact on the Student’s insurance coverage), the Student will simultaneously enrol at The University of Sydney and the Partner Institution for each year of the candidature.

2.3.3 The agreement should specify the copyright of the thesis and other intellectual property issues.

2.3.4 The thesis is to be written in either English or the language of instruction at the other participating institution, with an abstract provided in the other language.

2.3.5 There is to be one examination process, and in the initial agreement it is determined whose processes will be followed, with both Universities agreeing to respect the outcome. There would be an exchange of letters with the candidate to ensure he/she was fully aware of all the special arrangements applying.

2.3.6 The Candidate shall be entitled to graduate at the University of Sydney and receive a testamur which (a) states the conferral of the Jointly Awarded Degree; and (b) carries the names of both The University of Sydney and the Partner Institution.

3. Country-specific principles
3.1 France
In respect of a cotutelle arrangement with a French university, the following principles apply:

3.1.1 If the examination is carried out by a French institution at least two examiners would be appointed by each institution. Of the two examiners nominated by the University of Sydney, one must be external. Two of these examiners (one nominated by the French institution and the external examiner nominated by the University of Sydney) prepare written reports on the thesis which are made available to the candidate and the examining jury. The candidate is required to defend the thesis in person by the way of an oral defense (Viva Voce) in French or English and to provide an oral summary in the other language. The candidature does not progress to the oral defense stage if the examiners are not convinced of the candidate's prima facie preparedness.

3.1.2 If the examination is carried out under the University of Sydney's procedures the relevant Sydney Faculty would coordinate the examining process in the normal way.

3.1.3 The successful outcome of either examining process would be the award of the PhD from the University of Sydney and a Doctorat from the relevant French institution. The agreement would state that the award was made as a consequence of a cotutelle agreement with the University of ................. . The French Doctorat is normally awarded with the qualification honorable, très honorable or très honorable avec félicitations. This could be accommodated within the Sydney examination process by specifically asking examiners for their recommendation in respect of the Doctorat.

3.1.4 The signing of such an agreement, particularly if the French institution is to examine, has financial implications for the University. At the very least the University may have to fund expenses associated with two examiners attending a thesis defense. Support for the student concerned, including travel, is another consideration. However, the intent of such agreements is that they should operate in a broader context of cooperative research between the two institutions. Schools/Faculties proposing cotutelle arrangements would have to certify that the necessary financial support would be forthcoming. There is some French Government funding available on a competitive basis.
Cotutelle agreement pro-forma/checklist

Attach documents as appropriate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Sydney Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed partner institution and department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of past and ongoing research collaboration including any existing cotutelle agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed candidate and qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale for a cotutelle agreement rather than other means of collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed supervisors and qualification/position University of Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed periods of residence at each institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed language of thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed form of examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of willingness of partner institution to enter into an agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangements for fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship/stipend and travel support for candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding arrangements for travel for supervisors/examiners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of candidate's understanding of proposed arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of consultation with International Office to ensure visa and other requirements have been considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of consultation with Student Centre to ensure Student Information System requirements have been considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Approvals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head of Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro-Vice-Chancellor (College)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Copy to be sent to Chair, Graduate Studies Committee and the Scholarships Officer*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notification to Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval by Vice-Chancellor if no previous cotutelle agreement in existence with this institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Establishment and Award of Scholarships and Prizes

Approved by: Academic Board on 15 March 2000
Date of effect: 16 March 2000
Amended by: Academic Board on 16 April 2008

1. Policy
The Academic Board’s policy for the establishment and award of prizes and scholarships for academic proficiency in the University is based on the following principles:

1.1 The acceptance of an offer to establish a gift or a prize is a solemn undertaking by the Senate of the University.

1.2 Senate has delegated authority to accept gifts to the Vice-Chancellor and Deputy Vice-Chancellors. This delegation of authority is not marked with an asterisk *; the delegate is, therefore, permitted to authorise another person to exercise his or her delegation (or any part of it) as an agent.

1.3 Senate has delegated to the Academic Board the authority to:
   1.3.1 award all prizes, scholarships and fellowships and other awards;
   1.3.2 determine the terms and conditions of awards established within the University, either by donation or bequest, in accordance with any terms of the gift and following acceptance of the offer by the Senate.

1.4 The Academic Board carries out this delegation by:
   1.4.1 publishing the policies which guide the drafting of terms and conditions, and any revisions thereof, and
   1.4.2 in consultation with the Provost, identifying the responsibilities of the parties involved in considering offers of awards, accepting awards, determining the terms and conditions of awards in accordance with any terms of the gift, making awards and reporting on the procedural framework to the Academic Board and Senate.

1.5 The policy incorporates all earlier resolutions of the Academic Board and clarifies all relevant delegations of authority pertaining to the establishment and award of scholarships and prizes.

2. Acceptance of Gifts
The Vice-Chancellor and Deputy Vice-Chancellors have a delegation from the Senate to accept gifts and corporate sponsorships and are permitted to authorise another person to exercise this delegation (or any part of it) as an agent.

3. Role of the Academic Board
The Academic Board has delegated authority from the Senate to:

3.1 determine the terms and conditions of awards, scholarships and prizes established within the University, either by donation or bequest;

3.2 determine the policies and procedures which govern the award of all prizes, scholarships, fellowships and other awards in the University.

4. Factors to be Taken into Account in Establishing Awards
The following factors shall be taken into account when considering offers to establish awards:

4.1 that the award observes the spirit of anti-discrimination legislation;

4.2 that the University administers the award, including selection of the successful applicant;

4.3 that the conditions of award are determined by the University within the donor’s general terms of reference;
4.4 that a postgraduate scholarship or fellowship be tenable for a sufficient period of time to enable a holder to make substantial progress towards the degree in which the holder is enrolled;
4.5 that continuance of a prize, scholarship or fellowship is assured for a minimum period of time;
4.6 that the value of a postgraduate scholarship or fellowship which is intended to provide a living allowance is such that the holder is not under pressure to supplement the stipend with part-time earnings;
4.7 that the value of a prize or undergraduate scholarship is sufficient to make a reasonable contribution towards the cost of a student’s books and/or equipment;
4.8 that the field in which a scholarship or fellowship may be held is not unduly narrow;
4.9 that any progress report required of a scholarship or fellowship holder is subject to the approval of the University and not of the donor;
4.10 that any decision as to whether a scholarship or fellowship holder’s work justifies renewal of the award is subject to the approval of the University which may, if the merits of the circumstances so dictate, consult with the donor;
4.11 that any restrictions on the publication of the results of a postgraduate scholarship or fellowship holder’s work be consistent with current University policy;
4.12 that in creating new scholarships and prizes, due consideration be given to possible adverse effects of the proposed scholarships on recruitment into cognate disciplines.

5. Creation of and Amendments to Established Scholarships and Prizes

5.1 Undergraduate and Postgraduate Coursework
5.1.1 University-Wide Scholarships and Prizes
The Scholarships & Prizes Office, reporting through the Deputy Provost (Learning and Teaching) and Pro Vice-Chancellor, is responsible for:
5.1.1.1 consideration of offers to establish University-wide prizes, scholarships and bursaries, either by donation or bequest, taking into account advice of any departments and faculties concerned, and acceptance of such offers in accordance with his/her delegated authority;
5.1.1.2 determination of the terms and conditions of award of such prizes and scholarships and bursaries, including the amendment of such terms and conditions, in accordance with any policies established by the Senate or the Academic Board;
5.1.1.3 reporting to the Academic Board on such policy matters relating to prizes and scholarships as may be referred to the Scholarships & Prizes Office or the Deputy Provost (Learning and Teaching) and Pro Vice-Chancellor.

5.1.2 Faculty, School or Departmental Scholarships and Prizes
The relevant dean is responsible for:
5.1.2.1 consideration of offers to establish undergraduate and postgraduate coursework faculty, school or departmental prizes, scholarships and bursaries, and acceptance of such offers in accordance with his/her delegated authority;
5.1.2.2 determination of the terms and conditions of award of such prizes and scholarships and bursaries, including the amendment of such terms and conditions, in accordance with any policies established by the Senate or the Academic Board;
5.1.2.3 recording the establishment of a new award or revision of conditions of an existing award on the FlexSIS record system. The Scholarships & Prizes Office will confirm whether the
award meets University policies before the new or revised award becomes active.

5.1.3 The Deputy Provost (Learning and Teaching) and Pro Vice-Chancellor will provide an annual report, to be prepared by the Scholarships & Prizes Office, to the Academic Board on all new undergraduate and postgraduate coursework awards and revised conditions to such awards and on any problems encountered in the administration of such awards.

5.2 Postgraduate Research

5.2.1 University-Wide Scholarships and Prizes
The Research Office, reporting through the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research), is responsible for:
5.2.1.1 consideration of offers to establish University-wide postgraduate research prizes, scholarships and bursaries, taking into account advice of any departments and faculties concerned, and acceptance of such offers in accordance with his/her delegated authority;
5.2.1.2 determination of the terms and conditions of award of such prizes and scholarships and bursaries, including the amendment of such terms and conditions, in accordance with any policies established by the Senate or the Academic Board;
5.2.1.3 reporting to the Academic Board on such policy matters relating to prizes and scholarships as may be referred to the Research Office or the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research).

5.2.2 Faculty, School and Departmental Scholarships and Prizes
The relevant dean is responsible for:
5.2.2.1 consideration of offers to establish postgraduate research faculty or departmental prizes, scholarships and bursaries, and acceptance of such offers in accordance with his/her delegated authority;
5.2.2.2 determination of the terms and conditions of award of such prizes and scholarships and bursaries, including the amendment of such terms and conditions, in accordance with any policies established by the Senate or the Academic Board;
5.2.2.3 recording the establishment of a new award or revision of conditions of an existing award on the FlexSIS record system. The Research Office will confirm whether the award meets University policies before the new or revised award becomes active.

5.2.3 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) will provide an annual report, to be prepared by the Research Office, to the Academic Board on all new postgraduate research awards and revised conditions to such awards and on any problems encountered in the administration of such awards.

6. Authority to Award Scholarships and Prizes

6.1 University-Wide Scholarships and Prizes
University-wide scholarships or prizes will be awarded by the Academic Board or some other body within the University, as specified in the scholarship or prize conditions. Where responsibility for awarding a scholarship or prize is not so specified:
6.1.1 the Deputy Provost (Learning and Teaching) and Pro Vice-Chancellor has authority to award University-wide undergraduate and postgraduate coursework scholarships or prizes;
(b) the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) has authority to award University-wide postgraduate research scholarships or prizes.
6.2 Faculty, School and Departmental Scholarships and Prizes
Faculty, School or Departmental scholarships or prizes will be awarded by a body within the University as specified in the scholarship or prize conditions. Where responsibility for awarding a scholarship or prize is not so specified:

6.2.1 the head of the responsible unit has authority to award faculty, school or departmental scholarships or prizes for which applications are not required;

6.2.2 the relevant dean has authority to award faculty, school or departmental scholarships or prizes for which applications are required.

7. Non-Established Scholarships
Scholarships are from time to time created within the University through faculty or departmental funds, external sponsorship or research grants. Such scholarships are awarded under the following conditions:

7.1 A scholarship shall be awarded on the basis of academic merit.

7.2 A scholarship shall be awarded by the Head of Department or School most concerned.

7.3 The value and duration of a scholarship may be recommended by the Head of Department or School. In determining the value of a scholarship, the Head will take into account:

7.3.1 availability of funds, and

7.3.2 the general level of the value of scholarships offered by the University.

7.4 A scholarship may provide allowances if the Head of Department or School so recommends, subject to the availability of funds.

7.5 All non-established scholarships must be advertised.

8. Special conditions for postgraduate scholarships
8.1 The object of each scholarship is to promote and encourage postgraduate research within the University of Sydney.

8.2 Awards shall be granted to graduates who are eligible for admission to candidature for a higher degree by research and who enrol accordingly as full-time candidates.

8.3 A scholarship shall be tenable for one year in the first instance but subject to satisfactory progress may be renewed for a second year and in the case of a PhD candidate for a third, and in special circumstances, a further six months.

8.4 A scholarship may be renewed subject to:

8.4.1 progress satisfactory to the Head of Department or School, and

8.4.2 availability of funds.

8.5 The holder of a scholarship shall acknowledge the donor of the funds in any publication arising out of the research.

9. Travelling Scholarships
9.1 All candidates for travelling scholarships shall be graduates or graduands of the University of Sydney who are of no more than four years' standing from qualifying for their final undergraduate degree.

9.2 The scholarships shall be awarded only when the proposed course of study overseas is related to at least one of the undergraduate degrees of the candidate.

9.3 All candidates shall be citizens or permanent residents of Australia.

9.4 Candidates who have previously held awards designed to promote study overseas and which offer similar benefits to travelling scholarships shall be ineligible for consideration, unless exceptional circumstances apply.

9.5 The scholarships shall normally be awarded to enable scholars to undertake studies or research in some place or places overseas approved by the Academic Board.

9.6 The scholarships shall not normally be held for longer than one year unless the holder is enrolled for a higher degree. A scholarship shall not be renewed for a third year unless the holder is a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and renewal shall be subject to satisfactory progress.
10. **Bursaries**

10.1 The bursaries at the disposal of the University have been created by private foundations. The capital sums are held in perpetuity with the bursary funded from the income from interest on the capital. The bursary or bursaries shall normally be awarded for an undergraduate degree course. Unless otherwise specified, the bursaries are tenable in any faculty.

10.2 All students of the University who shall, during their course, have received bursaries or exemptions from fees are invited by the Senate to make returns to the University, when their circumstances in life shall permit, for the purpose of conferring like benefits on future students. The names of all students making such returns will, if so desired, be published.

11. **Number of Scholarships Which May be Held**

11.1 An undergraduate student will usually only hold one primary scholarship in any given year, except with the approval of the Deputy Provost (Learning and Teaching) and Pro Vice-Chancellor, who will take into account the value and duration of the awards concerned.

(2) A postgraduate student may hold no more than one scholarship providing a living allowance although this may be held with a scholarship providing a supplementary allowance, unless otherwise permitted by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) who shall take into account the value of the awards and their purposes.
Research Fellows: Conditions

Approved by: Academic Board in April 1997
Last amended: 15 November 2006
Date of effect: 1 January 2007

1. Policy
On the recommendation of the Research Committee, the Academic Board approved in principle the following recommendations in respect of the conditions to be provided to Research Fellows and commended to the Vice-Chancellor for his endorsement those recommendations with resource implications.

1.1 All categories of fellow listed below should be accorded the same school/departmental facilities and school/departmental resources as are accorded to other academics of equivalent academic status in their school/department.

1.2 The University recognises the special status of Research Fellows. Consistent with this, it is recommended that the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) consider each year the award of start-up funds (once only per fellow) for externally-funded Research Fellows. The funds are to be spent at their discretion on approval from the Head of Department and are in addition to the resources covered by point 1.1.

1.3 Research Fellows holding a fellowship from the list below will be eligible to apply to internal University research funding schemes subject to the specific terms and conditions of those schemes.

1.4 The list of fellows should be reviewed periodically by the Academic Standards and Policy Committee, which may add or remove categories of fellows whenever it is deemed appropriate, after consultation with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research).

1.4.1 ARC Australian Postdoctoral Fellowship, Australian Postdoctoral Fellowship (Industry), Australian Research Fellowship, Queen Elizabeth II Fellowship, Professorial Research Fellowship, Federation Fellowship

1.4.2 NHMRC Research Fellowship, Senior Research Fellowship, Principal Research Fellowship, or Senior Principal Research Fellowship

1.4.3 NHMRC Australian Training Fellowship:
1.4.3.1 Peter Doherty Fellowship
1.4.3.2 Australian Clinical Research Fellowship
1.4.3.3 Australian Health Professional Research Fellowship
1.4.3.4 Australian Research Training Fellowship (Part-time)
1.4.3.5 General Practice Fellowship
1.4.3.6 Public Health (Australian) Fellowship

1.4.4 NHMRC Career Development Fellowship:
1.4.4.1 R. Douglas Wright Biomedical Career Development Award
1.4.4.2 Clinical Career Development Award
1.4.4.3 Population Health Career Development Award
1.4.4 Partnership Career Development Award
1.4.5 NHMRC Howard Florey Centenary Research Fellowship
1.4.6 NHMRC Industry Research Fellowship
1.4.7 NHMRC Overseas Training Fellowship (for period of time spent at the University of Sydney):
   1.4.7.1 C.J. Martin Fellowship
   1.4.7.2 Neil Hamilton Fairley Fellowship
   1.4.7.3 Sidney Sax Fellowship
   1.4.7.4 INSERM Exchange Fellowship
   1.4.7.5 R.G. Menzies Fellowship
1.4.8 NHMRC Practitioner Fellowship
1.4.9 NSW Cancer Institute Career Development and Support Fellowships
1.4.10 Pharmacia Foundation Fellowship
1.4.11 Rolf Edgar Lake Fellowship
1.4.12 Viertel Fellowship
1.4.13 University of Sydney/Sesqui Postdoctoral Research Fellowship
Research Principles

Approved by: Academic Board on 13 December 2006
Date of effect: 1 January 2007

For more than 150 years, the Royal Charter of the University of Sydney has included the phrase “the promotion of useful knowledge”. The University of Sydney Act specifically identifies amongst the objects and functions of the University “the promotion … of scholarship, research, free inquiry, the interaction of research and teaching, and academic excellence”. Throughout its existence the profile and reach of the University has grown nationally and internationally with an expanding network of partner institutions and the exchange of ideas, research and disciplinary advances. Our students and our staff who are engaged in research are participants in a global culture of research and inquiry at the University.

The University of Sydney is an international research institution which values:

- Excellence – of students, staff, research, research environment and research training
- Intellectual inquiry
- Academic Freedom
- Diversity of defensible opinions and values
- Integrity and ethical practice in all academic endeavours

The University subscribes to the definition of research offered by the OECD:

- creative work, undertaken on a systematic basis in order to increase the stock of knowledge, including knowledge of man, culture and society, and the use of this stock of knowledge to devise new applications;
- any activity classified as research is characterised by originality; it should have investigation as a primary objective and should have the potential to produce results that are sufficiently general for humanity’s stock of knowledge (theoretical and/or practical) to be recognisably increased. Most higher education research work would qualify as research;
- pure basic research, strategic basic research, applied research and experimental development.

The understanding of research at the University accords parity of esteem to academic research and creative artistic work.

Nine major principles support research and research training at the University of Sydney:

1. **The University values excellence in research**
   Research in the University is undertaken in the belief that it will benefit society by increasing knowledge, foster innovation and discovery, enrich culture, and contribute to social well-being.
2. **The University promotes the acquisition of research skills**
   All researchers are encouraged to evaluate critically and independently the literature of their own and related research fields; to be able to define a research problem (and to establish its significance); to be able to plan and develop ways of investigating it; to execute, critically evaluate and report on the outcome (including critical reflection on progress); and to understand the theory, operation and appropriate application of relevant techniques and methodologies.

3. **The University fosters an appreciation and understanding of the research environment and the proper management of research**
   All researchers are encouraged to understand and appreciate the ethical issues and intellectual property issues of their own and related research, occupational health and safety issues, and to be skilled in good research practice. Researchers need to understand how research is funded and evaluated (including government- and contract-funded research) and be able to justify their selection of techniques and methodologies in their research. All researchers are encouraged to manage their own research, to establish priorities and to develop the requisite skills.

4. **The University promotes the dissemination of research outcomes**
   The appropriate dissemination of research outcomes, whether as books, published papers, conference presentations, performances, exhibitions, patents, etc., is vital. Peer review begins within the research environment, and students should be encouraged to look to publication in appropriate media from early in their research career.

5. **The University encourages personal effectiveness and initiative in research**
   All researchers are encouraged to develop and demonstrate initiative and self-reliance, the ability to identify the need for extra skills or training and a willingness to learn new knowledge and techniques.

6. **The University promotes the development of effective communication skills**
   All researchers are encouraged to write clearly and concisely for a variety of audiences (thesis examiners, journal editors and readers, the general public, patent examiners, research contractors, etc.) and to be able to articulate and defend coherently their ideas, arguments, interpretations and research outcomes. They should be able to convince both expert and lay audiences of the merits of their research and that of their field.

7. **The University fosters the development of team work and leadership skills**
   Research requires collaboration, whether of a supervisor with an Honours or postgraduate candidate, of a colleague or colleagues, or of members of a research team. Students and staff alike are encouraged to learn how to work as part of a team and to adopt leadership roles in their team, working effectively with supervisors, peers and less experienced colleagues. All researchers are encouraged to listen, to give and receive feedback and to provide a considered response to the comments of others. In particular, they should critically evaluate, not uncritically follow, advice.

8. **The University promotes research-led teaching**
   The University’s research ethos and strengths infuse all undergraduate and postgraduate learning and teaching. Research-led teaching emphasises the partnership of academics and students as they engage in the critical challenge of open exploratory inquiry and it encourages active learning, critical creative thinking and lifelong learning.
9. The University insists on ethical behaviour

The University expects all its researchers to take responsibility for ensuring scholarly and scientific rigour and integrity, in obtaining, recording and analysing data and in presenting, reporting and publishing results. Rigour and integrity are indicated by: (1) giving appropriate recognition to those who have made an intellectual contribution to the contents of a publication; (2) obtaining the permission of the author before using new information, concepts or data originally obtained through access to confidential data; (3) conforming to University requirements for working with humans, animals, and bio-hazards; (4) using research funds in accordance with the terms and conditions under which those funds were received; and (5) disclosing to the University any conflict of interest (financial, personal or other) that might influence their research.
Scholarships

Approved by: Academic Board on 15 June 2005
Date of effect: 16 June 2005

1. Principles
1.1 The University of Sydney aims to use scholarships and bursaries to assist as many meritorious and needy undergraduate students as possible, where funding and existing conditions allow.

1.2 Scholarships may be awarded on a one-off or ongoing basis.

1.3 A scholarship may be intended for commencing or continuing students or both.

1.4 Undergraduate scholarships awarded on an ongoing basis should be tenable for the normal duration of the degree. This includes combined degrees. This may also include an additional honours year.

1.5 Newly established undergraduate scholarships should be of an amount sufficient to be of significant assistance to a student to study full-time. The current (2005) recommended value for a primary scholarship is in the range of $4000-$6000 p.a. A student will usually only hold one primary scholarship in any given year.

1.6 Awards of a lesser value should be established as secondary (or supplementary) scholarships, prizes (if for merit) or bursaries (if for equity purposes).

2. Definitions
Additional honours year: A degree program where the award of honours requires an extra year of enrolment above and beyond the requirements of the pass degree.

Award: A payment or benefit made on the basis of criteria established by the University of Sydney. Includes Prizes, Scholarships and Bursaries.

Bursary: An award made to enable further study, primarily based on need.

Combined degree: A course of study with a single application process that may result in the award of two degrees.

Commencing student: A student enrolling in the first calendar year of their current degree course of study at the University of Sydney.

Continuing student: A student who has completed units towards their current degree course of study at the University of Sydney in a previous calendar year.
**Equity:** An award made on the basis of allowing fair and equal access to tertiary education regardless of factors of disadvantage. An award aiming to redress factors of disadvantage that may affect access to tertiary education.

**Merit:** A measure of academic or other excellence.

**One-off Scholarship:** A scholarship awarded for a tenure of a single year, for example at the commencement of degree, or for an honours year or in recognition of an outstanding performance.

**Ongoing scholarships:** A scholarship with a tenure of more than one year.

**Primary scholarship:** A scholarship intended as a recipient’s main form of scholarship support.

**Prize:** An award in recognition of outstanding performance, academic achievement or service.

**Scholarship:** An award made available to enable further study.

**Secondary scholarship:** A scholarship, usually of a lesser value, and generally intended to supplement a primary scholarship. Holding a primary scholarship may or may not be a condition of award.

**Supplementary scholarship:** A secondary scholarship awarded on the condition that a student must also hold a primary scholarship. Sometimes referred to as “top up” scholarships.
Scholarships: Prizes and Scholarships – Academic Board
Resolutions

Approved by: Academic Board prior to 1992

PUBLICATION OF AWARD AND MERIT LISTS
The Board has resolved:
(1) that the University publish order of merit lists in all courses for those students with results of Credit or better;
(2) that the Registrar publish the names of students awarded university prizes as a result of the annual examinations, preferably with their examination results.

See also:
- the Academic Board policy on the Establishment and Award of Scholarships and Prizes
- Delegations of Authority: Academic Functions – Part C, Prizes and Scholarships
Semester Length and Stu-Vac

Approved by: Academic Board in August 1993
Date of effect: August 1993

Following the adoption in 1987 of a 13 to 14 week semester system, the Academic Board approved the following resolutions with regard to semester length and stu-vac:

1. All classes should commence in the first week of the semester.

2. Both semesters should contain 14 teaching weeks, but the use of the fourteenth week is a matter for faculties to determine.

3. Regardless of whether or not the fourteenth week of semester is deemed a teaching week by a faculty, the fourteenth week of semester is to be followed by a clear stu-vac (student vacation) week.

4. Mid-semester breaks are to be described as non-teaching weeks, rather than Easter recess or mid-semester recess.
**Policy Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLICY DOCUMENT (22 August 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE SYDNEY SUMMER SCHOOL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Policies**

| I.1 | The Sydney Summer School supports the broad educational aims of the University as a whole. |
| I.2 | The Sydney Summer School will operate in a manner consistent with existing University policies and procedures. |
| I.3 | The Sydney Summer School will be self funding. It will not draw upon University funds to finance its operations. It will make a contribution to the University central funds in return for the use of university facilities and services. |
| I.4 | The University does not regard teaching within The Sydney Summer School as part of an academic member of staff's normal workload. Refer to The University of Sydney (Academic & Teaching Staff) Enterprise Agreement, 1999 - 2002, clause 49 (4) (f) [formerly section 5.6.3.6]. |
| I.5 | Participation in The Sydney Summer School will not affect an employee’s entitlement to leave. |

**Governance Policies**

| A.1 | The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) will have responsibility for overseeing the activities of The Sydney Summer School. |
| A.2 | An Advisory Committee will replace the previous Summer School Board. **Membership:** a representative from each of the Colleges, nominated by the relevant PVC (College); a nominee of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Infrastructure); the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching); and the Director of The Sydney Summer School. **Responsibilities:** The Advisory Committee will have the power to determine on operational matters within the context of policies approved by the Provost. Operational matters will include such matters as: (a) the provision of equity and merit scholarships and fee-waivers; (b) withdrawal without financial penalty, and (c) withdrawal with only a partial penalty. |
| A.3 | The day-to-day matters of The Sydney Summer School will be managed by The Sydney Summer School office, consisting of a Director, and continuing and casual staff. |
| A.4 | The Sydney Summer School office will manage the operations of the School and will liaise with relevant university academic units and administrative departments regarding units of study, staffing and other operational matters. |
| A.5 | General oversight for each unit of study offered in the Sydney Summer School, (in particular the budgeting, management of teaching and assessment undertaken) will remain the responsibility of the Heads of Academic units, who in turn are responsible to their Deans and College Pro-Vice-Chancellors. |
| A.6 | The academic organizational unit will develop the budget for each unit of study in conjunction with the Director of The Sydney Summer School. |

**Teaching Policies**

<p>| T.1 | Most if not all teaching in The Sydney Summer School will be undertaken by current or casual academic employees of The University of Sydney. The availability of current members of staff to undertake additional teaching and related duties for The Sydney Summer School will follow current University policies. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>T.2</strong> Participation in The Sydney Summer School will be on a voluntary basis for academic staff. If more than one member of staff volunteers to teach a unit of study, normal selection procedures will apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T.3</strong> Depending on the teaching requirements, it may be appropriate to employ a casual academic staff member (e.g. a recent post-graduate student). The latter should be employed as per Section 2 of the Enterprise Agreement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T.4</strong> In the event that an Academic unit has insufficient volunteers to run the unit, the Head may use the University's normal recruitment procedures and appoint additional staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T.5</strong> The Head may also appoint teachers from outside this University where their presence would be of benefit to students and staff (for example distinguished teachers from overseas or elsewhere in Australia).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T.6</strong> The level of payment should recognise the extra responsibility inherent in teaching and assessing a unit of study in The Sydney Summer School. Academic staff are to be remunerated according to the casual academic rates and definitions specified in Section 3 of this policy. Additional remuneration may be offered to a staff member to whom responsibility for coordinating The Sydney Summer School units of study is devolved. Any additional payments to be made, including any payments exceeding those specified in section 3 of this policy, must be referred to the appropriate College Pro-Vice-Chancellor, consistent with the University's Delegations of Authority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T.7</strong> Payments for these duties will be made through the University's pay system and in accordance with PAYG policies of the Australian Taxation Office.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T.8</strong> Each year prior to commencement of The Sydney Summer School teaching staff who intend to participate in The Sydney Summer School will sign an agreement with the Head of the academic unit outlining the terms of their participation. A pro forma agreement between a Head of an academic unit and a member of the academic staff to formalise the staff member’s participation in The Sydney Summer School is attached.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T.9</strong> Casual employees will be employed as per the Enterprise Agreement provisions. Any teachers who attend the teaching workshop for Summer School (see Q.3) will be paid at the Other Activities rate noted in the accompanying schedule.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Staff Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GS.1</strong> Where the operation of The Sydney Summer School involves specific, additional duties for general staff which cannot be accommodated within normal operations of the administrative unit, appropriate additional compensation should be made through existing award provisions for higher duties or additional hours.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GS.2</strong> Within administrative units additional technical and administrative staff may need to be hired to support The Sydney Summer School's activities. Heads of Departments have the responsibility to arrange appropriate technical and administrative support in accordance with the University's employment policies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S.1</strong> Enrolment in The Sydney Summer School will be on a voluntary basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S.2</strong> The purposes of The Sydney Summer School is to provide an opportunity for students either to accelerate their progression towards the completion of an award or to take a unit outside their regular program of studies or to “catch up” a failed subject.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S.3</strong> Because of the intensive nature of The Sydney Summer School a student will only be permitted to enrol for a maximum of 16 credit points. These credit points may be associated with no more than two units of study, except with the written permission of the Director of The Sydney Summer School.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units of Study Policies</td>
<td>U.1 The Dean of the relevant Faculty must authorize the inclusion of all units of study proposed for the Sydney Summer School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.2 Only units of study that are part of an approved award of the University of Sydney and which are suitable to be taught within a 6 - 8 week period will be offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.3 The units of study proposed for inclusion in The Sydney Summer School may differ from their normal presentation in either Semester 1 or Semester 2 but their content, aims and objectives will remain the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.4 Units of study will be offered at the same rate as that applied to local fee paying undergraduate students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.5 Minimum and maximum capacities will be placed on all units of study in order to maintain the financial viability and the quality of the teaching experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.6 The program may include both undergraduate and postgraduate units of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.7 In some circumstances a Unit of Study may be offered on site in a foreign country. However, its content is to be equivalent to a unit of study offered at the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.8 With the approval of the Academic Board as the body responsible for establishing the criteria for admission to the University, units of study may be developed specifically for The Sydney Summer School where they are intended as foundation units, introductory or preparatory units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Policies: Fees</td>
<td>FF.1 Tuition fees will be the same for local and international undergraduate students. Postgraduate fees are set at the discretion of the PVC of the relevant College and will be reviewed annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FF.2 Tuition fees will be determined on a pro rata basis of the full-fee paying cost to local students undertaking award programs in Semester 1 or Semester 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FF.3 Extra fees will be charged where there is a significant added cost (e.g. excursions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FF.4 In order to meet the University’s strong commitment to access and equity, a number of fee-waiver scholarships based on financial hardship and educational disadvantage will be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FF.5 The amount of fee waivers will not exceed 5% of the gross fees that would otherwise be payable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Policies: Management</td>
<td>FM.1 The Director of The Sydney Summer School will have overall responsibility for financial monitoring of The Sydney Summer School and will submit realistic and accurate budgets, maintain an operational consolidated budget to ensure agreed financial returns and generate reports in accordance with standard University procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FM.2 Fee distribution policies, as determined by the Vice-Chancellor from time to time, will be applied to a percentage of the gross receipts of The Sydney Summer School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FM.3 The Sydney Summer School will pay a fee to the Provost for negotiated services provided by that area for The Sydney Summer School and for the generation of quality improvement projects for the University as a whole (see Q.5 below).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Quality Assurance Policies

| Q.1 | The Director of The Sydney Summer School in consultation with the Advisory Committee will establish an evaluation policy. This evaluation will assess the quality of the delivery of the units of study and student satisfaction. It will also take into account the special nature of accelerated or intensive programs. |
| Q.2 | The Director of The Sydney Summer School will work with participating academic units to facilitate quality assurance. |
| Q.3 | The Director of The Sydney Summer School will facilitate the provision of appropriate support for all teaching staff (particularly those who are new to the teaching profession). This support will include such items as: a workshop for teachers, a teaching kit, mentoring and regular follow up during the teaching period. |
| Q.4 | The staff of The Sydney Summer School will facilitate the evaluation of the quality of accommodation, services and facilities by students and staff. |
| Q.5 | Using funds from The Sydney Summer School which are directed towards the Provost see FM.3 above, the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) will undertake projects related to improving the quality of teaching throughout the University. |

### Responsibilities of Summer School Administration

| RS.1 | Liaising with academic units and faculties to determine which units of study they wish to offer (and have approved for offering) in the summer school. |
| RS.2 | Producing the appropriate teaching timetables. |
| RS.3 | Booking appropriate ‘non-dedicated’ and dedicated rooms for The Sydney Summer School classes. |
| RS.4 | Liaising with Campus Properties and Service with respect to the impact of planned maintenance and capital works. |
| RS.5 | Marketing: including information book production, brochures, advertisements, events. |
| RS.6 | Enrolling students, including collection of all data elements required for DEST reporting and University management information and accounting for fees. |
| RS.7 | Coordinating the provision of ancillary academic and administrative services (e.g. Library, learning assistance, counselling, building attendants, cleaners, security) necessary to facilitate the effective running of the program. |
| RS.8 | Overseeing the examination process, including the processing of results, provision of results notices to students and the administration of credit transfer for University of Sydney students. |
| RS.9 | Mounting any special events associated with The Sydney Summer School such as public lectures. |
| RS.10 | Liaising with the University of Sydney Union, the Sydney University Sports, Student Services (and others) to facilitate the adequate provision of student amenities. |
| RS.11 | Administering the financial aspect of The Sydney Summer School including planning and budget development. |
| RS.12 | Drafting relevant policies and procedures for the operation of The Sydney Summer School to be submitted to the Advisory Committee for consideration. Once passed by the Advisory Committee, these policies and procedures will be forwarded to the Provost for approval and then to the Academic Board if appropriate. |
RS.13 The Sydney Summer School office will administer provision for fee waivers where participants can show educational disadvantage on the basis of financial disadvantage and one or more criteria from the educational disadvantage criteria from Broadway Scheme (University Policy 305).

| Responsibilities of Academic units and Faculties | RD.1 | The selection of units of study to be offered to the Dean for approval. |
| RD.2 | The engaging of suitable teaching staff. |
| RD.3 | The payment of all teaching and general staff involved in the Summer School. |
| RD.4 | The booking of dedicated rooms where appropriate. |
| RD.5 | The academic unit has responsibility for the development of a budget for each unit of study (in consultation with the Director of The Sydney Summer School) and ensuring that the delivery of a unit of study is successful financially as well as educationally. |
| RD.6 | The Dean and the Director of The Sydney Summer School are jointly responsible for the decision to withdraw a unit of study. |

### Hiring Procedure Policies

A Head of an academic unit should create an eligibility list for casual academic staff by reference to the following:

1. from the current postgraduate or honours students of the relevant academic unit;
2. from specific advertisements for casual employment, either internal or external;
3. in the case of professional faculties, through appropriate professional channels; and
4. from eligible former academic staff.
Procedure/ Pro Forma Agreement

An Agreement between a member of the academic staff and their Head of Academic unit/School, concerning teaching and related duties to be undertaken during the Summer School. At all times, the member of staff’s supervisor is (insert name of supervisor if not Head of the academic unit/or Head of the academic unit).

1. Details of the Duties required in order for the Unit(s) of Study to be taught including:

   (a) Preparation of materials etcetera for the Unit of Study; for which appropriate time should be allowed, (and for which payment at the “Other Duties” rate of the Casual Academic Rates detailed in Attachment 3 is applicable).

   (b) The lecturing and/or tutorial and/or anticipated marking duties to be undertaken - including anticipated number of students.

   (c) Unit of Study/Subject Co-ordination duties required (for which payment at the “relevant doctoral qualification/subject co-ordination” rate detailed in Attachment 3 is applicable).

2. Any other specific teaching and related duties to be undertaken by the academic staff member

3. Availability for Teaching and Related Duties

   The availability of current members of staff to undertake additional teaching and related duties for The Sydney Summer School will follow current University policies and financial arrangements will be in accordance with the University’s outside earnings policy.

4. Remuneration Arrangements

   All payments are based on the rates prescribed for casual academic staff in the updated Casual Academic Rates document at Attachment 3. If the staff member is
employed as a Level A (Associate Lecturer) or Level B (Lecturer), then additional payments should be made for any unit co-ordination duties performed (see (b) below).

(a) It is agreed that the sum of $___________ will be paid to the staff member as an over award payment, from which tax at the appropriate rate will be deducted. (The minimum payment is related to the staff member's normal fortnightly salary and/or the relevant casual academic rates). Please note this amount is not superannuable other than for TESS purposes (and/or)

(b) The following amounts will be paid in addition to the above for the performance of Unit Co-Ordination or other specialist duties if applicable (only relevant to Level A and B): $___________

5. Arrangements for the Taking of Leave

In the interests of staff it is strongly recommended that a minimum of 2 weeks recreation leave in one block of time be taken within every 12 months.

6. Dispute Resolution

In the event of any dispute(s) arising from the implementation of The Sydney Summer School policy, either the staff member or the Head of the academic unit may refer the matter to the relevant Dean or Pro Vice-Chancellor for consideration. A staff member may be accompanied by a person of their choice (including the staff association representative) at any such discussions. Disputes may also be resolved via mediation or through the grievance and disputes settlement procedures in the Academic Staff Enterprise Agreement.

7. Any other Matter

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

Signed for and on behalf of the Academic unit/School

______________________________________________

Print Name:_________________________

Signature____________________________ date:________

______________________________________________

Signed by staff member______________________ date:________

Records/Personnel Team (College) for file:

cc Staff member/Head of Academic unit
Schedule 2 of Section 2 Employment Security and Types of Employment Schedule 2

PRO FORMA CASUAL STAFF INSTRUMENT OF APPOINTMENT

Dear (insert name of casual appointee),

On behalf of the University, I am pleased to offer you a casual academic appointment on the following terms: The terms of your casual engagement are/will be as follows:

1. The attached Table of Duties outlines the
   - duties you are required to perform
   - number of hours you are required to perform them, and
   - rate of pay for each class of duty required.

2. Any additional duties required during the term of your engagement with us will be paid for. There is provision within the Table of Duties for additional duties to be recorded.

3. As a casual academic staff member, you will receive employer superannuation contributions in accordance with the Tertiary Education Superannuation Scheme (TESS) Superannuation Award, 1993 or the Superannuation Guarantee Levy.

4. During the period of your casual work with the Academic unit of (insert name of the academic unit or School) you will report to A/Prof/Dr/M/r/s ____________________ who is your supervisor.

5. Other than certain specified casual staff, casual staff are only engaged by the University for lectures, tutorials or demonstrations for up to 0.6 of the time of the teaching contact hours expected of a full-time staff member of similar designation within the department.

6. You are advised that where it is brought to the attention of the University that the number of casual hours for one semester or more exceeds the local 0.6 ratio, the staff member will be paid equivalent to a relevant fractional staff member for 20 weeks for each semester in which the staff member has exceeded the local ratio, less the amounts already paid to the staff member for casual work in that semester.

7. Therefore, you are required to advise your supervisor if you are undertaking any casual work for the University additional to that detailed in this document, both at the time you sign below and in the future. Failure to do so may nullify the casual engagement.

8. For your information, the University of Sydney is a party to the University of Sydney Academic and Teaching Staff Enterprise Agreement 1999 - 2002, from which your conditions of employment are derived. Casual academic staff members are paid in accordance with the casual academic rates contained in Schedule 2 of Section 3 of the Agreement.
### Table of Duties for Casual Academic Engagement – Semester I / II (Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of duty</th>
<th>Rate of pay</th>
<th>Number of hours</th>
<th>Total payment</th>
<th>Additional duties required (initialled by casual academic and the supervisor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I …………………………….hereby state that I agree to the terms of the casual engagement specified in this document, and that I am not undertaking any additional casual work for the University to that detailed in the attached Table of Duties. Further, should this situation change, I will advise my supervisor:

Signed:…………………………..Date:………………
( casual staff member)

Head of academic unit/School………………………..Date:………………

### Schedule 2 of Section 3

**Casual Academic Rates of Pay**

The rates in this document are effective from 1 October 1998, and reflect the salary increases detailed in Section 3, to be effective from 3 September 1999.

Where applicable, this document adopts the relevant award formula which provides for higher rates to be paid to casuals performing full subject co-ordination duties and/or holding a relevant PhD is indicated by the use of the symbol ^.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of lecturing and associated working time assumed:</th>
<th>Effective 1/10/98 (incl. 3%)</th>
<th>Effective 3/9/99 (includes 2%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/00 (+ 4%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/01 (+ 4%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/02 (+ 4%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid to a distinguished visiting scholar for a single lecture or for each lecture in a small group of lectures and Specialised lecture (1 hour of delivery and up to 4 hours associated working time)</td>
<td>$154.64</td>
<td>$157.73</td>
<td>$164.04</td>
<td>$170.60</td>
<td>$177.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Rate 1</td>
<td>Rate 2</td>
<td>Rate 3</td>
<td>Rate 4</td>
<td>Rate 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid where the lecturer assumes significant responsibility for planning and developing a unit # or a large part of a unit as well as lecturing, or where a lecture or small group of lectures calls for special expertise</td>
<td>$123.71</td>
<td>$126.18</td>
<td>$131.23</td>
<td>$136.48</td>
<td>$141.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed lecture (1 hour of delivery and up to 3 hours associated working time)</td>
<td>$123.71</td>
<td>$126.18</td>
<td>$131.23</td>
<td>$136.48</td>
<td>$141.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the casual academic staff member has responsibility for coordination of a unit, they must be paid as a minimum the developed lecture rate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid as the normal rate for a lecture (1 hour of delivery and up to 2 hours associated working time)</td>
<td>$92.78</td>
<td>$94.64</td>
<td>$98.43</td>
<td>$102.36</td>
<td>$106.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid for a ‘repeat’ lecture, i.e., the same lecture given within seven days to another group of students (1 hour of delivery and up to 1 hour associated working time)</td>
<td>$61.85</td>
<td>$63.09</td>
<td>$65.61</td>
<td>$68.23</td>
<td>$70.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The class/grade/step code indicated * to be used on claim forms for the above rate
^ Higher rate indicated by ^ to be used for casual academic staff with a relevant PhD and/or performing full subject co-ordination duties

**II - TUTORING**
4(c)(i) "A part-time (non-fractional) staff member required to deliver or present a tutorial (or equivalent delivery through other than face to face teaching mode) of a specified duration and relatedly provide directly associated non contact duties in the nature or preparation, reasonably contemporaneous marking and student consultation, shall be paid at a rate for each hour of tutorial delivered or presentation, according to the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of tutoring and associated working time assumed</th>
<th>Effective 1/10/98 (incl. 3%)</th>
<th>Effective 3/9/99 (include 2%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/00 (+ 4%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/01 (+ 4%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/02 (+ 4%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial (1 hour of tutorial time and up to 2 hours associated working time)</td>
<td>$66.18</td>
<td>$67.50</td>
<td>$70.20</td>
<td>$73.01</td>
<td>$75.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$79.14^</td>
<td>$80.72^</td>
<td>$83.95^</td>
<td>$87.31^</td>
<td>$90.80^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat Tutorial (1 hour of tutorial time and up to 1 hour associated working time)</td>
<td>$44.12</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$46.80</td>
<td>$48.67</td>
<td>$50.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$52.76^</td>
<td>$53.82^</td>
<td>$55.97^</td>
<td>$58.21^</td>
<td>$60.53^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III - OTHER REQUIRED ACADEMIC ACTIVITY - DEMONSTRATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors: Other Activities - including Demonstrations - NB: any preparation or marking associated with the demonstrations, but performed outside the demonstration period, is paid for at the same rate per hour</th>
<th>Effective 1/10/98 (incl. 3%)</th>
<th>Effective 3/9/99 (include 2%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/00 (+ 4%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/01 (+ 4%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/02 (+ 4%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other activity - including **Demonstrations** (Includes: the conduct of practical classes, all demonstrations - (including repeat demonstrations), workshops, student field excursions; the conduct of clinical sessions other than clinical nurse education; the conduct of performance and visual art studio sessions; musical coaching, repetiteurship, and musical accompanying other than with special educational service; development of teaching and subject material such as the preparation of subject guides and reading lists and basic activities associated with subject coordination; consultation with students; supervision; attendance at departmental and/ or faculty meetings as required)

Above list is a guide only and should not be considered to be exhaustive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effective 1/10/98 (incl. 3%)</th>
<th>Effective 3/9/99 (include 2%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/00 (+ 4%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/01 (+ 4%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/02 (+ 4%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$22.06</td>
<td>$22.50</td>
<td>$23.40</td>
<td>$24.34</td>
<td>$25.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$26.38^</td>
<td>$26.91^</td>
<td>$27.99^</td>
<td>$29.11^</td>
<td>$30.27^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The class/grade/step code indicated * to be used on claim forms for the above rate

^ Higher rate indicated by ^ to be used for casual academic staff with a relevant PhD and/or performing full subject co-ordination duties

### IV - MARKING

**Descriptors:**

- Marking as a supervising examiner, or marking requiring a significant exercise of academic judgment appropriate to an academic at Level B status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effective 1/10/98 (incl. 3%)</th>
<th>Effective 3/9/99 (include 2%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/00 (+ 4%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/01 (+ 4%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/02 (+ 4%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$30.93</td>
<td>$31.55</td>
<td>$32.81</td>
<td>$34.12</td>
<td>$35.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine (standard) marking</td>
<td>$22.06</td>
<td>$22.50</td>
<td>$23.40</td>
<td>$24.34</td>
<td>$25.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB Includes Multiple Choice Marking from 9 May 1997</td>
<td>$26.38^</td>
<td>$26.91^</td>
<td>$27.99^</td>
<td>$29.11^</td>
<td>$30.27^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V - MUSICAL ACCOMPANYING (with special educational service, and associated duties)

4(d)(ii) "For the purposes of this subclause, the term "musical accompanying with special educational service" means the provision of musical accompaniment to one or more students or staff in the course of teaching by another member of the academic staff in circumstances where the accompanist deploys educational expertise in repertoire development or expression for student concert or examination purposes, but does not include concert accompanying, vocal coaching or musical directing."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effective 1/10/98 (incl. 3%)</th>
<th>Effective 3/9/99 (include 2%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/00 (+ 4%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/01 (+ 4%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/02 (+ 4%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$44.12</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$46.80</td>
<td>$48.67</td>
<td>$50.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$52.76^</td>
<td>$53.82^</td>
<td>$55.97^</td>
<td>$58.21^</td>
<td>$60.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One to One Teaching at the Conservatorium of Music - per hour only  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$60.33</th>
<th>$61.54</th>
<th>$64.00</th>
<th>$66.56</th>
<th>$69.22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Recital Examinations and Auditions (per hour of delivery)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$61.42</th>
<th>$62.65</th>
<th>$65.16</th>
<th>$67.77</th>
<th>$70.48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Musical accompanying, repetiteurship, musical coaching other than with special educational service (1 hour of delivery)  

|                         | $22.06  | $22.50  | $23.40  | $24.34  | $25.31  |

* The class/grade/step code indicated * to be used on claim forms for the above rate

^ Higher rate indicated by ^ to be used for casual academic staff with a relevant PhD and/or performing full subject co-ordination duties

VI - CLINICAL NURSE EDUCATOR

4(e)(i) "A part-time (non-fractional) academic staff member required to provide undergraduate clinical nurse education shall be paid for each hour of clinical education delivered, together with directly associated non-contact duties in the nature of preparation, reasonably contemporaneous marking and student consultation, according to the following table:"  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of undergraduate clinical nurse education and associated working time assumed: - conduct of undergraduate nurse education in a clinical setting</th>
<th>Effective 1/10/98 (incl. 3%)</th>
<th>Effective 3/9/99 (include 2%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/00 (+ 4%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/01 (+ 4%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/02 (+ 4%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Little preparation required (1 hour of delivery and 0.5 hours associated working time)</td>
<td>$33.09</td>
<td>$33.75</td>
<td>$35.10</td>
<td>$36.50</td>
<td>$37.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$39.57 ^</td>
<td>$40.36 ^</td>
<td>$41.98 ^</td>
<td>$43.66 ^</td>
<td>$45.41 ^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Normal preparation time (1 hour of delivery and 1 hour of associated working time)</td>
<td>$44.12</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$46.80</td>
<td>$48.67</td>
<td>$50.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$52.76 ^</td>
<td>$53.82 ^</td>
<td>$55.97 ^</td>
<td>$58.21 ^</td>
<td>$60.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII - CLINICAL EDUCATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-contact duties include liaison with the specific health agency, examination of student patient care plans, student evaluation and counselling and individual preparation for contact periods.</th>
<th>Effective 1/10/98 (incl. 3%)</th>
<th>Effective 3/9/99 (include 2%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/00 (+ 4%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/01 (+ 4%)</th>
<th>Effective f.p.p. after 1/9/02 (+ 4%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average of three hours on non-contact duties per session:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Without experience - rate per hour</td>
<td>$30.17</td>
<td>$30.77</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>$33.28</td>
<td>$34.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Experienced - rate per hour</td>
<td>$32.88</td>
<td>$33.54</td>
<td>$34.88</td>
<td>$36.27</td>
<td>$37.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less time consuming non-contact duties:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Without experience - rate per hour</td>
<td>$25.24</td>
<td>$25.74</td>
<td>$26.77</td>
<td>$27.85</td>
<td>$28.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Experienced - rate per hour</td>
<td>$27.40</td>
<td>$27.95</td>
<td>$29.07</td>
<td>$30.23</td>
<td>$31.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The class/grade/step code indicated * to be used on claim forms for the above rate

^ Higher rate indicated by ^ to be used for casual academic staff with a relevant PhD and/or performing full subject co-ordination duties
to be paid where a relevant doctoral qualification is held or full subject coordination duties are performed

8 Seminars - "definition that is in equivalent terms to that adopted for tutorials" (Supplementary decision, 23 June 1997, Casual pay rate for academic staff) i.e., "specified duration and relatedly provides directly associated non contact duties in the nature of preparation, reasonably contemporaneous marking and student consultation"(or equivalent delivery through other than face to face teaching mode).

# course unit - commonly known as a 'subject'
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the report on the processes to be used for reporting on 2015 cases of academic dishonesty.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Academic Board Policy: Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism, which was in effect until 1 January 2016, requires all faculties to report annually on the incidences of alleged academic dishonesty occurring within the faculty for the previous year. Clause 3.5.1 of the old policy stated:

3.5.1 In March each year, Faculties will report to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee of the Academic Board on:
   (a) the number of allegations of Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism received by the Faculty during the previous year;
   (b) the manner in which the Faculty handled any allegations of Academic Dishonesty or Plagiarism;
   (c) steps taken by the Faculty to promote compliance with this Policy and Procedure, including maintenance of a register of units of study or groups of units of study in which a Plagiarism checking tool is mandated or is intended to be mandated for all students.

During 2015, the VC’s Taskforce on Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism produced its report, which contained a number of key recommendations with regards to the management of academic honesty issues, which has resulted in the new Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015. As such, the manner in which faculties handle allegations and the steps taken to promote compliance are now standardised across the University. Use of plagiarism checking tools is now mandated for all text based assessments.

This is the last year that reporting will be required in this form. It is anticipated that the use of the allegation Reporting Workflow will produce all of the statistics from 2016 onwards (as required by the new Policy), and faculties will only be required to provide commentary.
Non-Confidential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Assoc Prof Peter McCallum, Director Educational Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer/Approver</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper title</td>
<td>Academic Honesty Procedures 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To provide a set of Procedures to accompany the Academic Honesty Policy 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee consider and provide comment on the draft Academic Honesty Procedures 2016.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy was approved in 2015. In 2016 a working party was established to develop accompanying procedures to this policy. Whereas the Policy related to coursework students, and those higher degree by research students undertaking coursework units of study, the procedures have been expanded to cover academic honesty, code breaches and academic integrity in relation to higher degree by research students and their theses.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

One of the recommendations of the taskforce into Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism last year was to write a single set of Procedures that would encompass both Coursework Policy (the new Academic Honesty Policy in Coursework which was approved by the Academic Board last December) and Procedures relating to HDR students. The taskforce identified the current separation of academic honesty provisions for HDR students in several different policies as a risk and Margaret Faedo pointed us to some research which identified policy fragmentation as a demonstrated risk factor.

The Policy Manager made recommendations to the Working Party regarding the movement of parts of the existing policy to procedures.

Work on assessment types risk evaluation in relation to academic integrity, and the work of the SEG Research Training Committee sub-group on academic integrity was incorporated into the procedures.

Work on drafting the procedures commenced in February 2016.

NOTES TO ACCOMPANY PROCEDURES

The Working Party is pleased to present to the Committee the Academic Honesty Procedures. As recommended in the task force report, these procedures include procedures specific to higher degree by research students.

When reading the procedures, members of the committee should note the following clauses that are highlighted for consideration and discussion:

Clause 15: Process for handling suspected academic dishonesty, code breaches or research misconduct at probationary milestone or during candidature:

15 (1) Note 21 (1) of the Research Code: “Allegations of research misconduct should be made to the Director of Research Integrity and if received elsewhere must be referred to the Director of Research Integrity.” 15 (1) –(3) proposes that allegations are made on the online reporting tool and considered in the first instance by the Associate Dean, although the Associate Dean is still required to forward any case of suspected research misconduct to the Director of Research Integrity. An individual still has the right to report a case direction to the Director of Research Integrity but this is not specifically stated Question: is this clause compliant with the Research Code of Conduct?.
Note: adopting this clause will require some adjustment to the Thesis and Examination Policy. At the moment the reason given for declining to examine (13 (7)) of the Thesis and Examination Policy does not include academic dishonesty and the Associate Dean does not have authority to recommend it. This will require an adjustment if adopted.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee consider and discuss the attached Academic Honesty Procedures and provide feedback to Rachel Symons (rachel.symons@sydney.edu.au) by May 20th 2016
PART 1 - PRELIMINARY

1 Purpose and application

(1) These procedures are to give effect to the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy ("the policy").

(2) These procedures apply to:
   (a) staff and affiliates;
   (b) all students enrolled in a coursework award course;
   (c) all higher degree by research students; and
   (d) non-award students, exchange students and study abroad students in a unit of study at the University.

2 Commencement

These procedures commence on [date] or the day after the date on which they are registered.

PART 2 - DEFINITIONS

3 Interpretation

(1) Words and phrases used in these procedures and not otherwise defined in this document have the meanings they have in the policy.

   Note: see clause 6 of the policy.

   Note: In these procedures, the term “the Policy” refers to the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy. All other policies mentioned in the procedures will be referred to by their title.
administrative unit • means the central University administrative unit responsible for the processes of candidature management

Associate Dean Research 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.

Submission check means

PART 3 – COURSEWORK STUDENTS

4 Education in academic honesty and discipline specific requirements

(1) Students should be educated in the academic writing and referencing conventions of their discipline at an early stage in the first semester of the award course in which they are enrolled.

(2) All students commencing a new coursework degree code after 1 January 2016 must complete an online education module on Academic Honesty in their first semester of enrolment, unless they have completed the module or an equivalent course approved by the Office of Educational Integrity in the previous ten calendar years.

(3) For the purpose of these procedures, a new degree code includes:
   (a) students commencing a new degree;
   (b) students transferring degrees within the University or from another institution;
   (c) exchange students;
   (d) non-degree students;
   (e) students commencing honours, where honours is a different code; and
   (f) students in a combined degree program where the degree code changes during candidature.

(4) Students who do not complete the module in their first semester of enrolment:
   (a) must undertake the module in a subsequent semester; and
   (b) will have the result recorded on the academic transcript as a fail.

(5) Students who do not complete the module in the second or subsequent semesters of enrolment will:
   (a) have the result recorded as a fail on their transcript; or
   (b) have the results suppressed; and
   (c) be unable to complete subsequent assessment tasks until the module is completed.

Note: Faculties may put their own processes in place for dealing with students who fail to complete the module.
5 Requirements for assessment

(1) Where there is a possibility that ghostwriting (that is, commissioning another person to write all or part of an assessment) might occur the unit of study coordinator must take reasonable steps to eliminate or minimise the opportunity to do so, so that examiners can be satisfied, as far as reasonably possible, that the submitted work was written by the student without assistance except for reasonable cooperation. Such measures may include, but are not limited to:

(a) requiring an oral presentation of the work as part of the assessment;
(b) assessing outlines, drafts and other iterations of the written work as it is developed;
(c) requiring that students demonstrate their ability to produce unaided work in a supervised examination, where the student is required to pass, or reach a reasonable threshold in, the examination in order to pass the unit of study;
(d) conducting an oral examination.

(2) If a quiz or online assessment contributes significantly to the assessment mark for the unit, the unit of study coordinator must take appropriate steps to assure the academic integrity consistently with the policy and these procedures.

(3) If a quiz or online assessment contributes a small percentage of the overall unit mark, academic integrity should still be considered as part of its design but assurance of the overall academic integrity of assessment for the unit may be through consideration of the complete assessment approach.

(4) If class tests and mid-semester examinations contribute to the assessment mark, the unit of study coordinator must take active measures to provide seating arrangements which prevent copying. Where it is not possible to ensure students cannot see another student’s paper one of the following techniques should be used:

(a) sorted seating where students are sitting with adjacent students taking different examinations;
(b) scrambling multiple choice questions between candidates; or
(c) another appropriate method.

(5) For the purpose of these procedures, legitimate or reasonable cooperation means that the process:

(a) is transparent and open;
(b) is fair, with no unfair advantage to any particular student in students who are working together on an assignment;
(c) advances student learning; and
(d) results in students submitting what they know.

6 Preliminary assessment

(1) Where an Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic becomes aware of an allegation of plagiarism or academic dishonesty, he or she must, in consultation with the examiner:

(a) formulate a clear expression of the alleged conduct; and
(b) form a preliminary view of whether, if proven, it would constitute plagiarism or academic dishonesty.

(2) If the Educational Integrity Coordinator’s preliminary view is that the alleged conduct could not amount to plagiarism or academic dishonesty and was not caused by a failure fully to understand referencing requirements rather than dishonesty as set out in 3 (3), he or she must record ‘no impropriety’ as the decision and take no further steps.

(3) If the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic’s preliminary view is that the conduct is likely to have been caused by a failure to fully understand referencing requirements rather than dishonesty, the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must check the student’s record.

(4) If, after checking the student’s record, the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic still considers that the conduct is likely to have been caused by a failure to fully understand referencing requirements and not dishonesty, the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must:

(a) direct the student to attend and complete, within a specified time, an additional development course on academic integrity approved by the Office of Educational Integrity; and

(b) provided that to do so would not confer an unfair advantage on any student, permit the student to resubmit the work for assessment:

(i) within a specified time; and

(ii) if appropriate, for a specified maximum mark; or

(c) permit the student to undertake alternative assessment:

(i) within a specified time; and

(ii) if appropriate, for a specified maximum mark.

(5) The Office of Educational Integrity must record the student’s completion of, and success or otherwise at, the additional development course.

Note: See the University Recordkeeping Policy and Recordkeeping Manual

(6) If a student satisfactorily completes an additional development course required under 3 (4), the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must record ‘development course completed’ as the outcome and take not further steps beyond those in 3 (4).

(7) If a student who has been required to attend and successfully complete a remedial education course fails to do so within the specified time, the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must require the student to attend an interview and follow the process set out in Clause 18 of the policy.

(8) If the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic’s preliminary view is that the conduct is not likely to have been caused by a failure to understand referencing requirements, the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must then determine whether the matter should be dealt with by the faculty, as provided in Clause 18 of the policy, or referred to the Registrar for action under the By-Law.

(a) If the allegations are such that, if proven, a penalty of failure in the unit of study would not be appropriate, the matter should be referred to the Registrar.

(b) If there is a credible allegation that:
(i) another person has been engaged to complete or contribute to the assessment instead of the student; or

(ii) the student has accepted such an engagement from another student

the matter should be referred to the Registrar.

(9) If the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic forms the view that the conduct should be referred to the Registrar as set out in clause 3 (8), the student must be informed of this in writing.

(10) The Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must inform the examiner and the unit of study coordinator of the outcome of the preliminary assessment process, and record that outcome on the student’s file.

7 Conclusion of no impropriety

(1) If the decision maker concludes that the student has engaged in no impropriety:

(a) the decision maker must inform:

(i) the student;

(ii) the examiner;

(iii) the unit of study coordinator;

and

(b) if the work has not already been assessed, it must be returned to the examiner for assessment on its academic merit.

8 Conclusion of plagiarism or academic dishonesty

(1) If, after further consideration, the decision maker determines that the allegation of plagiarism or academic dishonesty is substantiated, he or she must inform the following of the conclusion reached:

(a) the student;

(b) the examiner;

(c) the unit of study coordinator; and

(d) if not the decision maker, the Educational Integrity Coordinator.

(2) If the decision maker concludes:

(a) that the work contains plagiarism but not dishonest plagiarism; and

(b) after consulting the student record, is satisfied that the plagiarism is due to a failure to fully understand referencing requirements

the decision maker must:

(c) direct the student to attend and successfully complete, within a specified period, and additional development course on academic integrity approved by the Office of Educational Integrity;

(d) inform the unit of study coordinator and, if not the decision maker, the Educational Integrity Coordinator, of the outcome; and

(e) provided that to do so would not confer an unfair advantage on any student, permit the student to resubmit the work for assessment:
(i) within a specified time; and
(ii) if appropriate, for a specified maximum mark;

or

(f) permit the student to undertake alternative assessment:
   (i) within a specified time; and
   (ii) if appropriate, for a specified maximum mark.

(3) The Office of Educational Integrity must record the student's completion of, and success or otherwise at, the additional development course.

(4) If a student who has been required to undertake and successfully complete an additional development course fails to do so, the decision maker must then:
(a) apply one of more of the actions specified in sub-clauses 5 (5); and
(b) inform the following of this decision:
   (i) the student;
   (ii) the Educational Integrity Coordinator, if not the decision maker;
   (iii) the examiner; and
   (iv) the unit of study coordinator.

(5) If the decision maker concludes that the work contains dishonest plagiarism or that the student has engaged in academic dishonesty, the decision maker must apply one or more of the following outcomes:
   (a) provided that to do so would not confer an unfair advantage on any student, require the student to resubmit the work for assessment or undertake alternative assessment:
      (i) within a specified time; and
      (ii) for a specified maximum mark
   (b) require the student to undertake other remedial action;
   (c) apply a fail grade, a mark penalty or a mark to the work which reflects its unsatisfactory standard;
   (d) apply a fail grade or a mark penalty to the unit of study; or
   (e) if the decision maker considers the conduct to be sufficiently serious, refer the matter to the Registrar to be dealt with under the By-Law.

(6) In any case where there is a conclusion of academic dishonesty in a substantial assessment item (as determined by the decision maker in his or her absolute discretion), the penalty should be a mark of zero for the assessment unless there are exceptional mitigating circumstances. The nominated academic may also impose a grade of FA for the unit of study.

(7) If the conduct would, if proven, constitute academic misconduct, the decision maker must refer the matter to the Registrar for investigation under the By-Law.

(8) The decision maker must inform the original examiner, the student and the unit of study coordinator of the results obtained from any resubmission or other remedial action imposed.

9 Risk of educational integrity in assessments
(1) As part of reviewing and revising assessments, staff should give consideration to the degree of risk of educational integrity inherent in each assessment type, and implementing appropriate mitigating measures.

(2) Staff should also consider how likely the risk of educational integrity is to occur versus the contribution of that particular assessment to the overall mark.

(3) All faculties should develop guidelines that give consideration to the degree of risk to educational integrity of the assessment types used within their faculty.

(4) The process used would include the following steps:
   (a) unit of study coordinators will complete a template using the Assessment risk and mitigation table and Risk assessment matrix.
      Note: See Schedule One of these procedures
   (b) in cases where an assessment has a risk that is high or very high, the Learning and teaching committee may wish to discuss the use of that particular assessment with the unit of study coordinators and the implementation of mitigating strategies.
   (c) Learning and teaching committees should ensure that there is follow-up at the end of semester to:
      (i) confirm the initial risk assessment;
      (ii) confirm the success of mitigating strategies; and
      (iii) discuss what may be implemented in the future if the initial strategy was not successful.
   (d) Faculties should report annually any issues that have been identified with particular assessments/assessment types, including any proposed changes and further strategies to mitigate these issues to the Academic Board.

10 Proof-reading and editing of written work

(1) The unit of study coordinator may determine whether students are permitted to use editors or proof-readers in the preparation of written assignments.

(2) If a unit of study coordinator determines that editors or proof-readers are not to be used, this must be indicated in the unit of study outline.

(3) If permitted by the unit of study coordinator students proposing to use an editor must:
   (a) discuss the use of an editor with the relevant tutor, lecturer or unit of study coordinator;
   (b) provide the editor with a copy of these procedures; and
   (c) ensure that their editor abides by the standards set out in the Australian Standards for Editing Practice (ASEP) 2013
      Note: As at the date of these procedures the Australian Standards for Editing Practice (ASEP) 2013 can be found at the website of the Institute of Professional Editors Limited

(4) An editor may only be used for:
   (a) copy-editing and proof-reading; and
   (b) providing advice about:
(i) matters of structure (the need to structure and reword, deletions, additions);
(ii) conventions of grammar and syntax;
(iii) using clear language;
(iv) logical connections between phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs and sections;
(v) voice and tone; and
(vi) avoiding ambiguity, repetition and verbosity.

(5) When an editor has been used:
   (a) the name of the editor and a brief description of the service rendered must
       be printed as part of the list of acknowledgements or other prefatory matter
       near the front of the work when it is submitted for examination; and
   (b) if the editor’s current or former area of academic specialisation is similar to
       that of the student, this must also be stated.

11 Appeals

Students may appeal against academic decisions under the policy and procedures in the
manner provided in the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic

PART 4 – HIGHER DEGREE BY RESEARCH STUDENTS

12 Academic dishonesty, code breaches and research misconduct

(1) Higher degree by research students must adhere to the highest possible standards
    of academic honesty and research integrity and avoid any academic dishonesty,
    code breaches or research misconduct.

(2) All higher degree by research students and their supervisors must abide by the
    conditions of the Research Code of Conduct, the Academic Honesty in
    Coursework Policy and other relevant policies and procedures, including the
    Research Data Management Policy and related procedures.

(3) Academic dishonesty is seeking to obtain or obtaining academic advantage for
    oneself or for others (including in the assessment or publication of work) by
    dishonest or unfair means. In the context of higher degree by research students, it
    is used to describe academically dishonest conduct by a higher degree by
    research student undertaking coursework

    Note: See Clause 9 (1) of the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy

(4) A code breach is conduct which deviates from the requirements of the Research
    Code of Conduct, or any other applicable code of conduct for the research being
    carried out.

    Note: See Clause 19 (1) of the Research Code of Conduct

(5) Research misconduct is conduct which:
   (a) is a code breach as defined in (3) above;
(b) involves intent and deliberation, recklessness or gross and persistent negligence;
(c) has serious consequences, such as false information on the public record, or adverse effects on research participants, animals or the environment.

(6) Any instance of code breach, research misconduct or academic dishonesty by a higher degree by research student will be investigated according to the relevant policy as set out in these procedures.

13 Forms of academic dishonesty, code breach and research misconduct

(1) Any form of academic dishonesty by a higher degree by research student is potentially a code breach.
(2) Any code breach meeting the criteria in 12 (4) above is potentially research misconduct.
(3) Research misconduct includes but is not limited to:
   (a) fabrication, falsification or deception in research proposals, drafts, publications, or thesis;
   (b) plagiarism in a proposal, submitted draft, publication or thesis;
   (c) failure to declare conflict of interest;
   (d) wilful or avoidable failure to follow procedures approved by an ethics committee or conducting research without ethics approval where required;
   (e) misleading ascription of authorship;
   (f) taking, sequestering or materially damaging research-related property without authority;
   (g) risking human safety or wellbeing, animals or the environment;
   (h) gross or persistent negligence in complying with policy or following approved procedure;
   (i) other conduct referred to in Clause 18 (2) of the Research Code of Conduct.
(4) Conduct described in 13 (3) above that is found not to be research misconduct may still be a code breach or academic dishonesty or both.

14 Progression

(1) Students must observe the highest standards of academic and research integrity throughout their candidature.
(2) Students must satisfactorily complete the Responsible Research Practice module and Academic Integrity Research Student module [name to be confirmed] as part of the Preliminary appraisal milestone within six months of commencing candidature as set out in Schedule 1 of the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy.
(3) Supervisors must report any suspected breach of academic or research misconduct by students who they supervise as set out in the relevant policy and these procedures.
(4) Review panels must ensure that students have completed the Responsible Research Practice and Academic Integrity Research Student module [name to be confirmed] modules as part of the Preliminary appraisal milestone within six months of commencing candidature as set out in Schedule 1 of Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy and must report any academic or research misconduct by a student as set out in the relevant policy and these procedures.

(5) Higher degree by research students or staff members who become aware of suspected research or academic misconduct by others must report any academic or research misconduct as set out in the relevant policy and these procedures.

15 Process for handling suspected academic dishonesty, code breaches or research misconduct at probationary milestone or during candidature

(1) A student or staff member who suspects academic dishonesty, a code breach or research misconduct by a higher degree by research student or another researcher must report the suspected misconduct using the online reporting tool.

(2) The Associate Dean Research or postgraduate coordinator will consider all reported cases of suspected academic dishonesty, code breach or research misconduct by a higher degree by research student or another researcher and come to a preliminary view as to whether the conduct potentially constitutes:

(a) research misconduct, a code breach but without misconduct, or
(b) academic dishonesty but with a code breach or research misconduct.

(3) The Associate Dean Research or postgraduate coordinator must refer the suspected case to the Director of Research Integrity if:

(a) the suspected case is potentially a case of research misconduct as defined in 12 (5) above;
(b) the case is related to research work on a project funded by a research grant;
(c) the case is related to research findings that have been published or which are about to be published.

(4) If the Associate Dean Research or postgraduate coordinator's preliminary view is that the conduct is potentially a code breach but not research misconduct the Associate Dean Research or postgraduate coordinator must consult with the Director of Research Integrity and refer the case to the Director of Research Integrity if requested.

(5) If the Associate Dean Research or postgraduate coordinator’s preliminary view is that the conduct is potentially a code breach or academic dishonesty but not research misconduct and the Director of Research Integrity has not requested that the case be referred as set out in 14 (1) (c) above, the Associate Dean Research or postgraduate coordinator must:

(a) inform the student in writing of the allegation as formulated;
(b) appoint a time and place for the student to attend an interview; and
(c) provide the student with:
   (i) any further information and materials relevant to the case; and
   (ii) a copy of these procedures.
(6) Following the interview the Associate Dean Research or postgraduate coordinator will come to a determination on the allegation.

(7) Available determinations:

(a) The Associate Dean Research or postgraduate coordinator must make one or more of the following determinations:

(i) refer the case to the Director of Research Integrity for investigation;

(ii) require the student to undertake additional education and make corrections to data, findings, drafts, papers or other research work;

(iii) require the student to attend an additional progress review in accordance with the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy;

(iv) make a finding of no impropriety.

16 Process for handling suspected academic dishonesty, code breach or research misconduct in a thesis that has been submitted for examination

(1) Three months prior to submission of a thesis for examination all higher degree by research students must check their compliance with any ethics approval given and their data management plan and report to the supervisor.

(2) The administrative unit will conduct a submission check, apply similarity detection software to and conduct a data integrity check to all higher degree by research theses submitted for examination and assess the report.

(3) If the administrative unit is satisfied that the similarity detection and data integrity report reveal no evidence of possible academic dishonesty, code breach or research misconduct, the thesis will be forwarded to examiners for examination.

(4) If, after conducting the submission check referred to in 16 (2) above, the administrative unit has a suspicion of possible academic dishonesty, code breach or research misconduct, the administrative unit must refer the matter to the Associate Dean Research using the online report tool.

(5) On receipt of a suspected case of academic dishonesty, code breach or research misconduct, the Associate Dean Research will come to a preliminary view.

(6) If the Associate Dean Research’s preliminary view is that the thesis contains evidence of potential academic misconduct as defined in 12 (5), a potential code breach as defined in 12 (4), the Associate Dean Research must refer the matter to the Director of Research Integrity in accordance with clause 21 (1) of the Research Code of Conduct.

(7) If the Associate Dean Research’s preliminary view is that the deficiencies identified by the administrative unit do not constitute academic dishonesty, a code breach or research misconduct, the Associate Dean Research will:

(a) forward the thesis to examiners for examination and forward a report on the deficiencies to the PhD Award Sub-Committee and the Faculty Postgraduate Awards Committee requiring that they be addressed along with any recommendations from the examiners and considered when the Faculty Postgraduate Awards Committee and the PhD Awards Sub-Committee are determining the outcome of the examination. A copy of the report is to be kept on the student file.

or
(b) forward the case to the Faculty Postgraduate Committee to reconsider the decision as to whether the thesis is suitable to examine in the light of information discovered in the submission check.

(8) If the Faculty Postgraduate Committee is asked to reconsider a previously taken decision on the basis of information discovered in the submission check outlined in 16 (2) above it must either:

(a) decline to examine the thesis; or

(b) forward the thesis to examiners for examination and forward a report on the deficiencies to the PhD Award Sub-Committee and the Faculty Postgraduate Awards Committee requiring that they be addressed along with any recommendations from the examiners and considered when the Faculty Postgraduate Awards Committee and the PhD Award Sub-Committee are determining the outcome of the examination. A copy of the report is to be kept on the student file.

(9) If the Faculty Postgraduate Committee decides to decline to examine a thesis on the basis of information identified in the submission check described at 12 above, it must:

(a) report the circumstances and reasons for the decision to the PhD Award Sub-Committee;

(b) inform the student in writing of:
   (i) the reasons for declining to examine the thesis;
   (ii) any changes necessary to make the thesis acceptable for examination; and
   (iii) any other actions required to be completed prior to examination.

(c) recommend to the Dean that the student be either:
   (i) permitted to re-enrol in order to complete the necessary actions and changes and resubmit the thesis; or
   (ii) be asked to show good cause why they should be permitted to re-enrol.

(10) If the Faculty Committee decides to decline to examine a thesis as set out in (9) above, the Dean will decide whether the student will be permitted to re-enrol or required to show good cause.

(11) If the Faculty Examinations Committee receives a report from an Associate Dean indicating problems have been identified in the submission check, but that it was decided to send the thesis for examination, it must, on receipt of the examiners reports, forward the reports to the PhD Award Sub-Committee as set out in Clause 10 (11) of the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures after considering the matter as set out in Section 16 (1) of these procedures.

(12) If the PhD Awards Sub-Committee receives a report from either an Associate Dean Research or a Faculty Postgraduate Committee indicating problems have been identified in the submission check, but that it was decided to send the thesis for examination, it must require that all issues identified in the submission check are addressed before a higher degree by research is awarded.

(13) If an internal or an external examiner of a thesis reports allegations of potential academic dishonesty, code breach or research misconduct, matters will be referred for investigation by the Office of Research Integrity. (Clause 10 of the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures).
17 Proof-reading and editing of theses

(1) Students are permitted to use editors or proof-readers in the preparation of their thesis for submission.

(2) Students proposing to use an editor must:
   (a) discuss the use of an editor with their supervisor;
   (b) provide the editor with a copy of these procedures; and
   (c) ensure that their editor abides by the standards set out in the Australian Standards for Editing Practice (ASEP) 2013

Note: As at the date of these procedures the Australian Standards for Editing Practice (ASEP) 2013 can be found at the website of the Institute of Professional Editors Limited

(3) An editor may only be used for:
   (a) copy-editing and proof-reading; and
   (b) providing advice about:
      (i) matters of structure (the need to structure and reword, deletions, additions);
      (ii) conventions of grammar and syntax;
      (iii) using clear language;
      (iv) logical connections between phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs and sections;
      (v) voice and tone; and
      (vi) avoiding ambiguity, repetition and verbosity.

(4) When an editor has been used:
   (a) the name of the editor and a brief description of the service rendered must be printed as part of the list of acknowledgements or other prefatory matter near the front of the work when it is submitted for examination; and
   (b) if the editor’s current or former area of academic specialisation is similar to that of the student, this must also be stated.

18 Appeals

Students may appeal against academic decisions under the policy and procedures in the manner provided in the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended).

19 Rescissions and replacements

This document replaces the following, which are rescinded as from the date of commencement of this document:

(1) Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Procedures, which commenced in 2012
## Schedule One: Summary of Assessment Types, Risks and Mitigating Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Type</th>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Suggested Mitigating Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invigilated Quiz</td>
<td>Identity of student</td>
<td>Identity Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-exam room setting, or poor spacing in room</td>
<td>Multiple versions of same paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Randomisation of the question order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Try to book bigger room or even 2 rooms to spread class out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple quizzes run on different days with similar but not identical</td>
<td>Questions with answers likely to be memorized and shared through social media – ensure no mobile phones, difficult to totally mitigate for, content should be retested in formal examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>questions (may be electronic or paper based)</td>
<td>Password protected entry to quiz if electronically accessed. Automatic closure of exam after time is completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Invigilated Exam</td>
<td>Identity of student</td>
<td>Identity Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confidential papers removed from exam room</td>
<td>Maintain strict exam conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t use confidential papers if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions from confidential papers memorized and then reproduced</td>
<td>Always change at least some questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t use confidential papers if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Always change at least some questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Give sample, practice or past papers/questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Type</td>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Suggested Mitigating Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invigilated Oral Exam (vivas, OSCEs, patient examinations)</td>
<td>Identity of student</td>
<td>Identity Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reuse of questions</td>
<td>Quarantine students before/after exam until all students with same questions have finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-test work in a formal (preferably barrier) exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have a test bank of suitable questions/scenarios to reduce the likelihood of students been given “the same” question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-invigilated Quiz</td>
<td>No assurance of identity of student at all</td>
<td>Impossible to assure identity, therefore ensure that it is a low weighted assessment and re-test work in a formal (preferably barrier) exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider the use of technology such as Examity (??)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identity of student completing work</td>
<td>Include an oral component with detailed questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment (as above) with scaffolding or periodic submission of sections</td>
<td>Identity of student completing work</td>
<td>Include an oral component with detailed questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Presentation</td>
<td>Identity of student of who prepared presentation and speech?</td>
<td>Include detailed oral questions about topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Type</td>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Suggested Mitigating Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-lab/pre-tutorial work</td>
<td>Identity of student who completed work</td>
<td>Ensure that weighting of pre-class work is low, retest in formal (preferably barrier) exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab class</td>
<td>Source of results were used for write up</td>
<td>Require students to submit results or product before leaving the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plagiarism of Lab report</td>
<td>Use Turnitin for submitted written work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If lab is a repeat no assurance of identity of person who obtained results</td>
<td>Include 5 min viva on lab experiment with detailed questions, and/or retest in final barrier exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical exams</td>
<td>Identity of student</td>
<td>Identity Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple exams run on different days with similar but not identical questions</td>
<td>Questions with answers likely to be shared through social media – ensure no mobile phones, difficult to totally mitigate for, ensure content is retested in formal barrier examination. Have a test bank of suitable questions/scenarios to reduce the likelihood of students been given “the same” question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>If repeat class no assurance of identity of person who prepared work.</td>
<td>Keep weighting low, ensure content is retested in formal barrier examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Type</td>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Suggested Mitigating Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>Did student attend placement at all?</td>
<td>Visit or Skype call to placement site, at least once during course of placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have a mid-way “check” of student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Require student to produce ID card to placement site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plagiarism of report or reflective diary used to assess placement</td>
<td>Use Turnitin for submitted work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forgery of signature of external educators on assessment reports or</td>
<td>All assessment pieces with educator signature to be duplicated and forward to University for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>competency documents</td>
<td>cross check. Consider electronic submission of placement assessment reports. Keep a bank of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identity of who completed report, reflective diary etc associated</td>
<td>authorized signatures for review. Use watermarked documents that allow alterations to be clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with placement</td>
<td>identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Performances</td>
<td>Identity of student</td>
<td>Include short interview about placement activities, include preceptor if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Type</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Mitigating Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reasons for not using a particular mitigating strategy
# Educational Integrity of Assessments Risk Assessment Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Significance</th>
<th>Not Significant</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Highly Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning &amp; Teaching Activity with low weighted contribution to final mark. Content can be retested in formal exam</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low weighted assessment e.g. short quiz. Content can be retested in formal exam</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment that contributes to a significant proportion of marks (~30%). Content can be retested in formal exam</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major assessment (~50%) but content can be retested in a formal exam or OSCE.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major assessment e.g. final exam Honours thesis, dissertation, test of essential professional skills. Cannot be further examined.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Almost Certain</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Rare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected to occur regularly</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected to occur</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately likely</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not likely to occur</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May happen, but not often</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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