MINUTES

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES
The Chair welcomed members, noting that Dr Schwartz was attending for Professor Pattison and Ms Hush was attending as an observer.

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS
2.1 Minutes of Meeting 2016/1, 9 March 2016
Members confirmed the minutes of the last meeting held on 9 March 2016.

ASPC16/2-1
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolved that the minutes of meeting 2016/1, held on 19 March 2016, 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 the proposed amendment to the Coursework Policy 2014 regarding simple extensions had been approved at the Academic Board’s last meeting. An email has gone to faculties and the issue was also included in this week’s staff and student news.

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

3.2 Report of the Academic Board meeting held 30 March 2016
Associate Professor Masters advised that in addition to the news items on simple extensions, there is information on the Academic Board’s website with a brief FAQ section. The webpage advises that there are no procedures as yet for simple extensions, but these will be developed. In the interim, it is recommended that arrangements for simple extensions should be confirmed by email between the student and the unit of study co-ordinator, and the subject line for the email should include “simple extensions”, the student’s SID and the unit of study code.

ASPC16/2-3
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 30 March 2016.

4 ITEMS FOR APPROVAL
4.1 Assessment types risk evaluation
The Chair advised that the matrix had been updated following discussions at the last meeting. There will be a policy change related to the matrix, but it will be presented with other amendments
to the Academic Honesty Policy. Members endorsed the revised matrix.

**ASPC16/2-4**

The Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommends the Academic Board adopt the draft guidelines for assessment types risk evaluation.

### 4.2 Anonymous and De-Identified Marking

Dr Schwartz reminded members that this issue was raised by the SRC last year, and had been considered by the SEG Education Committee and this committee. This further paper looks at the differences between anonymous and de-identified marking, and sets out the changes that will be required to policy and procedures if such a process is introduced. Associate Professor Gibbens questioned the definitions of anonymous and de-identified marking in the paper, suggesting they were the wrong way around and that anonymous marking (where no name is used but the student is identified by their student number) is the system used at other universities. Dr Schwartz advised that she would check this point. The Chair advised members that the policy changes related to examinations referred to in this report should be coming to the Committee’s next meeting and will cover issues such as the processing of all examinations held in the exams period via the exams office, and a simplification of the different exam times and reading periods which will be used.

Associate Professor Peat pointed out that anonymous marking is unlikely to have much impact against unconscious bias in units such as his, where almost all the students are from mainland China, and the Chair agreed that the process would have different levels of impact in different disciplines. Ms Henderson pointed out that ethnicity is not the only dimension in which unconscious bias can operate, but can also cover gender identity, sexual orientation and other issues. Associate Professor Gerzina noted the process is aimed at written assignments and examinations, and asked if there would be any suggestion of using it for clinical examinations where it can be crucial to identify the student under examination. The Chair agreed it would not work in such circumstances, and Professor Gerzina suggested there be a statement that it would not apply in live performance and clinical settings. Ms Henderson and Associate Professor Elias pointed out that the report refers to only written examinations.

Ms Vimalarajah thanked the committee for discussing and supporting this policy change, but asked that students be advised why this change is being implemented and that it is to make the marking system fairer and to minimise unconscious bias. Professor Masters noted that the SRC had originally raised this issue and he thanked them for their work.

Professor Peat noted that the risk mitigation matrix refers to personal presentations as a way of ensuring academic honesty, but this report is endorsing anonymous marking, and he asked if there was a risk of the Academic Board sending mixed messages. The Chair advised that she had discussed this issue with Ms Rozenberg when they developed the matrix, and pointed out that the presentation could be a brief one which is not worthy many marks, or any at all, and is used as a post-audit process. Associate Professor Elias added that the Board should be stressing that anonymous marking is for fairness, but academic staff should also get to know their students. Members endorsed the proposal.

**ASPC16/2-5**

The Academic Standards and Policy Committee:

1. endorsed anonymous marking (identification by SID only) for all assignments and examinations; and
2. noted that consequent amendments to the Coursework Policy 2014 and Assessment Procedures 2011 will be submitted to the Academic Board for its approval.

### 4.3 Board of Interdisciplinary Studies – Terms of reference and governance issues

Dr Schwartz advised that this item is related to the curriculum framework report in item 5.1, with both focussing on the implementation of sections of the strategic plan. The Board of Interdisciplinary Studies already exists, but changes are proposed to its terms of reference to reflect both the strategic plan and the University’s continuing education strategy, which was approved by SEG last year. She noted that more work is required before the final terms of reference can be submitted to the Academic Board and Senate, but sought the committee’s comments and feedback.
Professor Peat noted the reference to interdisciplinary projects and asked if this included within faculties, as well as between faculties. Dr Schwartz clarified that this referred to cross-faculty projects only. Mrs Agus asked if the term interdisciplinary be used in a consistent fashion to avoid confusion, and suggested that “cross-faculty” might be a better term. Ms Henderson pointed out that the new University structure will include a number of units, referred to as schools, which were previously faculties but would no longer have the status of faculties, and this could make the term “cross-faculty” a difficult one to use. Dr Schwartz advised that units being offered in the Bachelor of Advanced Studies will be administered by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.

Mr Greenwell queried the change to student membership of the Board, and asked what criteria will be used by the Chair of the Academic Board when appointing students. Professor Masters advised that he will consult with SUPRA and the SRC to develop a protocol. Ms Henderson noted that there may be consequent amendments required to other Senate Rules or resolutions as a result of the proposed amendments to the terms of reference of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies. Members noted the report.

**ASPC16/2-6**

The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the report on proposed amendments to the terms of reference for the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.

### 5.1 Curriculum Framework – Policy Amendments

The Chair advised members that this item and the two draft procedures documents would be coming back to the committee’s next meeting in June. Dr Schwartz advised that a number of working parties have been looking at issues related to the new curriculum framework. Some definitions and policy statements to underpin the new framework have been developed, and these will form the basis for the course proposals to be submitted later in the year.

The Chair advised that she and Professor Masters have identified some issues. She queried the reference to 5000 and 6000 level units of study, noting that many postgraduate courses only use 5000 level units, and asked if faculties will be required to recode some units. Dr Schwartz advised the reference was simply a reflection of how units are coded at the undergraduate level, and the Chair suggested the policy change refer to 5000 or 6000 level units. She also suggested that the definitions of majors and minors could be reworded and simplified. Professor Masters noted the reference to exceptions to the standard 6 credit point weighting for units of study, pointing out that exceptions already exist and that this reference should be reworded. He also queried the use of the word “program” which has a specific definition but is then used in other ways. Mrs Agus asked if the number of clause 84A inferred it was a subset of the previous clause, and Ms Henderson advised the numbering would be reviewed by her unit. Professor Masters also pointed out that the reference to AQF levels for undergraduate degrees should be 7, not 9. Members noted the report.

**ASPC16/2-7**

The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the report on policy amendments required to implement the curriculum framework outlined in the University’s Strategic Plan 2016-2020.

### 5.2 Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016

Dr Schwartz advised that these draft procedures were commenced in 2015 as part of the development of the Learning and Teaching Policy. The procedures have been further amended to reflect proposed changes to the course approval process related to the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies. The Chair advised she had some suggested amendments to the procedures, and Ms Henderson added that she would need to review these. She suggested the final version of the procedures be considered in the context of any amendments to the Learning and Teaching Policy. Members noted the draft procedures.

**ASPC16/2-8**

The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the proposed Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016.
5.3 Review of Policies in 2016
The Chair noted that this item outlines those Academic Board policies which have not yet been reviewed and provides suggestions on what should be done with each of them. She noted that the main policies still requiring review relate to scholarships and that a meeting will be organised with the Head of Fees and Scholarships to discuss how this will be done. Dr Schwartz advised that Student Support Services is currently looking at the Student Code of Conduct and will be making recommendations to the Student Consultative Committee. Members noted the report.

ASPC16/2-9
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the report on the review of policies in 2016.

5.4 2015 Annual Reports on Cases of Academic Dishonesty
The Chair advised members that a template was circulated prior to the meeting and the aim is to have faculties respond by 30 June 2016. It was agreed the template would also be circulated to faculty managers.

ASPC16/2-10
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the report on the processes to be used for reporting on 2015 cases of academic dishonesty.

5.5 Academic Honesty Procedures 2016
The Chair noted that this item was also for discussion only. Dr Schwartz added that this had been developed from the recommendations of the Taskforce on Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism. The previous University policy had been a mix of policy and procedures and it was agreed that the new policy would have a set of complementary procedures. The Taskforce had also recommended the procedures cover HDR students, noting that information on how to deal with academic misconduct by this group of students is currently outlined in the research code of conduct. Ms Henderson advised that some consequent amendment to the research code of conduct and the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research policy would be needed. Members noted the draft procedures.

ASPC16/2-11
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee considered the draft Academic Honesty Procedures 2016.

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

6.2 Next meeting 8th June 2016

Remaining Meeting Dates for 2016
2:00 pm Wednesday, 8th June 2016
2:00 pm Wednesday, 20th July 2016
2:00 pm Wednesday, 24th August 2016
2:00 pm Wednesday, 12th October 2016
2:00 pm Wednesday, 9th 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