NOTICE OF MEETING

Meeting 4/2016 of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee will be held from 2:00pm – 4:00pm on Wednesday 20 July 2016 in the Senate Room, Quadrangle. The Agenda for the meeting is below.

Matthew Charet
Executive Officer to the Academic Board

AGENDA

Non-confidential items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>WELCOME AND APOLOGIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Committee welcomes Associate Professor Alex Chaves as representative of the Faculty of Veterinary Science.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apologies have been received from Professor Adam Bridgeman, Associate Professor Peter Gibbens, Professor Manuel Graeber, and Professor Pip Pattison.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PROCEDURAL MATTERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Minutes of Meeting 3/2016 on 8 June 2016</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Actions Arising</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STANDING ITEMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Report of the Chair</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Report of the Academic Board meeting, 29 June 2016</td>
<td>Tony Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ITEMS FOR APPROVAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Course Amendment Proposal: Faculty of Engineering and IT – Bachelor of Engineering (Honours)</td>
<td>Tim Wilkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Academic Honesty Procedures</td>
<td>Peter McCallum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ITEMS FOR NOTING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2015 Academic Dishonesty Reports</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>OTHER BUSINESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Any Other Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respect is a core value of the Academic Board
Next meeting: 2:00pm – 4:00pm, Wednesday 24 August 2016
Senate Room, Quadrangle

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.

20 July 2016
ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY COMMITTEE

2:00pm – 4:00pm, Wednesday 8 June 2016
Senate Room, Quadrangle (A14)

Members Present: Professor Jane Hanrahan (Chair); Helen Agus, Science; Associate Professor Tim Allender, Education and Social Work; Associate Professor Geoff Frost, Business School; Associate Professor Tania Gerzina, Dentistry; Associate Professor Peter Gibbens, Engineering and IT; Professor Manuel Graeber, Medicine; Thomas Greenwell, nominee, SUPRA; Kylee Hartman-Warren, Postgraduate Student; Kerrie Henderson, Office of General Counsel; Associate Professor Glen Hill, Architecture, Design and Planning; Associate Professor Veyesel Kayser, Pharmacy; Dr Peter Knight, Medicine; Associate Professor Tony Masters, Chair of the Academic Board; Associate Professor Peter McCallum (for Professor Pip Pattison); Associate Professor Mark Melatos, Arts and Social Sciences; Professor Greg Tolhurst, Law; Subeta Vimalarajah, Undergraduate Student.

Attendees: None.

Apologies: Associate Professor Thomas Bishop, Agriculture and Environment; Dr Frances Di Lauro, Arts and Social Sciences; Associate Professor Ann Elias, Sydney College of the Arts; Professor Pip Pattison, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (Associate Professor Peter McCallum attending instead); Associate Professor Maurice Peat, Business School; Associate Professor Jennifer Rowley, Sydney Conservatorium of Music; Dr Debra Shirley, Health Sciences; and Matthew Charet (Secretary).

MINUTES

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES
The Chair welcomed members and conveyed apologies from those unable to attend.

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS
2.1 Minutes of Meeting 2/2016 on 15 May 2016
Members confirmed the minutes of the last meeting held on 15 May 2016.

Resolution ASPC2016/3-1
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolved that the minutes of meeting 2/2016, held on 15 May 2016, be confirmed as a true record.

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

3 STANDING ITEMS
3.1 Report of the Chair
The Chair advised that she had nothing to add to the written report.

Resolution ASPC2016/3-2
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the report of the Chair.

3.2 Report of the Academic Board meeting of 18 May 2016
In addition to the written report, Associate Professor Masters advised that at a recent meeting of the NSW Chairs of Academic Board and Senate, the University’s adoption of HSC Mathematics as a prerequisite for admission to a suite of degrees was praised as “a game changer” and has already had a marked effect on driving student and teacher behaviour.

Resolution ASPC16/3-3
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 18 June 2016.
4 ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

4.1 Curriculum Framework

Associate Professor McCallum spoke to a proposal to amend the Coursework Policy 2014 and the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 to accommodate the curriculum framework in the Strategic Plan 2016-2020, following discussion of the amendments at the SEG Education, ASPC and Undergraduate Studies Committees. The Committee was advised that minor wording changes remain to be made to the Coursework Policy, including further refinement of several definitions. Faculties have the option of deciding in which pool their undergraduate degrees sit, with clarification now provided as to the definitions of Liberal Studies and professional or specialist degrees. A course resolution proposal for the Bachelor of Advanced Studies degree is anticipated for approval to August meetings of the appropriate committees.

In discussion, it was confirmed that at the moment the Bachelor of Advanced Studies was anticipated as a minimum AQF 7 qualification, but could be AQF 8 if it included an Honours component; there may also be merit to classifying the qualification as AQF 8 on the basis of the standards acquired and this would be a decision for the Academic Board to make in its assessment of the course when it is submitted.

A number of other suggestions were made: the inclusion of 5000 and 6000-level units of study under clause 9(k) was identified as problematic; the ban on use of third party learning technologies at 20(1) should be amended to allow such use, with the proviso that work must be able to be retrieved from such systems in the case of appeals, requiring some assessment of the tool by staff who are intending to use it; and the use of the term ‘faculty boards’ in Part 5(3)(a) was amended to ‘faculties’, noting that these responsibilities may be further impacted by forthcoming organisational change.

Pending these minor changes, the proposal to amend the Coursework Policy 2014 and the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 was approved.

Resolution ASPC16/3-4

*The Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommends that the Academic Board approve amendment of the Coursework Policy 2014 and the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 embedding the curriculum framework of the Strategic Plan 2016-2020, as presented.*

4.2 Honours in Combined Degrees with Bachelor of Advanced Studies

Associate Professor McCallum spoke to a proposal to amend the Coursework Policy 2014 as it relates to Honours in combined degrees with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies. A model was presented for approval, presenting Honours as an integrated program rather than appended so no extra year will be required to complete an Honours qualification. Nomenclature would signpost where and how the honours component was undertaken, with the possibility remaining that students could undertake Honours in the primary Liberal Studies (non-Advanced Studies) degree, or in the area of a second major. It is also proposed that the faculty offering the honours component would administer the candidature, including definition of admission and award criteria.

In discussion, the Committee was advised that it would be possible for students who have completed undergraduate qualifications elsewhere to transfer into the program, and at present there is no need for policy amendments to allow stand-alone enrolment in the Bachelor of Advanced Studies 3rd Year to enable this. Associate Professor Frost noted inconsistency in Honours grading presented in clauses 95, 96, 97 and 98, and Associate Professor McCallum advised that the award of Honours 1 for integrated programs is currently set at 75%. The Committee was also advised that a proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies (FEIT) is being submitted to the Undergraduate Studies Committee meeting of 15 June regarding the grading of Honours 3, necessitated by accreditation.

The setting of minimum standards for the award of a degree with Honours was raised, with an argument that an Honours result of less than 65% indicates that the student has not met the standard required for the award of Honours. Associate Professor McCallum advised that the grading for integrated Honours is based on different criteria to appended Honours, and is WAM-based rather than grading a dedicated program of study assessed against defined standards. The establishment of faculty-specific thresholds for Honours was flagged as problematic, but it was agreed to focus on the proposal as presented, rather than incorporating the potential proposal from FEIT into consideration.
The proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution ASPC16/3-5**
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee:
(1) endorsed the model for honours and double honours in combined degrees with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies;
(2) recommend that the Academic Board approve changes to the Coursework Policy 2014 arising from the model; and
(3) flag an intention to consider moving appended honours programs for stand-alone Liberal Studies into the proposed combined degree model; as presented.

4.3 Learning and Teaching Procedures
Associate Professor McCallum spoke to a proposal to introduce a revised set of Procedures to accompany the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015. This is an update to a draft presented to the Committee at its meeting of 20 April, with changes requested by faculties during consultation highlighted for easy identification. It was noted that some of the text as originally proposed has subsequently been moved into the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

The proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution ASPC16/3-6**
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend the adoption of the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016, as presented, to the Academic Board and the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education).

4.4 Simple Extensions – Amendment to Assessment Procedures 2011
Ms Henderson spoke to a proposal to amend the Assessment Procedures 2011 relating to simple extensions, arising from the previous approval of amendments to the Coursework Policy 2014 to reinstate a specific reference to the use of simple extensions. The amendments allow faculties to determine the process for managing simple extensions, with minimum requirements set. A system of permanent record-keeping has yet to be developed, although Mrs Agus advised that the Working Group discussed tracking and uploading email permissions to Records Online, with the importance of University-wide access to records of simple extensions flagged as a necessity to address equity concerns with exploitation and to assist in identifying students who may need additional support.

Associate Professor Frost suggested that the proposed system for managing simple extensions may be over-managing, with the process likened to Special Consideration ‘lite’.

To determine the level of take-up and administration of simple extensions, it was agreed that faculties be asked to report on instances of simple extension at the end of each semester.

The proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution ASPC16/3-7**
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board approve the amendment of the Assessment Procedures 2011, as presented, with immediate effect.

5 ITEMS FOR NOTING

5.1 Phase 4 Faculty Review Report and Faculty Response – Health Sciences
The Phase 4 Faculty Review Report and Faculty Response for the Faculty of Health Sciences was circulated to the Committee, and noted as presented.

**Resolution ASPC16/3-8**
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the Phase 4 Faculty Review Report and Faculty Response for the Faculty of Health Sciences, as presented.

5.2 Report of the Simplification of Examination Processes Working Group meeting of 23 May 2016
The Report of the Simplification of Examination Processes Working Group meeting of 23 May was circulated to the Committee, along with a confidential paper prepared by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) for the Senior Executive Group on Simplified End of Semester Examinations Arrangements.

The Chair acknowledged the work of the Associate-Professor Susan McGrath-Champ and the
members of the Working Group. In discussion, it was noted that the report of the Registrar only relates to written exams and members made a number of suggestions that they were encouraged to pass directly to the Registrar. While members of the committee were generally supportive of the proposed simplified measures, a number of issues were raised, and the Chair agreed to pass these to the Registrar.

Feedback from academic staff on examination processes for Semester 1 suggests that the new timetabling system is extremely inflexible, both as to timing and location. Concern was also expressed relating to special arrangements for alternative examinations or exam conditions managed through Disability Services, with possible impact on academic honesty. Clarification was sought relating to the number of alternate exam papers that staff might reasonably be expected to produce, noting a challenge to maintain standards and ensure equity of assessment. Access to seating patterns particularly with tiered seating arrangements, was requested, as well as the incorporation of de-identified and anonymous examinations.

Members were informed that assessment procedures are to be brought to the Committee in future, and that the Exams Unit is currently working with Records to develop an online reporting mechanism for exam misconduct. The impact on unit of study coordinators of the volume of material (especially new procedures) coming from the Registrar’s Office in recent months was also raised. The current requirement to produce exam scripts before all of the course content has been delivered was highlighted as a challenge, as is the lateness of availability of exam timetables, the latter especially impacting outgoing Study Abroad students.

Resolution ASPC16/3-9
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the report of the Simplification of Examination Processes Working Group meeting held on 23 May 2016, as presented.

5.3 2015 Academic Dishonesty Reports reminder
Members were reminded that 2015 Academic Dishonesty Reports are to be returned to the Secretary by 30 June 2016, for reporting at the following meeting.

Resolution ASPC16/3-10
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the report on the review of policies in 2016.

6 OTHER BUSINESS
6.1 Any Other Business
Clarification of the role of the Committee was requested, especially relating to the setting and maintenance of academic standards. It was agreed that the Committee checks performance against standards, but is not currently empowered to set these standards, nor to write policy. Associate Professor Masters informed the Committee that an external review of the Academic Board is anticipated to take place in the second half of 2016, and suggested that the role and scope of both the Board and its Standing Committees might best be addressed through the consultation process relating to this review.

There being no other business, the meeting closed at 3:40pm.

Next meeting: 2:00pm – 4:00pm, Wednesday 20 July 2016
Senate Room, Quadrangle

Remaining Meeting Dates for 2016:
2:00pm – 4:00pm, Wednesday 20 July 2016
2:00pm – 4:00pm, Wednesday 24 August 2016
2:00pm – 4:00pm, Wednesday 12 October 2016
2:00pm – 4:00pm, Wednesday 9 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
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 29 June 2016.

REPORT OF ACADEMIC BOARD MEETING

Items related to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee
The Academic Board:
- approved the amendment of the Coursework Policy 2014 and the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 embedding the curriculum framework of the Strategic Plan 2016-2020, as well as Honours provisions relating to Honours in combined degrees with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies;
- approved the introduction of the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016;
- approved the amendment of the Assessment Procedures 2011;
- noted that the Academic Standards and Policy Committee endorsed the model for honours and double honours in combined degrees with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies; and
- noted that the Academic Standards and Policy Committee flagged an intention to consider moving appended honours programs for stand-alone Liberal Studies into the proposed combined degree model.

Other matters
The Academic Board also:
- noted an amended version of Course Resolutions from the Sydney Medical School for the Bachelor of Medicine/Bachelor of Surgery and the Doctor of Medicine approved at the meeting of 18 May 2016;
- noted a presentation by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) on The University of Sydney Education and Research Innovation Week – 24-28 October 2016;
- recommended that Senate approve the scope, Terms of Reference and timeline to conduct an external review of the Academic Board;
- received an update report from the Equity and Diversity Working Group;
- noted the report of the student members of the Academic Board on Sexual Harassment Policy; Anonymous Marking; Simple Extensions; Special Consideration; the New SUPRA Executive; and Sydney College of the Arts;
- noted a verbal report of the Acting Vice-Chancellor on the Sydney College of the Arts;
- endorsed the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the faculty constitution, and recommended that Senate approve the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate related to the Constitution of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences;
- approved a proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Graduate Certificate in Applied Linguistics, Graduate Diploma in Applied Linguistics and Master of Applied Linguistics;
- approved a proposal from Sydney Medical School and partner faculties to amend the Bachelor of Commerce and Doctor of Medicine, Bachelor of Economics and Doctor of Medicine, Bachelor of Music Studies and Doctor of Medicine, Bachelor of Science (Advanced) and Doctor of Medicine, and Bachelor of Medical Science and Doctor of Medicine combined degree programs;
- approved a proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and IT to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours Mechanical Engineering stream;
• approved a proposal from the Sydney Law School to amend the Bachelor of Laws;
• approved a proposal from the Sydney Law School to amend the Faculty of Law coursework assessment guidelines in the Resolutions of the Faculty of Law for Coursework Awards;
• approved a proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences – Honours Provisions 2014;
• approved a proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to delete the World Religions major;
• approved a proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to merge two majors – Biblical Studies and Hebrew (Classical);
• approved a proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Economics combined degrees to include the five majors offered by the School of Economics;
• approved a proposal from the Sydney Nursing School to amend the study pattern for the Bachelor of Nursing (Advanced Studies);
• approved a proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the course resolutions and unit of study table for the Bachelor of Applied Science (Diagnostic Radiography) Pass and Honours;
• approved a proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to include a new elective in the Faculty of Health Sciences undergraduate electives list;
• approved a proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Health Sciences units of study table;
• approved a proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to delete the Master of Human Rights and Democratisation (Asia Pacific Regional Program); approve the deletion of Course Resolutions arising from this proposal; and recommend that Senate endorse the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal and approve amendments to the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences;
• approved a proposal from Sydney Medical School to amend the Master of Medicine, Master of Medicine (Advanced), Master of Science in Medicine, Master of Science in Medicine (Advanced), Graduate Diploma in Medicine, Graduate Diploma in Science in Medicine, Graduate Certificate in Medicine and Graduate Certificate in Science in Medicine to introduce a stream in Internal Medicine; approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal; and recommend that Senate endorse the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal and approve amendments to the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in Sydney Medical School;
• approved a proposal from Sydney Medical School to amend the Master of Medicine, Master of Medicine (Advanced), Master of Science in Medicine, Master of Science in Medicine (Advanced), Graduate Diploma in Medicine, Graduate Diploma in Science in Medicine, Graduate Certificate in Medicine and Graduate Certificate in Science in Medicine to introduce a stream in Pharmaceutical & Medical Device Development; approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal; and recommend that Senate endorse the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal and approve amendments to the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in Sydney Medical School, with effect from 1 January 2017;
• approved a proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend the Master of Commerce, Graduate Diploma in Commerce and Graduate Certificate in Commerce;
• approved a proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend the admission criteria for the Master of Commerce, Master of Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations, Master of International Business, Master of Logistics and Supply Chain Management, Master of Marketing, Master of Professional Accounting and Master of Transport Management;
• approved a proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend the Master of Human Resource Management & Industrial Relations and embedded programs;
• approved a proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend the Master of Professional Accounting;
• approved a proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend the Master of Logistics and Supply Chain Management, Graduate Diploma in Logistics and Supply Chain Management and Graduate Certificate in Logistics and Supply Chain Management;
• approved a proposal from the Faculty of Education and Social Work to amend the Master of Learning Sciences and Technology (Professional);
• approved a proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Engineering;
• approved a proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Engineering and Master of Professional Engineering;
Non-Confidential

- approved a proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Data Science;
- approved a proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Health Technology Innovation;
- approved a proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Information Technology, Master of Information Technology Management, Master of Information Technology / Master of Information Technology Management and Graduate Diploma in Computing;
- approved a proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Master of Diagnostic Radiography;
- approved two proposals from the Sydney Law School to amend the Juris Doctor;
- approved a proposal from the Sydney Medical School to amend the Doctor of Medicine;
- approved a proposal from the Sydney Medical School to amend the Master of Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology), Graduate Certificate in Clinical Epidemiology, Graduate Diploma in Clinical Epidemiology and Master of Science in Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology);
- approved a proposal from the Sydney Medical School to amend the Graduate Certificate in Medicine (Sleep Medicine), Graduate Diploma in Medicine (Sleep Medicine), Master of Medicine (Sleep Medicine), Master of Medicine (Advanced) (Sleep Medicine), Graduate Certificate in Science in Medicine (Sleep Medicine), Graduate Diploma in Science in Medicine (Sleep Medicine), Master of Science in Medicine (Sleep Medicine) and Master of Science in Medicine (Advanced) (Sleep Medicine);
- approved a proposal from Sydney Medical School to amend the Graduate Certificate in Surgery (Breast Surgery) and Master of Surgery (Breast Surgery) programs;
- approved two proposals from the Sydney Nursing School to amend the Master of Advanced Nursing Practice, Master of Cancer and Haematology Nursing, Master of Emergency Nursing, Master of Intensive Care Nursing, Master of Mental Health Nursing, Master of Primary Health Care Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Advanced Nursing Practice, Graduate Diploma in Cancer and Haematology Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Emergency Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Intensive Care Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Mental Health Nursing and Graduate Diploma in Primary Health Care Nursing;
- approved a proposal from the Faculty of Veterinary Science to amend the Bachelor of Veterinary Biology / Doctor of Veterinary Medicine and Doctor of Veterinary Medicine;
- approved a proposal from the Combined Board of Postgraduate Studies for Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing and Pharmacy to amend the Master of Philosophy degree in the Faculties of Dentistry, Medicine and Pharmacy; and
- endorsed in principle a proposal to amend the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy and Procedures, with specific emendations to current policy and procedures to be returned to the Graduate Studies Committee for approval following appropriate development and consultation.
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<td>Paper title</td>
<td>Amendment of the Coursework Policy 2014 to allow for the awarding of third class honours in programs with integrated honours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To amend the clauses relating to honours in the Coursework Policy 2014 to allow for the awarding of third class honours in programs with integrated honours. This will allow the Bachelor of Engineering (Honours) to remain accredited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

*That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that Academic Board approve the amendment of the clauses relating to honours in the Coursework Policy 2014 to allow for the awarding of third class honours in programs with integrated honours, to take effect from 1 January, 2017.*

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies proposes to bring the University’s Bachelor of Engineering programs into alignment with the practice across the sector, where all graduates from 4-year Bachelor of Engineering programs (and the associated combined degrees) are awarded an AQF8 qualification.

Engineers Australia (the external body responsible for accrediting professional engineering degrees) has indicated they will no longer accredit AQF7 (non-honours) programs. Sydney University is now the only institution in the country that does not recognise all 4-year undergraduate engineering programs as AQF8 (something currently prohibited by our Coursework Policy).

The proposed policy amendment will allow awarding of third class honours in programs with integrated honours. To not make this change would severely undermine the ongoing viability of the Engineering programs.

A version of this proposal was presented to and supported by the 15 June meeting of the Undergraduate Studies Committee, subject to further discussion with the Director, Education Strategy to ensure that proposed changes to the Coursework Policy 2014 are consistent with the most current version endorsed by the Academic Standards and Policy Committee on 8 June, and approval from the Academic Standards and Policy Committee regarding the proposed Coursework Policy 2014 changes. These changes are now presented to the Committee for consideration, as outlined on pages 5-8 below.
Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Engineering and Information Technologies

Contact person: Prof David Lowe x15653, Christine Lacey x40678

1. Name of award course
   Bachelor of Engineering Honours
   Bachelor of Engineering

2. Purpose of proposal

   This proposal modifies the honours grading within the (AQF8) Bachelor of Engineering Honours degree program (and associated combined degree programs), in order to bring them into alignment with all other undergraduate professional Engineering programs within Australia, and ensure that the programs can remain accredited by the relevant professional industry body: Engineers Australia.

   Associated with this change are a number of ancillary changes: (1) An amendment to the University Coursework policy to allow the required change to the BEHons programs; (2) The removal of the associated (AQF7) Bachelor of Engineering (i.e. non-honours) programs, as these are no longer viable nor necessary.

3. Details of amendment

   Background

   Australian Engineering courses are externally accredited by various professional engineering bodies, with the most significant body being Engineers Australia (EA). EA bases its accreditation of professional engineering programs (including all 4-year BE programs) on their Stage 1 Competency Standards.

   Subsequent to the approval of the revisions to the AQF in 2011, EA wrote to all Australian Deans of Engineering. In this letter they indicated that their evaluation of the new AQF level descriptors resulted in the conclusion that the Stage 1 competency standards were consistent with the AQF Level 8 descriptors. They acknowledged in a subsequent letter that:

   The Accreditation Board anticipates that a program designed to meet AQF Level 8 will also meet the EA Stage 1 Competency Standards for the Professional Engineer. It may be that a four year AQF Level 7 program will meet EA Stage 1 Competency if the program is structured to ensure that all the elements of the EA Stage 1 Competency Standards for Professional Engineers are met. Engineers Australia will therefore consider for accreditation a four year AQF Level 7 program at the level of Professional Engineer.

   Despite the comment regarding recognition of AQF7 programs a majority of Australian Universities moved to reclassify their 4-year BE degrees as AQF8, and hence changed the title of the degree awarded to all graduates from these programs to Bachelor of Engineering Honours.

   During 2013 the Faculty of Engineering and IT investigated how it would respond to this situation. It became apparent that a proposal to bring our Engineering programs into alignment with those elsewhere – where all BE degree graduates were awarded an AQF8 Honours degree – would be unlikely to be approved by Academic Board. As an alternative, the Faculty proposed, and had approved, an approach based on introducing parallel BE programs – one a BEHons program with a requirement for completion consistent with the previous honours requirements, and the other a BE program, identical except for the absence of that requirement. Students are admitted into the BEHons degree, but if they do not achieve the required honours WAM then they graduate from the BE program. Whilst not ideal, this
approach provided an acceptable compromise position which has been in place since the 2014 commencing cohort.

In late 2015 EA again wrote to the Deans of Engineering. In this letter (see attachment 7) they indicated that they would no longer be accrediting, at the level of professional engineer, any AQF7 programs.

In order to help avoid potential confusion for all stakeholders in an already complex landscape, it is planned that from 2017 the Accreditation Board will no longer consider for accreditation, four year programs for Professional Engineer at AQF Level 7. Any Professional Engineer programs currently accredited at AQF Level 7 not planned for phasing out will be required to have a transition plan to AQF Level 8 or accreditation will be terminated.

This issue has been discussed at length with Engineers Australia. They have advised us that they will not be changing their position on this issue, and that **all remaining Engineering departments within Australia** have indicated that they have moved (or are in the processing of finalising a move) to have all 4-year Engineering programs to be Bachelor of Engineering Honours programs, with all graduates awarded an AQF8 Honours degree.

This would leave Sydney University as the only University in Australia with AQF7 Bachelor of Engineering programs, and would mean that a significant proportion of graduates from our 4-year Engineering degrees (and associated combined degrees) would graduate from non-accredited programs\(^1\). Such a situation would be catastrophic to the Engineering programs offered by the University of Sydney.

**Details of proposal**

It is proposed to bring the University’s Bachelor of Engineering programs into alignment with the practice across the sector, where all graduates from 4-year Bachelor of Engineering programs (and the associated combined degrees) are awarded an AQF8 qualification.

Consideration has been given to the labelling of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours degree for those students who do not meet the requirements that exist within the current degree resolutions (i.e. who fall below the current threshold for 2\(^{nd}\) class honours). Attachment 6 lists the current award levels for a representative sample of other Australian BEHons programs, with the two dominant patterns being:

- **Remain silent**: i.e.
  - Bachelor of Engineering Honours, Class 1
  - Bachelor of Engineering Honours, Class 2A
  - Bachelor of Engineering Honours, Class 2B
  - Bachelor of Engineering Honours

- **Award 3\(^{rd}\) class honours**: i.e.
  - Bachelor of Engineering Honours, Class 1
  - Bachelor of Engineering Honours, Class 2A
  - Bachelor of Engineering Honours, Class 2B
  - Bachelor of Engineering Honours, Class 3

It is suggested that the former approach (i.e. remaining silent) is potentially open to misinterpretation regarding the level of award for students whose testamur does not list an honours level. The latter approach is more common, and appears to have been adopted by two third or more of institutions, and hence is the approach we are proposing to adopt at Sydney.

This will require the following changes (with detailed outlined in the attachments):

---

\(^1\) The proportion of students who currently graduate without honours varies from program to program but in 2015, taken across all BE programs, approximately 20% gained first class honours, 30% gained second class honours, and just over 50% were not awarded honours.
1. **Proposed changes to Coursework policy (see Attachment 1)**
   The proposed changes amend clauses 94 and 97. The change to clause 94 provides clarification regarding interpretation of the phrase “special proficiency” as it relates to honours degrees, and aims to ensure that it is consistent with the awarding of AQF8 honours degrees.
   The change to clause 97 allows the awarding of 3rd class honours to graduates from the AQF8 Bachelor of Engineering Honours programs who have a WAM below that currently required for 2nd class honours.

2. **Proposed changes to Senate Resolutions (see Attachment 2)**
   These changes remove the current AQF7 (non-Honours) Bachelor of Engineering program and associated combined degree programs.

3. **Proposed changes to Faculty Resolutions (see Attachment 3)**
   Removes references to the (non-Honours) Bachelor of Engineering programs and ensure that all references are to the Bachelor of Engineering Honours programs.

4. **Proposed changes to BE Hons degree resolutions (see Attachment 4)**
   **Proposed changes to BE Combined degree resolutions (see Attachment 5)**
   Removes references to the (non-Honours) Bachelor of Engineering programs and ensure that all references are to the Bachelor of Engineering Honours programs. Amends the requirements for Honours so that students who complete the degree with a WAM below the current threshold for 2nd class honours are awarded third class honours.

4. **Transitional arrangements**
   (as outlined in attachments)

5. **Other relevant information**

6. **Signature of Dean**
Attachment 1: Proposed changes to Coursework Policy 2014

Part 19  Awards with honours

93  Admission to an award course with honours

(1) On the recommendation of the relevant Head of Department, a Dean may admit a student to an appended honours course, if the student has:
   (a) met the requirements for a pass degree in the course;
   (b) achieved a weighted average of at least 65, calculated from at least 48 credit points of undergraduate study (excluding any 1000-level units if the course is available on a full-time basis to high school graduates); and
   (c) met any additional requirements set by the faculty resolutions or award course resolutions for admission to honours in the course.

(2) On the recommendation of the relevant Head of Department, a Dean may admit a student to an integrated honours course:
   (a) if the student has:
      (i) met the requirements for a pass degree in the course;
      (ii) achieved a weighted average of at least 65, calculated from at least 48 credit points of undergraduate units of study (excluding any 1000-level units if the course is available on a full-time basis to high school graduates); and
      (iii) met any additional requirements set out by the faculty resolutions or award course resolutions; or
   (b) from the commencement of the award course if:
      (i) the Academic Board has approved the award course as one that meets the learning outcomes of an AQF Level 8 honours qualification; and
      (ii) the award course resolutions incorporate explicit requirements for completion of the award course that are consistent with the awarding of honours as prescribed in this Policy.

(3) On the recommendation of the relevant Heads of Departments that offer and administer the proposed honours courses, a Dean may admit a student to honours or double honours in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies if the student has:
   (a) completed:
      (i) 144 credit points in the combined degree program;
      (ii) a Liberal Studies undergraduate degree program at the University; or
      (iii) a program of study deemed by the relevant Heads of Departments to be the equivalent of such study;
   (b) achieved a weighted average mark of at least 65, as specified in the award course resolutions, in the first three years (144 credit points) of the combined degree;
   (c) completed:
      (i) requirements for a major in the intended area of honours specialisations; or
      (ii) study of equivalent depth in the intended area as set out in the award course resolutions; and
   (d) met any additional requirements for admission to the honours courses set by the faculty or school and approved by the Academic Board.

(4) A student who is enrolled in an appended honours course:
   (a) may not graduate with the pass degree; and
may not enrol part-time
except in accordance with the award course resolutions.

A student who fails or discontinues an appended honours year may not re-enrol in it, except
with the approval of the Dean.

94 Principles for the award of honours

The principles for the University’s offering degrees with honours are:

(a) the award of honours is reserved to indicate special proficiency;
(b) the University offers courses leading to a degree with honours to provide research
   training opportunities to students who demonstrate special proficiency and the ability to
   undertake further study and research within a discipline;
(c) a course leading to a degree with honours is intended to attract and stimulate students of
   high ability;
(d) honours awards are in classes, to recognise and reward outstanding academic ability;
(e) an honours course:
   (i) will provide the foundations of research training within the relevant discipline; and
   (ii) will have an identifiable, discipline-specific individual research, scholarly or
        creative component that is allocated at least 12 credit points; and
(f) the assessment tasks for research units of study will comprise, at least in part, a
dissertation.

95 Qualifying for an award with honours

(1) To qualify for an award with honours, a student must meet the requirements set out in the
    faculty resolutions and award course resolutions.
(2) The award of a degree with honours, and the grade of honours awarded, will be assessed and
    calculated according to two mechanisms:
    (a) for appended honours and for honours taken as an embedded component in a combined
        degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies - by an honours mark; or
    (b) for integrated honours - by a grade average calculated across at least 48 credit points of
        study.
(3) Each faculty will publish the grading systems and criteria for the award of honours in that
    faculty.

96 Determining honours awards for appended honours and integrated
honours (using a 48+ credit point average)

(1) This clause applies to:
    (a) an appended honours course; and
    (b) an integrated honours course where, under the award course resolutions, the conferral of
        the degree with honours, and the class of honours, is determined using a mark
        calculated across units of study attracting at least 48 credit points but less than 96 credit
        points.
(2) A student who achieves a mark within a range set out in the following table is to be awarded
    honours in the class set out in the table for that range.
A student who achieves an honours mark in the range … will be awarded honours …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Honours Mark</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>80 ≤ m ≤ 100</td>
<td>First Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75 ≤ m &lt; 80</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>70 ≤ m &lt; 75</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>65 ≤ m &lt; 70</td>
<td>Third Class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) A student who achieves a mark of less than 65 is not awarded honours.

97 Determining honours awards for appended honours and integrated honours (using a 96+ credit point average)

(1) This clause applies to an integrated honours course where, under the award course resolutions, the conferral of the degree with honours, and the class of honours, is determined using an honours mark calculated across units of study that together have at least 96 credit points.

(2) A student who achieves an honours mark within a range set out in the following table is to be awarded honours in the class set out in the table for that range.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Honours Mark</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>75 ≤ m ≤ 100</td>
<td>First Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>70 ≤ m &lt; 75</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>65 ≤ m &lt; 70</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50 ≤ m &lt; 65</td>
<td>Third Class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) The award course resolutions for a course may require a student to achieve higher honours marks for particular classes of honours.

(4) A student who achieves a mark of less than 65 is not awarded honours may be awarded Third Class honours where this has been specified as available under the course resolutions.

97A Determining honours awards on the basis of an embedded honours component in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies

(1) This clause applies to honours taken as an embedded component in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies.

(2) Where a student is undertaking a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, the student may be awarded the combined degree with honours on the basis of completion of an honours component embedded within the combined degree.

(3) The requirements for embedded honours in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies will be specified in the combined award course resolutions, and will require the completion of an honours component comprising:

(a) 36-48 credit points of 4000-level work at honours level, including an honours research project of 12–36 credit points included in the 4000-level work; and

(b) honours coursework of 12-36 credit points.

(4) A student may be awarded double honours in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies on completion of a second honours component.

(5) The requirements for double honours in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies will be the completion of:
(a) 36-48 credit points as set out in subclause 97A(3); and
(b) the requirements for the combined degree as set out in the award course resolutions.

(6) The honours mark will be:
(a) calculated according to a method specified in the faculty or school resolutions of the faculty or school offering the honours course; and
(b) based on results from 36-48 credit points of work as specified in subclause 97A(3).

(7) A student who achieves an honours mark within a range set out in the following table is to be awarded honours in the class set out in the table for that range.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>A student who achieves an honours mark in the range …</th>
<th>will be awarded honours …</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>80 ≤ honours mark ≤ 100</td>
<td>First Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75 ≤ honours mark &lt; 80</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>70 ≤ honours mark &lt; 75</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>65 ≤ honours mark &lt; 70</td>
<td>Third Class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8) A student who achieves a mark of less than 65 is not awarded honours.

(9) The honours mark for a student in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies will be determined by the faculty that administers the honours course in the discipline in which it is taken. The faculty administering the student’s candidature will award honours on the basis of the mark determined by the faculty administering the honours course.

(10) Where a student enrolled in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies is admitted to and completes honours requirements, the name of the honours component would replace the major indicated in brackets next to the appropriate degree in the nomenclature for the combined degree.

(a) Where the completed honours component is normally available in the partner degree to the Bachelor of Advanced Studies the nomenclature for the combined award should indicate the honours component in brackets attached to the partner degree as in the following example: Bachelor of Science (Mathematics Honours)/Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Philosophy).

(b) Where the completed honours component is not normally available in the partner degree to the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, the nomenclature for the combined award should indicate the honours component in brackets attached to the Bachelor of Advanced Studies as in the following example: Bachelor of Science (Mathematics)/Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Philosophy Honours).

(c) Where double honours is completed, the nomenclature for the combined award should indicate the honours component in brackets attached to both awards as in the following example: Bachelor of Science (Mathematics Honours)/Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Philosophy Honours).
Attachment 2: Proposed changes to Senate resolutions

Resolutions of the Senate

1 Degrees, diplomas and certificates of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies

(1) With the exception of the Doctor of Engineering and the Doctor of Philosophy, The Senate, by authority of the University of Sydney Act 1989 (as amended), provides and confers the following degrees, diplomas and certificates, according to the rules specified by the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. The Doctor of Engineering and the Doctor of Philosophy are provided and conferred according to the rules specified by the Senate and the Academic Board.

(2) This list is amended with effect from 1 January, 2016. Degrees, diplomas and certificates no longer open for admission will be conferred by the Senate according to the rules previously specified by the Faculty.

2 Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title &amp; stream</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RHENGINE</td>
<td>Doctor of Engineering</td>
<td>DEng</td>
<td>Published work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPPHDENG</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMPHLENG</td>
<td>Master of Philosophy</td>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAENGINE</td>
<td>Master of Engineering</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINFTEC</td>
<td>Master of Information Technology</td>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINFTMG</td>
<td>Master of Information Technology Management</td>
<td>MITM</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAHLTCIN</td>
<td>Master of Health Technology Innovation</td>
<td>MHTI</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADATASC</td>
<td>Master of Data Science</td>
<td>MDS</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPROFEN</td>
<td>Master of Professional Engineering</td>
<td>MPE</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace</td>
<td>MPE(Aerospace)</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical</td>
<td>MPE(Biomedical)</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>MPE(Chemical &amp; Biomolecular)</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomolecular Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>MPE(Civil)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>MPE(Mechanical)</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>MPE(Power)</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>MPE(Fluids)</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluids</td>
<td>MPE(Geo)</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geomechanical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>MPE(Structural)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>MPE(Telecoms)</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>MPE(Software)</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>MPE(Structural)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPRJMGMT</td>
<td>Master of Project Management</td>
<td>MPM</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPRJLEA</td>
<td>Master of Project Leadership</td>
<td>MPL</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BE Hons – AQF8 Amendments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title &amp; stream</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPCSTECN</td>
<td>Bachelor of Computer Science and Technology*</td>
<td>BCST(ComputerScience)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>BCST(ComputerScience)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>BCST(InformationSystems)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPCSTECN</td>
<td>Bachelor of Computer Science and Technology (Advanced)*</td>
<td>BCST(Adv)(ComputerScience)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>BCST(Adv)(ComputerScience)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>BCST(Adv)(InformationSystems)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUENGINE</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeronautical Engineering</td>
<td>BE(Aeronautical)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>BE(Biomedical)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering</td>
<td>BE(Chemical &amp; Biomolecular)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>BE(Civil)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>BE(Electrical)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>BE(Mechanical)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechatronic Engineering</td>
<td>BE(Mechatronic)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Engineering</td>
<td>BE(Software)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGINE</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeronautical Engineering</td>
<td>BEHons(Aeronautical)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>BEHons(Biomedical)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering</td>
<td>BEHons(Chemical and Biomolecular)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>BEHons(Civil)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>BEHons(Electrical)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>BEHons(Mechanical)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechatronic Engineering</td>
<td>BEHons(Mechatronic)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Engineering</td>
<td>BEHons(Software)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPENCHBM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Project Management</td>
<td>BPM</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPPRMCES</td>
<td>Bachelor of Project Management (Civil Engineering Science)</td>
<td>BPM(Civil Engineering Science)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPPRMSES</td>
<td>Bachelor of Project Management (Software)</td>
<td>BPM(Software)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPPRMBEN</td>
<td>Bachelor of Project Management (Built Environment)</td>
<td>BPM(Built Environment)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPINFTEC</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>BIT(ComputerScience)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>BIT(InformationSystems)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*may be awarded with honours following a further year of study.
*may be awarded with honours in an integrated program

### 3 Combined degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title &amp; stream</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

BE Hons – AQF8 Amendments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAINFITM</td>
<td>Master of Information Technology/Master of Information Technology Management</td>
<td>MIT/MITM</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPENGART</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering^/Bachelor of Arts*</td>
<td>BE/BA</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPENGCOM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering^/Bachelor of Commerce*</td>
<td>BE/BCom</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPENGDGAR</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering^/Bachelor of Design in Architecture*</td>
<td>BE/BDesArch</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUENGLAW</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering^/Bachelor of Laws*</td>
<td>BE/LLB</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPENGMSC</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering^/Bachelor of Medical Science*</td>
<td>BE/BMedSci</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPENGSCI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering^/Bachelor of Science*</td>
<td>BE/BSc</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGART</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>BEHons/BA</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGCOM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Commerce</td>
<td>BEHons/BCom</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGDGAR</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Design in Architecture</td>
<td>BEHons/BDesArch</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGLAW</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>BEHons/LLB</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGMSC</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Medical Science</td>
<td>BEHons/BMedSci</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGSCI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>BEHons/BSc</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPTCART</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology^/Bachelor of Arts*</td>
<td>BIT/BA</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPTCCOM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology^/Bachelor of Commerce*</td>
<td>BIT/BCom</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPTCLAW</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology^/Bachelor of Laws*</td>
<td>BIT/LLB</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPTCMSC</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology^/Bachelor of Medical Science*</td>
<td>BIT/BMedSc</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPTCSCI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology^/Bachelor of Science*</td>
<td>BIT/BSc</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPENGPRM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering^/Bachelor of Project Management*</td>
<td>BE/BPM</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGPRM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Project Management*</td>
<td>BEHons/BPM</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*may be awarded with honours following a further year of study

*may be awarded with honours in an integrated program

### 4 Graduate diplomas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNCOMPUT</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Computing</td>
<td>GradDipComp</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNENGINE</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Engineering</td>
<td>GradDipEng</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNENPROF</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Engineering (Professional Engineering) (Last in take 2013)</td>
<td>GradDipEng(ProfEng)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNINFTEC</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Information Technology</td>
<td>GradDipIT</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*BE Hons – AQF8 Amendments*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNINFTMG</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Information Technology Management</td>
<td>GradDipITM</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNPRJMGMT</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Project Management</td>
<td>GradDipPM</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNPRJLEA</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Project Leadership</td>
<td>GradDipPL</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNHLCIN</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Health Technology Innovation</td>
<td>GradDipHTI</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCEHNGINE</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Engineering</td>
<td>GradCertEng</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCINFTEC</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Information Technology</td>
<td>GradCertIT</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCINFTMG</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Information Technology Management</td>
<td>GradCertITM</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCDATASC</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Data Science</td>
<td>GradCertDS</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCPRJMGTL</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Project Management</td>
<td>GradCertPM</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCPRJLEA</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Project Leadership</td>
<td>GradCertPL</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 3: Proposed changes to Faculty resolutions

Resolutions of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies for coursework awards

These resolutions apply to all undergraduate and postgraduate coursework award courses in the Faculty, unless specifically indicated otherwise. Students enrolled in postgraduate research awards should consult the resolutions for their course. These resolutions must be read in conjunction with applicable University By-laws, Rules and policies including (but not limited to) the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014 (the "Coursework Rule"), the resolutions for the course of enrolment, the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended) and the Academic Board policies on Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism.

Part 1: Course Enrolment

Terminology: In the following resolutions, all reference to the Bachelor of Engineering degree applies to both the Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Engineering Honours, except where otherwise indicated.

1 Enrolment Restrictions

(1) Except where explicitly listed in a Faculty recommended program of enrolment, or with the permission of the Dean or delegate, an undergraduate student shall satisfy the following enrolment requirements.

(a) No more than 26 credit points in either semester one or two;
(b) No more than 12 credit points in the summer session and 6 credit points in the winter session;
(c) A student may enrol only:
   (i) in level 1000 units of study during their first year;
   (ii) in level 1000 or 2000 units of study during their second year;
(d) A student shall enrol in lower year level core units of study as a priority above any higher year level units of study irrespective of meeting any prerequisite requirements of the higher year units.

2 Transferring Between Streams or Degrees

(1) Students admitted to specific postgraduate degrees or streams wishing to transfer between degrees or streams managed by the Faculty need to apply to the Faculty and obtain the approval of the Dean (or delegate). Students will be assessed based on their progress in their current degree or stream and must be able to show that they meet the criteria that apply to commencing students.

3 Time Limits

(1) Except where specific course resolutions specify alternative requirements, the following conditions must be met:

(a) A student must complete all the requirements for a coursework doctorate, within ten calendar years of first enrolment;
(b) A student must complete all the requirements for a combined BEHons, single or combined BIT, and BCST within ten calendar years of first enrolment;
(c) A student must complete all the requirements for a single (non combined) BEHons or BPM within the lesser of 16 enrolled semesters or ten calendar years of first enrolment;
(d) A student must complete all the requirements for a graduate certificate within two calendar years of first enrolment; completing in a minimum of 1 semester and a maximum of 4 semesters
(e) A student must complete all the requirements for a graduate diploma within four calendar years of first enrolment; completing in a minimum of 2 semesters and a maximum of 6 semesters
(f) A student must complete all the requirements for a master's degree within six calendar years of first enrolment; completing in a minimum of 2 semesters and a maximum of 8 semesters.

(2) Periods of suspension, exclusion or lapsed candidature will be added to maximum completion times except that no completion time may exceed 10 years from first enrolment.

(3) Credit will not be granted for prior learning older than 10 years at the time of first enrolment.

4 Suspension, Discontinuation and Lapse of Candidature

The Coursework Rule specifies the conditions for suspending or discontinuing candidature, and return to candidature after these events. The Rule also defines the circumstances when candidature is deemed to have lapsed. Students seeking to suspend, discontinue or apply for a return to candidature after a lapse must apply to the Dean of Engineering and Information Technologies or their delegate for permission, supplying detailed reasons and evidence to support the request.

5 Credit for Previous Study

(1) Conditions for the granting of credit for previous study are in accordance with the Coursework Rule, except:
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(a) the maximum credit that may be granted to the Bachelor of Engineering Honours degree, Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees, Bachelor of Information Technology degree or Bachelor of Information Technology combined degrees is 96 credit points;
(b) the maximum credit that may be granted to the Bachelor of Computer Science and Technology or Bachelor of Science and Technology(Advanced) or Bachelor of Project Management is 48 credit points; and
(c) credit for prior learning at the University of Sydney at postgraduate level may be given subject to the approval of the Faculty and to the following conditions:
   (i) where no award has been conferred, credit may be transferred in full to the Graduate Diploma and Master degree;
   (ii) if an award has been conferred credit to a limit of 12 credit points may be transferred.
(d) credit for prior learning at postgraduate level at an external institution recognised by the University of Sydney may be granted as follows:
   (i) where no award has been conferred credit to a maximum of 50 percent of the degree may be approved, provided units of study have been completed at credit average and are equivalent to units of study offered under the degree being taken;
   (ii) where an award has been conferred credit to a maximum of 12 credit points may be approved provided units of study have been completed at credit average and are equivalent to units of study offered under the degree being taken;
   (iii) credit will not be granted for recognised prior learning older than 10 years at the time of first enrolment.
(e) where Course resolutions make other specifications.
(f) that credit must not be awarded where it would result in less than 50% of the course being undertaken at the University of Sydney.

Part 2: Unit of Study Enrolment

6 Cross-institutional Study

(1) Provided permission has been obtained in advance, the Dean (or delegate) may permit a student to complete a unit of study at another institution and have that unit credited to the student's course requirements, provided that:
   (a) the resolutions of the student's course of enrolment do not specifically exclude cross-institutional study; and either
   (b) the unit of study content is not taught in any corresponding unit of study at the University; or
   (c) the student is unable, for good reason, to attend a corresponding unit of study at the University.

7 International Exchange

The Faculty encourages students to participate in international exchange programs, except where specified otherwise in the resolutions for a particular course. Students must apply to the Head of the relevant School of Engineering and Information Technologies to obtain approval for their planned enrolment while on exchange. This guarantees that the units completed externally will be correctly matched to the core requirements of their Course. International exchange must not exceed 12 months / 48cp and must not be approved where it would result in less than 50% of the normal course requirements being completed at the University of Sydney.

Part 3: Studying and Assessment

8 Attendance

(1) Students are required to be in attendance at the correct time and place of any formal or informal examinations. Non attendance on any grounds insufficient to claim special consideration will result in the forfeiture of marks associated with the assessment. Participation in a minimum number of assessment items may be a requirement of any unit of study.
(2) Students are expected to attend a minimum of 90 percent of timetabled activities for a unit of study, unless granted exemption by the Dean or Head of School most concerned. The Dean or Head of School most concerned may determine that a student fails a unit of study because of inadequate attendance. Alternatively, at their discretion, they may set additional assessment items where attendance is lower than 90 percent.

9 Special Consideration for Illness, Injury or Misadventure

Special consideration is a process that affords equal opportunity to students who have experienced circumstances that adversely impact their ability to adequately complete an assessment task in a unit of study. The Coursework Rule provides full details of the University policy and procedures.

10 Concessional Pass

In this Faculty the grade PCON (Concessional Pass) is not awarded.

11 Re-assessment

The Faculty does not offer opportunities for re-assessment other than on the grounds of approved special consideration.
Part 4: Progression, Results and Graduation

12 Satisfactory Progress

The Faculty will monitor students for satisfactory progress towards the completion of their award course. In addition to the common triggers used to identify students not meeting academic progression requirements (as defined by the Progression requirements of the Coursework Rule), students must pass any unit of study identified in the course resolutions as being critical to progression through the course.

13 Award of the Bachelor's Degree with Honours

Honours is available to students as either appended honours or integrated honours. Admission, requirements and award for the honours courses are in accordance with the relevant course resolutions.

14 Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies Specific Weighted Average Mark Indicators.

(1) The Weighted Average Mark (WAM) is calculated by the formula:

\[
WAM = \frac{\sum (CP_i \times M_i)}{\sum (CP_i)}
\]

where
(a) CP\textsubscript{i} is the number of credit points for the unit of study.
(b) Mi is the mark achieved for the unit of study.

(2) The Engineering Integrated Honours Weighted Average Mark (EIHWAM) is calculated by the formula:

\[
EIHWAM = \frac{\sum (Wi \times CP_i \times M_i)}{\sum (Wi \times CP_i)}
\]

where
(a) Wi is the weighting given by 0 for 1000 level units of study, 2 for 2000 level units, 3 for 3000 level units and 4 for 4000 level or above units. Thesis units of study are given a double weighting of 8.
(b) CP\textsubscript{i} is the number of credit points for the unit of study.
(c) Mi is the mark achieved for the unit of study.

All attempts at units of study are included except for: units of study assessed on a pass/fail basis; units of study with a grade of DNFDC; and credited units of study from other institutions. The mark used for units of study with a grade of AF or DF is zero. For combined degree students, only units of study within the Bachelor of Engineering tables are included.

15 University Medal

A student who has qualified for the award with first class honours and has an EIHWAM of 85 or above, and who has demonstrated excellence in their honours thesis will be considered for the award of a University Medal. The Medal is awarded at the discretion of the Dean or relevant Associate Dean, after the recommendation of the relevant Head of School, to the highest achieving students who in the opinion of the Faculty have an outstanding academic record, in accordance with the Coursework Rule.

Part 5: Other

16 Transitional Provisions

(1) These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature on or after 1 January, 2016 2017.
(2) Students who commenced prior to 1 January, 2016 2017 may:
(a) complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions governing their candidature immediately prior to these changes; or
(b) where approved by the Faculty, elect to proceed under these resolutions provided appropriate programs of study can be identified.
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Bachelor of Engineering Honours

These resolutions must be read in conjunction with applicable University By-laws, Rules and policies including (but not limited to) the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014 (the ‘Coursework Rule’), the Resolutions of the Faculty, the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended) and the Academic Board policies on Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism.

Course resolutions

Terminology: In the following resolutions, all references to the Bachelor of Engineering degree apply to both the Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Engineering Honours degrees, except where otherwise indicated.

1 Course codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHENGINE</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUENGINE</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Attendance Pattern

The attendance pattern for this course is full-time or part-time. Part-time students must still satisfy appropriate enrolment progression and are subject to the same degree time limits as full-time students. International students are required to follow the enrolment pattern as specified by their visa. The Faculty strongly recommends full-time enrolment as the preferred option for all undergraduate students unless exceptional circumstances exist.

3 Streams

(1) The Bachelor of Engineering Honours is available in the following streams:

   (a) School of Aerospace, Mechanical and Mechatronic Engineering
       (i) Aeronautical Engineering
       (ii) Mechanical Engineering
       (iii) Mechatronic Engineering
       (iv) Biomedical Engineering

   (b) School of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering
       (i) Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering

   (c) School of Civil Engineering
       (i) Civil Engineering

   (d) School of Electrical and Information Engineering
       (i) Electrical Engineering
       (v) Software Engineering

(2) Completion of a stream is a requirement of the course.
(3) Students may apply to change streams by direct application to the Faculty Office. Approval is required from the relevant Associate Dean (or his/her delegate) for any case. Students will be assessed based on the Flexible First Year average mark criteria but will also be required to show that they have met progression requirements in their current degree or stream as specified by the school and that they will able to complete the new stream in the normal time period.

(4) Flexible First Year
   (a) Undergraduate students entering first year of the Engineering courses in Semester 1 may apply to undertake the Flexible First Year program, instead of choosing a particular stream.
   (b) The Flexible First Year Program is listed in the Flexible First Year Table. At the end of Semester 1 Students may transfer into approved streams as defined in the following clause, or may choose to continue in the Flexible First Year Program for Semester 2, though Semester 2 units may or may not count towards their course, depending on the final choice of stream.
(c) Those students who have met the requirements for first year entry (ATAR cut-off or equivalent) into a particular Engineering program will be guaranteed approval to transfer into that program even though they chose the Flexible First Year Program. Students who did not meet the first year entry requirements for specific streams, but subsequently attained average marks in the Flexible First Year Program that met or surpassed the specified requirements for those streams will also be eligible to apply for transfer into those streams. The transfer requirements will be approved by the Dean or nominee. These conditions will also apply for combined degree candidates.

4 Admission to Candidature

(1) Admission to this course is on the basis of a secondary school leaving qualification such as the NSW Higher School Certificate (including national and international equivalents), tertiary study or an approved preparation program. English language requirements must be met where these are not demonstrated by sufficient qualifications taught in English. Special admission pathways are open for mature aged applicants who do not possess a school leaving qualification, for educationally disadvantaged applicants and for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Applicants are ranked by merit and offers for available places are issued according to the ranking. Details of admission policies are found in the Coursework Rule.

5 Requirements for Award

(1) The units of study that may be taken for the course are set out in the Bachelor of Engineering Honours Flexible First Year Table of units of study, the Bachelor of Engineering Honours Core Table, the Bachelor of Engineering Honours Stream Core Tables, and the Bachelor of Engineering Honours Stream Specialist Tables of units of study for the specialised stream in the degree.

(2) To qualify for the award of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours degree, a candidate must:
(a) successfully complete 192 credit points comprising:
(i) A minimum of 36 credit points from the Engineering Core Table, including all required units;
(ii) A minimum of 108 credit points from the Engineering Stream Table pertaining to the specialist stream being undertaken, including all required units;
(iii) A minimum of 48 credit points of additional units from the Engineering Stream Specialist Table pertaining to the specialist stream being undertaken, including satisfying any additional requirements specified for the Specialist Table; and
(b) have an EIHWAM of at least 65 immediately prior to the semester in which a thesis unit of study is first attempted; and
(c) have an EWAM of at least 65 at the completion of the degree; and
(d) complete the requirements within a time limit of 5 years for a single Bachelor of Engineering Honours degree or complete the requirements within a time limit of 6 years for a Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degree.

(3) Candidates who satisfy Clause 5.2(a), but who have not satisfied all of clauses 5.2(b), 5.2(c) and 5.2(d), will qualify for the award of the Bachelor of Engineering degree (i.e. the pass degree, awarded without honours).

(4) The class of Honours will be determined by the EIHWAM.

(5) In exceptional circumstances, the Dean may vary the conditions for the award of Honours after seeking the advice of the relevant Head of School.

6 Level of Honours Awarded

(1) The Bachelor of Engineering Honours degree is awarded in classes ranging from First Class to Second Class, Division Two Third Class. The various classes of Honours are awarded on the basis of a candidate’s EIHWAM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>EIHWAM Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class I</td>
<td>75 &lt;= EIHWAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class II</td>
<td>70 &lt;= EIHWAM &lt;75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class II</td>
<td>65 &lt;= EIHWAM &lt;70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class III</td>
<td>EIHWAM &lt;65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Majors

(1) There is no requirement to complete a major.
(2) Availability of Majors:
(a) Except where otherwise specified in the details of a specific major, a major will be available to all students who satisfy the requirements of that major. The availability of the major does not however mean that the units of study listed in the table for the major (or required prerequisite units of study) will be available to all students, or that students in all streams will have sufficient free electives to complete the required units.
(b) Students can be awarded multiple majors where those majors are available without the limits specified in clause (2)(a) and where they satisfy the requirements for those majors. When completing multiple majors, no unit may be counted towards satisfying the requirements of more than one major.
(c) Students cannot be awarded a major that has a title directly associated with the name of their stream.
(d) Students are eligible to attempt the Space Engineering major based on either a separate and specific admission pathway or on application at the end of any calendar year having achieved an AAM approved by the Dean or nominee. There are no restrictions on students attempting majors other than the Space Engineering major.

(3) A major requires:
(a) the completion of 24 credit points chosen from units of study listed in the table for that major;
(b) satisfying any additional requirements specified for the major, and listed with the table of units for the major;
(c) the completion of a thesis project that has been approved by the Head of School (or delegate) as relevant to the topic of the major.

(4) The majors available are:
(a) Chemical Engineering
(b) Computer Engineering
(c) Construction Management
(d) Electrical Engineering
(e) Environmental Engineering
(f) Geotechnical Engineering
(g) Information Technology
(h) Materials
(i) Mechanical Engineering
(j) Mechatronic Engineering
(k) Power Engineering
(l) Space Engineering
(m) Structures
(n) Telecommunications Engineering
(o) Transport Engineering

8 Transitional Provisions
(1) These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature after 1 January, 2016 and students who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2016 who elect to proceed under these resolutions will take effect from 1 January 2017.
(2) Candidates who commenced prior to 1 January, 2016 may:
(a) complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions governing their candidature immediately prior to these changes: or
(b) where approved by the Faculty, elect to proceed under these resolution provided appropriate programs of study can be identified.
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BACHELOR OF ENGINEERING HONOURS COMBINED DEGREES

Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Arts
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Arts

Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Commerce
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Commerce

Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Design in Architecture
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Design in Architecture

Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Laws
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Laws

Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Medical Science
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Medical Science

Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Music Studies
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Music Studies

Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Project Management
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Project Management

Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Science
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Science

These resolutions must be read in conjunction with applicable University By-laws, Rules and policies including (but not limited to) the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014 (the ‘Coursework Rule’), the Coursework Policy 2014, the Resolutions of the Faculty, the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended) and the Academic Board policies on Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism. Up to date versions of all such documents are available from the Policy Register: http://www.sydney.edu.au/policies.

Course Resolutions

Terminology
In the following resolutions, all reference to the Bachelor of Engineering degree apply to both the Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Engineering Honours degrees, except where otherwise indicated.

1 Course codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHENGART</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENGART</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGCOM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENGCOM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGDAR</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honors and Bachelor of Design in Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Degree Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENGDAAR</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Design in Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGLAW</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENGLAW</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGMSC</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Medical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENGMSC</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Medical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGPRM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENGPRM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGSCI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENGSCI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Attendance Pattern

(1) The attendance pattern for the following programs is full-time only. The attendance pattern for all other Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined courses is full time or part time.
(a) Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Design in Architecture
(b) Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Design in Architecture
(c) Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Laws
(d) Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Laws

(2) Part time students must still satisfy appropriate enrolment progression and are subject to the same degree time limits as full time students. International students are required to follow the enrolment pattern as specified by their visa. The Faculty strongly recommends full time enrolment as the preferred option for all undergraduate students unless exceptional circumstances exist.

3 Streams

(1) Completion of a stream is a requirement of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours and students in combined degrees are subject to the stream requirements in the Bachelor of Engineering Honours course resolutions.
(2) Students in the Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees can change the stream of the BEHons portion of their combined degree in accordance with the same requirements specified in the Bachelor of Engineering Honours resolutions.
(3) Flexible First Year
(a) Students gaining entry to any of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees may also choose to undertake the Flexible First Year program under the same requirements as specified in the Bachelor of Engineering Honours resolutions.
(4) Within the Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Design in Architecture and the Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Design in Architecture, the Bachelor of Engineering Honours is available only in the Civil Engineering stream. For all other Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees, the streams available for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours are listed under the course resolution for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours.
(5) The Bachelor of Science degree is available in the following streams:
(a) Advanced
(b) Advanced Mathematics
Completion of a stream is not a requirement of the Bachelor of Science. Candidates wishing to transfer between streams should contact the Faculty of Science student office.
(6) The Bachelor of Music Studies is available in the following streams:
(a) Composition
(b) Contemporary Music Practice
(c) Musicology
(d) Performance
Completion of a stream is a requirement of the Bachelor of Music Studies.

4 Cross-Faculty Management
(1) Candidates in the combined Engineering and Law courses will be under the general supervision of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies until the end of the semester in which they complete the requirements for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours. They will then be under the supervision of the Faculty of Law. Candidates in all other combined degree programs will be under the general supervision of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies for the duration of the combined program.

(2) The Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies and the Dean of the Faculty hosting the associated combined degree shall jointly exercise authority in any matter concerned with the combined course not otherwise dealt with in these resolutions.

5 Admission to Candidature

(1) Admission to these degrees is on the basis of a secondary school leaving qualification such as the NSW Higher School Certificate (including national and international equivalents), tertiary study or an approved preparation program. English language requirements must be met where these are not demonstrated by sufficient qualifications taught in English. Special admission pathways are open for mature aged applicants who do not possess a school leaving qualification, educationally disadvantaged applicants and for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Applicants are ranked by merit and offers for available places are issued according to the ranking. Details of admission policies are found in the Coursework Rule.

(2) Admission to the Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Music Studies will, in addition to the above, require the applicant to complete a music skills test or jazz aptitude test and:
(a) Principal Study in Composition, to submit three compositions in different performance media which should represent their present level of achievement as composers, and to attend an interview;
(b) Principal Study in Contemporary Music Practice, to submit a portfolio with original work; song(s) or composition(s) in any genre that demonstrates a high level of creative potential and technical ability, and to attend an interview;
(c) Principal Study in Musicology, to present an example of recent work and to attend an interview;
(d) Principal Study in Performance, to undertake a practical audition in their nominated instrument or in voice.

The results of this process will form part of the ranking of applicants.

6 Requirements for Award

(1) To qualify for the award of the combined degree:
(a) For all Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees except the Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Laws, a candidate must complete 240 credit points and satisfy any additional requirements specified in the following clauses.
(b) For the Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Laws combined degree, a candidate must complete 288 credit points and any additional requirements specified in the following clauses.
(c) Where the requirements specified in the following clauses account for less than the total required credit, candidates must complete additional units of study (not including general electives) from the relevant Bachelor of Engineering Honours specialist stream table subject to any conditions specified in that table as may be necessary to satisfy the requirements of the degree.

(b) Except where varied by other clauses of these resolutions, all candidates must complete a minimum of 144 credit points comprising:
(i) 36cp from the Engineering Core Table, including all required units;
(ii) 108cp from the Engineering Stream Core Table pertaining to the specialist stream being undertaken, including all required units;
(c) The Faculty Board may approve, based on appropriate academic justification, a list of approved unit alternatives. These alternatives specify, for particular Engineering stream / combined degree combinations, units within the normal requirements for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours component of the combined degree that can be replaced by specified alternative units that would form part of the normal program for single degree students in that stream.

(3) For the Bachelor of Arts component of a combined degree:
(a) The units of study that may be taken are set out in Table A from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Tables of units of study.
(b) Candidates must complete a total of 84 credit points from Table A, including:
(i) a major from Table A
(ii) a minimum of 54 credit points of 2000/3000 level units of study.

(4) For the Bachelor of Commerce component of a combined degree:
(a) The units of study that may be taken are set out in the Tables of Undergraduate Units of Study from The University of Sydney Business School.
(b) Candidates must complete 96 credit points of units of study selected from the Table of Undergraduate Units of Study from The University of Sydney Business School including:
(i) 36 credit points of core units of study (30 junior credit points and six senior credit points); and
(ii) a major; and
(iii) at least 48 credit points of 2000 and/or 3000 level units of study.

(5) For the Bachelor of Science component of a combined degree:
(a) The units of study that may be taken are listed in Table 1 from the Faculty of Science.
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(b) Candidates must complete 96 credit points of Science units of study, including at least one major in a Science subject area.

(c) Candidates completing the Bachelor of Science in the Advanced or the Advanced Mathematics stream must include as part of the above requirements:

(i) a minimum of 54 credit points of intermediate or senior Science units of study, of which at least 36 credit points shall be completed at either the Advanced level or as Talented Student Program (TSP) units of study; and

(ii) a minimum of 24 credit points of senior Science units of study at either the Advanced level or as TSP units in a single Science subject area.

(6) For the Bachelor of Design in Architecture component of a combined degree:

(a) Candidates must complete 96 credit points of units of study from the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Civil) and Bachelor of Design in Architecture - Architecture Table.

(7) For the Bachelor of Laws component of a combined degree:

(a) The units of study that may be taken are set out in the Faculty of Law Undergraduate Table.

(b) Candidates must complete 144 credit points of Law units of study taken from the Faculty of Law Undergraduate Table, comprising:

(i) 102 credit points of compulsory units of study; and

(ii) 42 credit points of elective units of study, of which a maximum of 36 credit points are taken from Part 1 and a minimum of 6 credit points are taken from Part 2.

(8) For the Bachelor of Medical Science component of a combined degree:

(a) The units of study that may be taken are listed in Table IV for the Bachelor of Medical Science from the Faculty of Science.

(b) The mathematics requirement for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours component of the combined degree will also satisfy the mathematics requirements for the Bachelor of Medical Science component.

(c) Candidates must complete 96 credit points of units including:

(i) A minimum of 24 credit points from junior Science units of study, including:

12 credit points from Chemistry; and

MBLG1001/1901/1991 Introductory Molecular Biology and Genetics; and

6 credit points of Junior Biology;

(ii) 48 credit points from intermediate Science units of study, comprising:

36 credit points of BMED240X units from Table IV(B) for the Bachelor of Medical Science; and

MBLG2071/2971 Molecular Biology and Genomics; and

MBLG2072/2972 Genetics and Genomics.

(iii) A minimum of 24 credit points of senior Science units of study selected from the Bachelor of Medical Science Table IV (C).

(9) For the Bachelor of Project Management component of a combined degree:

(a) Candidates must complete the core and elective units of study as set out in the Bachelor of Project Management Unit of Study Table.

(10) For the Bachelor of Music Studies component of a combined degree:

(a) Candidates must complete 96 credit points from the Conservatorium of Music, and reach the minimum levels of achievement as set out in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
<th>Minimum Level of Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Study</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Principal Study 1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Skills</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Harmony and analysis 1-4 and Aural Perception 1-4; or Jazz Music Skills 1-4; or Music Fundamentals 1-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis, history, and culture studies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>At least 12 credit points from Foundation units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
<th>Minimum Level of Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Study</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Principal Study 1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Instrumentation &amp; Orchestration; New Music, New Thinking; or Electroacoustic Music 1&amp; 2; Composer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performer Workshop 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
<th>Minimum Level of Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 credit points Ensemble or 6 credit points Composition Through Improvisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Skills</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18 credit points of music theory and aural skills; Creative Music Technology; Sound Recording Fundamentals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Analysis, history and culture studies             | 12            | Comp Techniques: Number & Process  
Comp Techniques: Tonality & Process                                                                   |

(iii) Musicology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
<th>Minimum Level of Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Study</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6 credit points of Historical Studies; 6 credit points of Ethnographic Studies; 6 credit points in Analytical Studies; 18 credit points in senior Musicology Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Skills</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Harmony and Analysis 1-4 and Aural Perception 1-4; or Jazz Music Skills 1-4; or Music Fundamentals 1-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis, History and Culture Studies</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>At least 24 credit points of Foundation units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) Contemporary Music Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
<th>Minimum Level of Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Study</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Contemporary Music Practice 1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Music Studies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12 credit points in popular music units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Skills</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Music 1, 2, and 3, 18 credit points in Harmony &amp; Analysis, Aural Perception, or Jazz Music Skills units; 6 credit points in Music Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis, History and Culture Studies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sounds, Screens, Speakers, New Music, New Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Majors and Principal Studies

(1) For the Bachelor of Engineering Honours component of a combined degree:
(a) The conditions for awarding of a major, and the majors available, are the same as for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours degree.
(b) Where a candidate wishes to complete a major, and that major requires completion of additional credit points beyond the standard requirements, then such enrolment will be allowed for the first major to be completed, up to 24cp in total, provided the candidate utilises all allowed elective components in satisfying the requirements of the major.

(2) For the Bachelor of Arts component of a combined degree:
(a) completion of a Table A major is a requirement. The list of Table A majors is specified in the resolutions of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

(3) For the Bachelor of Science component of a combined degree:
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(a) completion of at least one major is a requirement. The list of majors available in the Bachelor of Science is specified in the course resolutions for the Bachelor of Science.

(4) For the Bachelor of Medical Science component of a combined degree:
(a) if the senior Science units of study completed by a candidate form a Science Table 1 major, the candidate shall have that major recorded on the Bachelor of Medical Science testamur at the completion of the degree.

(5) For the Bachelor of Commerce component of a combined degree:
(a) completion of a major is a requirement. The majors available and requirements are outlined in the resolutions for the Bachelor of Commerce.

8 Requirements for Honours

(1) Honours is available to candidates and is as defined for the constituent single degrees.

(2) Requirements for awarding of Honours is as defined in the course resolutions for the constituent single degrees.

9 Award of the Degrees

(1) Candidates will be awarded a separate testamur for each degree completed.

(2) The award grades, and the criteria for the grades, are as defined in the resolutions for the constituent single degrees.

(3) Candidates who do not meet the requirements for the award of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours but who have otherwise satisfied the requirements of the Bachelor of Engineering shall graduate with the Bachelor of Engineering pass degree.

(4) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Arts (Honours) who do not meet the requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded the Bachelor of Arts pass degree.

(5) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Commerce (Honours) who do not meet the requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded the Bachelor of Commerce pass degree.

(6) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Design in Architecture (Honours) who do not meet the requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded the Bachelor of Design in Architecture pass degree.

(7) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Medical Science (Honours) who do not meet the requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded the Bachelor of Medical Science pass degree.

(8) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Science (Honours) who do not meet the requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded Bachelor of Science pass degree.

10 Course Transfer

(1) For the Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined with Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Design in Architecture, Bachelor of Project Management, and Bachelor of Medical Science, a candidate may abandon the combined program and elect to complete either the Bachelor of Engineering Honours or the associated combined degree in accordance with the resolutions governing that degree.

(2) For the Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined with Bachelor of Laws, a candidate may withdraw from the combined degree program and elect to transfer to the Bachelor of Engineering, by written application to the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies, and complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions governing that degree at the time of transfer. Candidature in the Bachelor of Laws will cease in these circumstances.

(3) For the Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined with Bachelor of Commerce a candidate may abandon the combined program and elect to complete either the Bachelor of Engineering Honours or the Bachelor of Commerce in accordance with the resolutions governing that degree. Transfer from a combined degree to the Bachelor of Commerce is also conditional on the student having met the entry requirements of the Bachelor of Commerce in force at the time of their enrolment in the combined degree.

(4) Completion of the abandoned degree in the future will require a new application for admission to that course and completion in accordance with the resolutions governing that degree.

11 Progression Rules

(1) General progression rules for the combined degrees are covered by the resolutions of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies.

(2) Candidates in a combined Science program with a stream in either Science (Advanced) or Science (Advanced Mathematics):
(a) are required to maintain a minimum average mark of 65 in all intermediate and senior units of study in Science subject areas in each year of enrolment. Failure to maintain the required average will result in candidates being transferred to the Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Science without stream in their next year of enrolment with full credit for the units of study completed.
(b) who fail to achieve an average mark of 65 across all Science units of study attempted in their final year but have otherwise completed all the requirements of the degree will be awarded the Bachelor of Science.

(3) Candidates in a combined law program:
(a) must successfully complete LAWS1006 Foundations of Law before enrolling in any other Bachelor of Laws units of study;
(b) who fail to achieve an average mark of 65 across all Science units of study attempted in their final year but have otherwise completed all the requirements of the degree will be awarded the Bachelor of Science.
(c) except with permission of the Dean of the Faculty of Law, candidates must complete the requirements for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours before proceeding to Year Five of the Bachelor of Laws.

12 Transitional Provisions

(1) These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature on or after 1 January, 2016 2017.
(2) Students who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2016 2017 may:
(a) complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions governing their candidature immediately prior to these changes; or
(b) where approved by the Faculty, elect to proceed under these resolutions provided appropriate programs of study can be identified.
(3) Notwithstanding sub-rule (2), the admission and award requirement for Honours in the Bachelor of Laws will be determined according to the transitional provisions in rule 11 of the Resolutions for the Bachelor of Laws.
### Attachment 6: Engineering Honours calculations at other institutions

The following table describes the level of honours awarded for Engineering Honours programs at other Australian Universities. Note that "silent" means that the testamur does not indicate an honours level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Class 1</th>
<th>Class 2A</th>
<th>Class 2B</th>
<th>Class 3</th>
<th>Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>Class 2A</td>
<td>Class 2B</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>Class 2A</td>
<td>Class 2B</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANU</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>Class 2A</td>
<td>Class 2B</td>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monash</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>Class 2A</td>
<td>Class 2B</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSW (#1)</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>Class 2A</td>
<td>Class 2B</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtin</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>Class 2A</td>
<td>Class 2B</td>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMIT</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>Class 2A</td>
<td>Class 2B</td>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>Class 2A</td>
<td>Class 2B</td>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith Cowan</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>Class 2A</td>
<td>Class 2B</td>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UQ</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>Class 2A</td>
<td>Class 2B</td>
<td>Class 3A</td>
<td>Class 3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTasmania</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>Class 2A</td>
<td>Class 2B</td>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCU</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>Class 2A</td>
<td>Class 2B</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQU (#2)</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>Class 2A</td>
<td>Class 2B</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USQ</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>Class 2A</td>
<td>Class 2B</td>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

#1: For UNSW, honours class 1, 2A, 2B require a thesis mark of >= 65.0
#2: For CQU, level of honours based only on final year courses only
24 August 2015

Australian Council of Engineering Deans
Attention: Professor Doug Hargreaves, Executive Officer

Dear ACED Member

Re: Professional Engineer programs at AQF Level 7

Consequent to the implementation of the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) in 2015, the Accreditation Board of Engineers Australia (EA) has been considering its accreditation policy for the long term in relation to Professional Engineer and Engineering Technologist levels.

To assist education providers move to the new AQF, and in the context of its implementation phase, the Accreditation Board provided a letter (11 September 2013, attached) outlining its approach to accreditation of programs at the level of Professional Engineer at AQF Levels 7 and 8. In that letter, it was stated that:

"Analysis of the AQF requirements has demonstrated that there is alignment between the AQF Level 5 Bachelor Honours Degree requirements and the EA Stage 1 Competency Standards for Professional Engineer, AQF Level 7 for Engineering Technologist and AQF Level 5 for Engineering Associate. The Accreditation Board anticipates that a program designed to meet AQF Level 8 will also meet the EA Stage 1 Competency Standards for the Professional Engineer. It may be that a four year AQF Level 7 program will meet EA Stage 1 Competency if the program is structured to ensure that all the elements of the EA Stage 1 Competency Standards for Professional Engineers are met. Engineers Australia will therefore consider for accreditation a four year AQF Level 7 program at the level of Professional Engineer."

Now that almost all universities have settled their implementation approach and are transitioning their four year engineering programs to AQF Level 8, the Accreditation Board advises its longer term position regarding four year programs at AQF Level 7. In order to help avoid potential confusion for all stakeholders in an already complex landscape, it is planned that from 2017 the Accreditation Board will no longer consider for accreditation, four year programs for Professional Engineer at AQF Level 7. Any Professional Engineer programs currently accredited at AQF Level 7 not planned for phasing out will be required to have a transition plan to AQF Level 8 or accreditation will be terminated.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions in relation to this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Lincoln A Wood PhD FIEAust CPEng
National Manager Accreditation

cc Chair, Accreditation Board
25 February 2016

Professor David Lowe
Associate Dean (Education)
Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies
The University of Sydney NSW 2006

Ref. Letter to ACED dated 24 August 2015, regarding accreditation of AQF Level 7 courses at the level of Professional Engineer

Dear David,

Thank you for taking the time to meet with the Chair of the Engineers Australia Accreditation Board (Emeritus Professor Elizabeth Taylor) and myself recently to discuss the referenced letter (above).

Engineers Australia recognises that The University of Sydney has the authority to organise and name its education programs according to its policies and mission, consistent with its responsibility to TEQSA and to the community.

Similarly, Engineers Australia, in maintaining a well-ordered profession, has a responsibility to assure the community that the profession of engineering achieves appropriate professional competency standards, the foundation elements of which are provided by ‘entry to practice’ professional education programs. In the terminology of Engineers Australia, these standards are described as ‘Stage 1 Competency Standards’, representing the competencies required for entry to professional practice. Professional accreditation of engineering education programs is based on these competency standards. Standards are defined at three levels: Professional Engineer, Engineering Technologist and Engineering Associate.

The higher education environment has evolved significantly in recent years, one of the drivers of change being the introduction of the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF). The AQF has resulted in a period of transition for both universities and the professions. Each university has responded by aligning its education offerings with the AQF in ways that reflect the policies and mission of the organisation. Engineers Australia has also responded by aligning its three professional levels with the AQF levels, doing so in order to maintain the orderliness of the profession. Of particular relevance in the current discussion is the alignment of Professional Engineer Stage 1 Competency Standards with AQF Levels 8 and 9, and the Engineering Technologist Stage 1 Competency Standards with AQF Level 7.
In the engineering business community, AQF Level 7 has settled as the education level for Engineering Technologists, characterised by three year Bachelor education programs. Consequently, in order to avoid potential confusion between the Professional Engineer and Engineering Technologist standards, Engineers Australia has decided to consider all programs offered at AQF Level 7, whether three years or four years, for accreditation at the level of Engineering Technologist. This serves to not only protect the standing of the profession in the eyes of the community, but it also provides clarity and brand protection for all accredited engineering programs in Australia. It is for this reason that, although it is possible that some programs at AQF Level 7 might meet the Professional Engineer Stage 1 Competency Standards, Engineers Australia will only consider them at the level of Engineering Technologist.

I trust that this expanded explanation of our letter of August 2015 is helpful to the university in understanding the position of Engineers Australia in relation to accreditation of programs at AQF Level 7. If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Best regards,

Lincoln A Wood
National Manager Accreditation, Engineers Australia
Course management template

Use this template to:
- propose a new course of study following approval of an EOI
- propose an amendment to an existing course of study
- request the deletion of a course of study

Complete the relevant sections as indicated.

Please save and submit your complete document to the Curriculum and Course Planning Committee at: pio.ccpp@sydney.edu.au

The annual calendar of relevant committee meetings is located online at: http://sydney.edu.au/staff/planning/ccpc/index.php#meetschd

For all purposes, please complete these key details:

This submission relates to the following
- New course
- Amended course
- Deletion of a course

Name of course
- Bachelor of Engineering
- Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Arts
- Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Commerce
- Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Design in Architecture
- Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Medical Science
- Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Science
- Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Project Management

School/department
Managing faculty
Name of proponent
Telephone
Email

Version date
- Undergraduate
- Postgraduate coursework
- Postgraduate research

Signature

Dean

Faculty Manager

Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)

Divisional Finance Director
- Part 2

Head of Recruitment
- Section 1.5

Library Director
- Appendix 4

Approved by the Academic Board, 3 December 2014
PART 1: Strategy and marketing analysis

1.1 Strategic purpose (use this space, to a maximum one page)

This course deletion proposal is submitted in conjunction with proposed changes to the grading scheme of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours.

The Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies proposes to bring the University’s Bachelor of Engineering programs into alignment with the practice across the sector, where all graduates from 4-year Bachelor of Engineering programs (and the associated combined degrees) are awarded an AQF8 qualification. As part of this change, the Bachelor of Engineering degree (awarded without Honours) would be deleted.

1.2 Summary of internal consultation with other faculties and business services units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Consultees</th>
<th>Method of consultation</th>
<th>Evidence of consultation*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7 Course(s) to be closed as a consequence of this proposal (use this space, to a maximum one page)

- Bachelor of Engineering
- Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Arts
- Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Commerce
- Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Design in Architecture
- Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Laws
- Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Medical Science
- Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Science
- Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Project Management

PART 2: Financial viability analysis

No impact on finance, as the Bachelor of Engineering and associated combined degrees have already been replaced by the Bachelor of Engineering (Honours) for applicants.

PART 3: Course details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1 Course name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Design in Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Medical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Project Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2 Course abbreviation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE/BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE/BCom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE/BDesArch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE/LLB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE/BMedSci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE/BSc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE/BPM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3 Start year:</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Start semester:</th>
<th>Semester 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.4 Name of award:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Design in Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Medical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering / Bachelor of Project Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.5 Combined degree?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.6 Combined type: (if applicable)
☐ Combined means a single program with a single set of course Resolutions leading to the award of two degrees unless otherwise specified in the Resolutions
☐ Double means a program where students are permitted by participating faculties (and/or by specific Resolutions within a single award) to transfer between courses in order to complete two awards
☐ Combined Level means a single program with a single set of course Resolutions leading to the award of two degrees at two different levels unless otherwise specified in the Resolutions

3.7 Honours offered? ☑ Yes ☐ No

3.8 Honours type: (if applicable)
☐ Appended Students satisfy requirements for the award of a Bachelor (Pass) degree and on this basis qualify for admission to an additional Honours year
☐ Integrated Students undertake Honours components in Year 2, Year 3 etc. of the Bachelor course

3.9 Course group:
☒ Undergraduate ☐ Postgraduate coursework ☐ Postgraduate research

3.25 Articulation pathway (if applicable): N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course name</th>
<th>Credit given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.29 Course deletions may impact or be perceived to impact continuing (enrolled) students. If this proposal relates to a change to an existing course please complete sections 7.12.5 to 7.12.9 of this template which addresses transitional arrangements. Describe the proposed communication with continuing students about the deletion of the course.

Students admitted to the Bachelor of Engineering (2014 and prior) will continue their candidature under the rules in place at the time of entry. Additional communications not required.

3.30 Course deletions may impact commencing students or applicants. If this proposal relates to or involves a course deletion please complete sections 7.12.5 to 7.12.9 of this template. Has consultation been undertaken with Student Recruitment and Admissions regarding the numbers of applications or offers in train?

No impact on commencing students or applicants. SRA confirm there are no outstanding applications for the Bachelor of Engineering, as all offers were converted to Bachelor of Engineering (Honours) by end of 2014. Email confirmation at Appendix 4

PART 4: Admission details

The following information will be used for internal and external publication and marketing purposes.

4.1 Admission pathway: ☑ UAC ☑ Direct ☑ Flexible Entry (UG only) (provide details of new or amended flexible entry requirements)

4.8 Second semester admission ☑ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please indicate whether subject choice will be restricted and whether the duration of the course will necessarily increase

4.9 International student admission:

☒ Yes ☐ No

Will the minimum English language requirement for the proposed course differ from the usual requirements (i.e. overall IELTS score of 6.5 with a minimum of 6.0 in each band)? ☐ Yes ☑ No

If yes, please indicate IELTS equivalent:

Other international student entry requirements:

PART 5: External registration codes

Codes will be sought following final approval of the course proposal. For course deletions, please include existing details.

5.1 CRICOS Code:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000718F</td>
<td>Application pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025100A</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025102K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>064106E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032885D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>037177C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025101M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>074382B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International Services will apply for a Commonwealth Register of International Courses for Overseas Students code on behalf of the University. Courses that are not offered to international students do not require a CRICOS code. Courses offered by distance or online only cannot be registered.

Approved by the Academic Board, 3 December 2014
PART 7. Learning and teaching

7.12 Resolutions

Senate, Faculty and Course Resolutions

The faculty manager or nominee must provide any new Resolutions or proposed amendments to existing Resolutions with this proposal, using the attached templates as a strict guide. (Refer to Appendix 1 Resolutions of the Senate, Appendix 2 for Faculty Resolutions and Appendix 3 for Course Resolutions). Please also indicate below if changes to the Resolutions apply. New and amended resolutions are to be submitted as pdfs generated from the relevant CMS file. Advice and assistance can be obtained from the Committee Officer to the Undergraduate Studies or Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board, as applicable.

7.12.1 Are there changes to the list of Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates conferred by your faculty, as listed in the Resolutions of the Senate available in the University Calendar? If Yes, complete Appendix 1

7.12.2 Will there be new Resolutions or changes to existing Faculty Resolutions for the proposed course or amended course? If Yes, complete Appendix 2

7.12.3 Will there be new Resolutions or changes to existing Course Resolutions for the proposed course or amended course? If Yes, complete Appendix 3a or 3b (there are separate Appendices for undergraduate and postgraduate courses)

Academic dress

Resolutions of the Senate prescribe the academic dress for graduates including doctors of philosophy and recipients of higher doctorates or professional doctorates, and holders of masters and bachelors degrees and diplomas and certificates. There are general protocols about colours. Under delegated authority from Senate the Registrar approves all aspects of academic dress and proposals must be made in accordance with the Resolutions of the Senate relating to Academic Dress. The Dean of the faculty submits a proposal for academic dress to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) for approval.

7.12.4 Will there be changes to the academic dress due to the introduction of the proposed new award course? If Yes, contact the office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar)

Transitional arrangements

If this proposal replaces or amends an existing award course, what transitional arrangements have been made? (e.g. identification of last year of student intake; provision for enrolled students to continue under existing Resolutions etc.). Please include evidence of consultation with currently enrolled students who will be affected by any changes to, or withdrawal of the course.

7.12.5 Last semester intake under existing Resolutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Sem 2 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>Sem 2 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.12.6 Are there international students who are currently undertaking foundation or English language studies and planning to take this course? e.g., students who received a package offer. If yes, what provisions are in place for such students?

7.12.7 For course deletions, advise the last date for enrolments into the existing course

7.12.8 For course deletions, attach proof of consultation with Student Recruitment and Admissions to determine whether any student applications are currently being processed, and outlined any provisions to be put in place for such students

7.12.9 For course deletions, outline the provisions in place for students enrolled under existing Resolutions

Approved by the Academic Board, 3 December 2014

Academic Standards & Policy Committee
20 July 2016
requirements in accordance with the resolutions in force at the time of their commencement or to change to the new resolutions.
Resolutions of the Senate

1 Degrees, diplomas and certificates of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies

(1) With the exception of the Doctor of Engineering and the Doctor of Philosophy, The Senate, by authority of the University of Sydney Act 1989 (as amended), provides and confers the following degrees, diplomas and certificates, according to the rules specified by the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. The Doctor of Engineering and the Doctor of Philosophy are provided and conferred according to the rules specified by the Senate and the Academic Board.

(2) This list is amended with effect from 1 January, 2016. Degrees, diplomas and certificates no longer open for admission will be conferred by the Senate according to the rules previously specified by the Faculty.

2 Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title &amp; stream</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RHENGINE</td>
<td>Doctor of Engineering</td>
<td>DEng</td>
<td>Published work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPDPHDENG</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMMPHENG</td>
<td>Master of Philosophy</td>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINGENE</td>
<td>Master of Engineering</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINFTEC</td>
<td>Master of Information Technology</td>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINFTIMG</td>
<td>Master of Information Technology</td>
<td>MTM</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAHLCIN</td>
<td>Master of Health Technology</td>
<td>MHTI</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADATASC</td>
<td>Master of Data Science</td>
<td>MDS</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPROFEN</td>
<td>Master of Professional Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace</td>
<td>MPE(Aerospace)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical</td>
<td>MPE(Biomedical)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>MPE(Chemical &amp; Biomolecular)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>MPE(Civil)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>MPE(Electrical)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluids</td>
<td>MPE(Fluids)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geomechanical</td>
<td>MPE(Geo)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>MPE(Mechanical)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>MPE(Power)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>MPE(software)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>MPE(Structural)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>MPE(Telecoms)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPRJMG</td>
<td>Master of Project Management</td>
<td>MPM</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPRJLEA</td>
<td>Master of Project Leadership</td>
<td>MPL</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPCSTECN</td>
<td>Bachelor of Computer Science and Technology*</td>
<td>BCST(Systems)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPCSTECN</td>
<td>Bachelor of Computer Science and Technology (Advanced)*</td>
<td>BCST(Adv(Systems))</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUCENGIN</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace</td>
<td>BEng(Aerospace)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical</td>
<td>BEng(Biomedical)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>BEng(Chemical &amp; Biomolecular)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>BEng(Civil)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>BEng(Electrical)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>BEng(Mechanical)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechatronic</td>
<td>BEng(Mechatronics)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>BEng(software)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGINE</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title &amp; stream</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aeronautical Engineering</td>
<td>BEHons(Aeronautical)</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>BEHons(Biomedical)</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering</td>
<td>BEHons(Chemical and Biomolecular)</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>BEHons(Civil)</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>BEHons(Electrical)</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>BEHons(Mechanical)</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechatronic Engineering</td>
<td>BEHons(Mechatronic)</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Software Engineering</td>
<td>BEHons(Software)</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BPM</td>
<td>BPM</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor of Project Management (Civil Engineering Science)</td>
<td>BPM(Civil Engineering Science)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor of Project Management (Software)</td>
<td>BPM(Software)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor of Project Management (Built Environment)</td>
<td>BPM(Built Environment)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology*</td>
<td>BIT(ComputerScience)</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>BIT(InformationSystems)</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*may be awarded with honours following a further year of study

### Combined degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title &amp; stream</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Information Technology/Master of Information Technology Management</td>
<td>MIT/MITM</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPENGARR</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering/Bachelor of Arts*</td>
<td>BE/BA</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPGGSGM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering/Bachelor of Commerce*</td>
<td>BE/BCom</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPENGDAI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering/Bachelor of Design in Architecture*</td>
<td>BE/BDesArch</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPENGOLW</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering/Bachelor of Laws*</td>
<td>BE/LLB</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPGMSG</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering/Bachelor of Medical Science*</td>
<td>BE/BMedSci</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPGS6GI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering/Bachelor of Science*</td>
<td>BE/BSc</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGART</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>BEHons/BA</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGCOM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Commerce</td>
<td>BEHons/BCom</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGDAI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Design in Architecture</td>
<td>BEHons/BDesArch</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGAW</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>BEHons/LLB</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGMSI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Medical Science</td>
<td>BEHons/BMedSci</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGSCI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>BEHons/BSc</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPITCART</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology/Bachelor of Arts*</td>
<td>BIT/BA</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPITCCOM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology/Bachelor of Commerce*</td>
<td>BIT/BCom</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPITCLAW</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology/Bachelor of Laws*</td>
<td>BIT/LLB</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPITCMSC</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology/Bachelor of Medical Science*</td>
<td>BIT/BMedSci</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPITCSCI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology/Bachelor of Science*</td>
<td>BIT/BSc</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPGPRRM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Project Management*</td>
<td>BE/BPM</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*may be awarded with honours following a further year of study

*may be awarded with honours in an integrated program
### 4 Graduate diplomas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNCOMPUT</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Computing</td>
<td>GradDipComp</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNENGINE</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Engineering</td>
<td>GradDipEng</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNPENPROF</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Engineering (Professional Engineering) (Last intake 2013)</td>
<td>GradDipEng(ProfEng)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNINFTEC</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Information Technology</td>
<td>GradDipIT</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNINFTMG</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Information Technology Management</td>
<td>GradDipITM</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNPRJMGMT</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Project Management</td>
<td>GradDipPM</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNPRJLEA</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Project Leadership</td>
<td>GradDipPL</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNHLTCIN</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Health Technology Innovation</td>
<td>GradDipH</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Complex Systems</td>
<td>GradDipCS</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5 Graduate certificates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCENGINE</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Engineering</td>
<td>GradCertEng</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCINFTEC</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Information Technology</td>
<td>GradCertIT</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCINFTMG</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Information Technology Management</td>
<td>GradCertITM</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCDATASC</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Data Science</td>
<td>GradCertDS</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCPRJMGMT</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Project Management</td>
<td>GradCertPM</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCPRJLEA</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Project Leadership</td>
<td>GradCertPL</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Resolutions of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies for coursework awards

Resolutions of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies for coursework awards

These resolutions apply to all undergraduate and postgraduate coursework award courses in the Faculty, unless specifically indicated otherwise. Students enrolled in postgraduate research awards should consult the resolutions for their course. These resolutions must be read in conjunction with applicable University By-laws, Rules and policies including (but not limited to) the University of Sydney (Coursework Policy) 2014 (the ‘Coursework Policy’), the resolutions for the course of enrolment, the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended) and the Academic Board policies on Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism.

Part 1: Course Enrolment

Terminology: In the following resolutions, all reference to the Bachelor of Engineering degree applies to both the Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Engineering (Honours), except where otherwise indicated:

1 Enrolment Restrictions

(1) Except where explicitly listed in a Faculty recommended program of enrolment, or with the permission of the Dean or delegate, an undergraduate student shall satisfy the following enrolment requirements.

(a) No more than 26 credit points in either semester one or two;

(b) No more than 12 credit points in the summer session and 6 credit points in the winter session;

(c) A student may enrol only:

(i) in level 1000 units of study during their first year;

(ii) in level 1000 or 2000 units of study during their second year;

(d) A student shall enrol in lower year level core units of study as a priority above any higher year level units of study irrespective of meeting any prerequisite requirements of the higher year units.

2 Transferring Between Streams or Degrees

(1) Students admitted to specific postgraduate degrees or streams wishing to transfer between degrees or streams managed by the Faculty need to apply to the Faculty and obtain the approval of the Dean (or delegate). Students will be assessed based on their progress in their current degree or stream and must be able to show that they meet the criteria that apply to commencing students.

3 Time Limits

(1) Except where specific course resolutions specify alternative requirements, the following conditions must be met:

(a) A student must complete all the requirements for a coursework doctorate, within ten calendar years of first enrolment;

(b) A student must complete all the requirements for a combined BEHons, single or combined BIT, and BCST within ten calendar years of first enrolment;

(c) A student must complete all the requirements for a single (non combined) BEHons or BPM within the lesser of 16 enrolled semesters or ten calendar years of first enrolment;

(d) A student must complete all the requirements for a graduate certificate within two calendar years of first enrolment; completing in a minimum of 1 semester and a maximum of 4 semesters

(e) A student must complete all the requirements for a graduate diploma within four calendar years of first enrolment; completing in a minimum of 2 semesters and a maximum of 6 semesters

(f) A student must complete all the requirements for a master’s degree within six calendar years of first enrolment; completing in a minimum of 2 semesters and a maximum of 8 semesters

(2) Periods of suspension, exclusion or lapsed candidature will be added to maximum completion times except that no completion time may exceed 10 years from first enrolment.

(3) Credit will not be granted for prior learning older than 10 years at the time of first enrolment.

4 Suspension, Discontinuation and Lapse of Candidature

The Coursework Rule Policy specifies the conditions for suspending or discontinuing candidature, and return to candidature after these events. The Rule Policy also defines the circumstances when candidature is deemed to have lapsed. Students seeking to suspend, discontinue or apply for a return to candidature after a lapse must apply to the Dean of Engineering and Information Technologies or their delegate for permission, supplying detailed reasons and evidence to support the request.

5 Credit for Previous Study

(1) Conditions for the granting of credit for previous study are in accordance with the Coursework Rule Policy, except:

(a) the maximum credit that may be granted to the Bachelor of Engineering Honours degree, Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees, Bachelor of Information Technology degree or Bachelor of information Technology combined degrees is 96 credit points;

(b) the maximum credit that may be granted to the Bachelor of Computer Science and Technology or Bachelor of Science and Technology/Advanced or Bachelor of Project Management is 48 credit points; and

(c) credit for prior learning at the University of Sydney at postgraduate level may be granted subject to the approval of the Faculty and to the following conditions:

(i) where no award has been conferred, credit may be transferred in full to the Graduate Diploma and Master degree;

(ii) where an award has been conferred credit to a limit of 12 credit points may be transferred.

(d) credit for prior learning at postgraduate level at an external institution recognised by the University of Sydney may be granted as follows:

(i) where no award has been conferred credit to a maximum of 50 percent of the degree may be approved, provided units of study have been completed at credit average and are equivalent to units of study offered under the degree being taken;

(ii) where an award has been conferred credit to a maximum of 12 credit points may be approved provided units of study of have been completed at credit average and are equivalent to units of study offered under the degree being taken;
Part 2: Unit of Study Enrolment

6 Cross-institutional Study

(1) Provided permission has been obtained in advance, the Dean (or delegate) may permit a student to complete a unit of study at another institution and have that unit credited to the student’s course requirements, provided that:

(a) the resolutions of the student's course of enrolment do not specifically exclude cross-institutional study; and either
(b) the unit of study content is not taught in any corresponding unit of study at the University; or
(c) the student is unable, for good reason, to attend a corresponding unit of study at the University.

7 International Exchange

The Faculty encourages students to participate in international exchange programs, except where specified otherwise in the resolutions for a particular course. Students must apply to the Head of the relevant School of Engineering and Information Technologies to obtain approval for their planned enrolment while on exchange. This guarantees that the units completed externally will be correctly matched to the core requirements of their Course. International exchange must not exceed 12 months / 48cp and must not be approved where it would result in less than 50% of the normal course requirements being completed at the University of Sydney.

Part 3: Studying and Assessment

8 Attendance

(1) Students are required to be in attendance at the correct time and place of any formal or informal examinations. Non attendance on any grounds insufficient to claim special consideration will result in the forfeiture of marks associated with the assessment. Participation in a minimum number of assessment items may be a requirement of any unit of study.

(2) Students are expected to attend a minimum of 90 percent of timetabled activities for a unit of study, unless granted exemption by the Dean or Head of School most concerned. The Dean or Head of School most concerned may determine that a student fails a unit of study because of inadequate attendance. Alternatively, at their discretion, they may set additional assessment items where attendance is lower than 90 percent.

9 Special Consideration for Illness, Injury or Misadventure

Special consideration is a process that affords equal opportunity to students who have experienced circumstances that adversely impact their ability to adequately complete an assessment task in a unit of study. The Coursework Rule Policy provides full details of the University policy and procedures.

10 Concessional Pass

In this Faculty the grade PCON (Concessional Pass) is not awarded.

11 Re-assessment

The Faculty does not offer opportunities for re-assessment other than on the grounds of approved special consideration.

Part 4: Progression, Results and Graduation

12 Satisfactory Progress

The Faculty will monitor students for satisfactory progress towards the completion of their award course. In addition to the common triggers used to identify students not meeting academic progression requirements (as defined by the Progression requirements of the Coursework Rule Policy), students must pass any unit of study identified in the course resolutions as being critical to progression through the course.

13 Award of the Bachelor’s Degree with Honours

Honours is available to students as either appended honours or integrated honours. Admission, requirements and award for the honours courses are in accordance with the relevant course resolutions.

14 Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies Specific Weighted Average Mark Indicators.

(1) The Weighted Average Mark (WAM) is calculated by the formula:

\[
WAM = \frac{(Wi \times CPi \times Mi)}{(Wi \times CPi)}
\]

where

(a) \( CPi \) is the number of credit points for the unit of study.
(b) \( Mi \) is the mark achieved for the unit of study.

(2) The Engineering Integrated Honours Weighted Average Mark (EIHWAM) is calculated by the formula:

\[
EIHWAM = \frac{(Wi \times CPi \times Mi)}{(Wi \times CPi)}
\]

where

(a) \( Wi \) is the weighting given by 0 for 1000 level units of study, 2 for 2000 level units, 3 for 3000 level units and 4 for 4000 level or above units. Thesis units of study are given a double weighting of 8.
(b) \( CPi \) is the number of credit points for the unit of study.
(c) \( Mi \) is the mark achieved for the unit of study.

All attempts at units of study are included except for units of study assessed on a pass/fail basis; units of study with a grade of DNF, DC; and credited units of study from other institutions. The mark used for units of study with a grade of AF or DF is zero. For combined degree students, only units of study within the Bachelor of Engineering tables are included.

(3) The Engineering Integrated Honours Weighted Average Mark (EIHWAM) is calculated using the same formula as the EWAM in Clause 14.1 with the additional condition that thesis units of study are given a double weighting of 8.

15 University Medal

A student who has qualified for the award with first class honours and has an EIHWAM of 85 or above, and who has demonstrated excellence in their honours thesis will be considered for the award of a University Medal. The Medal is awarded at the discretion of the Dean or relevant
Associate Dean, after the recommendation of the relevant Head of School, to the highest achieving students who in the opinion of the Faculty have an outstanding academic record, in accordance with the Coursework Rule Policy.

Part 5: Other

16 Transitional Provisions

(1) These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature on or after 1 January, 2016 2017.

(2) Students who commenced prior to 1 January, 2016 2017 may:

(a) complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions governing their candidature immediately prior to these changes; or

(b) where approved by the Faculty, elect to proceed under these resolutions provided appropriate programs of study can be identified.
Bachelor of Engineering Honours

These resolutions must be read in conjunction with applicable University By-laws, Rules and policies including (but not limited to) the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014 (the 'Coursework Rule'), the Resolutions of the Faculty, the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended) and the Academic Board policies on Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism.

Course resolutions

**Terminology:** in the following resolutions, all references to the Bachelor of Engineering degree apply to both the Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Engineering Honours degrees, except where otherwise indicated. The Bachelor of Engineering Honours provides students with advanced knowledge and special proficiency in the professional work of engineering.

1 Course codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHENGINE</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UENGINE</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Attendance Pattern

The attendance pattern for this course is full-time or part-time. Part-time students must still satisfy appropriate enrolment progression and are subject to the same degree time limits as full-time students. International students are required to follow the enrolment pattern as specified by their visa. The Faculty strongly recommends full-time enrolment as the preferred option for all undergraduate students unless exceptional circumstances exist.

3 Streams

1. The Bachelor of Engineering Honours is available in the following streams:
   (a) **School of Aerospace, Mechanical and Mechatronic Engineering**
   (l) Aeronautical Engineering
   (lI) Mechanical Engineering
   (III) Mechatronic Engineering
   (IV) Biomedical Engineering
   (b) **School of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering**
   (l) Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering
   (c) **School of Civil Engineering**
   (I) Civil Engineering
   (d) **School of Electrical and Information Engineering**
   (l) Electrical Engineering
   (V) Software Engineering

2. Completion of a stream is a requirement of the course.

3. Students may apply to change streams by direct application to the Faculty Office. Approval is required from the relevant Associate Dean (or his/her delegate) for any case. Students will be assessed based on the Flexible First Year average mark criteria but will also be required to show that they have met progression requirements in their current degree or stream as specified by the school and that they will be able to complete the new stream in the normal time period.

4. Flexible First Year
   (a) Undergraduate students entering first year of the Engineering courses in Semester 1 may apply to undertake the Flexible First Year program, instead of choosing a particular stream.
   (b) The Flexible First Year Program is listed in the Flexible First Year Table. At the end of Semester 1 Students may transfer into approved streams as defined in the following clause, or may choose to continue in the Flexible First Year Program for Semester 2, though Semester 2 units may or may not count towards their course, depending on the final choice of stream.
   (c) Those students who have met the requirements for first year entry (ATAR cut-off or equivalent) into a particular Engineering program will be guaranteed approval to transfer into that program even though they chose the Flexible First Year Program. Students who did not meet the first year entry requirements for specific streams, but subsequently attained average marks in the Flexible First Year Program that met or surpassed the specified requirements for those streams will also be eligible to apply for transfer into those streams. The transfer requirements will be approved by the Dean or nominee. These conditions will also apply for combined degree candidates.

4 Admission to Candidature

1. Admission to this course is on the basis of a secondary school leaving qualification such as the NSW Higher School Certificate (including national and international equivalents), tertiary study or an approved preparation program. English language requirements must be met where these are not demonstrated by sufficient qualifications taught in English. Special admission pathways are open for mature aged applicants who do not possess a school leaving qualification, for educationally disadvantaged applicants and for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Applicants are ranked by merit and offers for available places are issued according to the ranking. Details of admission policies are found in the Coursework Rule.

5 Requirements for Award

1. The units of study that may be taken for the course are set out in the Bachelor of Engineering Honours Flexible First Year Table of units of study, the Bachelor of Engineering Honours Core Table, the Bachelor of Engineering Honours Stream Core Tables, and the Bachelor of Engineering Honours Stream Specialist Tables of units of study for the specialised stream in the degree.
(2) To qualify for the award of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours degree, a candidate must:

(a) successfully complete 192 credit points comprising:
(i) A minimum of 36 credit points from the Engineering Core Table, including all required units;
(ii) A minimum of 108 credit points from the Engineering Stream Table pertaining to the specialist stream being undertaken, including all required units;
(iii) A minimum of 48 credit points of additional units from the Engineering Stream Specialist Table pertaining to the specialist stream being undertaken, including satisfying any additional requirements specified for the Specialist Table; and

(b) have an EIHWM of at least 65 immediately prior to the semester in which a thesis unit of study is first attempted; and

(c) complete the requirements within a time limit of 5 years for a single Bachelor of Engineering Honours degree or complete the requirements within a time limit of 6 years for a Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degree.

Candidates who satisfy Clause 5.2(a), but who have not satisfied all of clauses 5.2(b), 5.2(c) and 5.2(d), will qualify for the award of the Bachelor of Engineering degree (i.e. the pass degree; awarded without honours).

(3) The class of Honours will be determined by the EIHWM.

(4) In exceptional circumstances, the Dean may vary the conditions for the award of Honours after seeking the advice of the relevant Head of School.

6 Level of Honours Awarded

(1) The Bachelor of Engineering Honours degree is awarded in classes ranging from First Class to Second Class, Division Two Third Class. The various classes of Honours are awarded on the basis of a candidate’s EIHWM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>HWAM Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class I</td>
<td>75 &lt;= EIHWM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class II (Division 1)</td>
<td>70 &lt;= EIHWM &lt;75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class II (Division 2)</td>
<td>65 &lt;= EIHWM &lt;70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class III</td>
<td>EIHWM &lt; 65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Majors

(1) There is no requirement to complete a major.

(2) Availability of Majors:

(a) There are no restrictions on students attempting majors other than the Space Engineering and Humanitarian Engineering majors.

(b) Except where otherwise specified in the details of a specific major, a major will be available to all students who satisfy the requirements of that major. The availability of the major does not however mean that the units of study listed in the table for the major (or required prerequisite units of study) will be available to all students, or that students in all streams will have sufficient free electives to complete the required units.

(c) Students can be awarded multiple majors where those majors are available without the limits specified in clause (2)(b) and where they satisfy the requirements for those majors. When completing multiple majors, no unit may be counted towards satisfying the requirements of more than one major.

(d) Students cannot be awarded a major that has a title directly associated with the name of their stream.

(e) Students are eligible to attempt the Space Engineering major based on either a separate and specific admission pathway or on application at the end of any calendar year having achieved an AAM approved by the Dean or nominee. There are no restrictions on students attempting majors other than the Space Engineering major.

(f) Entry to the Humanitarian major may be on a competitive basis, subject to demand. Any required application process and selection criteria will be approved by the Dean or nominee.

(3) A major requires:

(a) the completion of 24 credit points chosen from units of study listed in the table for that major;
(b) satisfying any additional requirements specified for the major, and listed with the table of units for the major;
(c) the completion of a thesis project that has been approved by the Head of School (or delegate) as relevant to the topic of the major.

(4) The majors available are:

(a) Chemical Engineering
(b) Computer Engineering
(c) Construction Management
(d) Electrical Engineering
(e) Environmental Engineering
(f) Geotechnical Engineering
(g) Humanitarian Engineering*
(h) Information Technology
(i) Internet of Things*
(j) Materials
(k) Mechanical Engineering
(l) Mechatronic Engineering
(m) Power Engineering
(n) Space Engineering
(o) Structures
(p) Telecommunications Engineering
(q) Transport Engineering

* available from 2017

8 Transitional Provisions

(1) These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature before 1 January 2016 and students who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January 2016 who elect to proceed under these resolutions will take effect from 1 January 2017.

(2) Candidates who commenced prior to 1 January, 2016 may:

(a) complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions governing their candidature immediately prior to these changes; or
(b) where approved by the Faculty, elect to proceed under these resolution provided appropriate programs of study can be identified.
Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees

Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees
Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees
Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees
Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Arts
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Arts
Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Commerce
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Commerce
Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Design in Architecture
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Design in Architecture
Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Laws
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Laws
Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Medical Science
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Medical Science
Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Music Studies
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Music Studies
Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Project Management
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Project Management
Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Science
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Science

These resolutions must be read in conjunction with applicable University By-laws, Rules and policies including (but not limited to) the University of Sydney (Coursework Rule 2014) (the ‘Coursework Rule’) Coursework Policy 2014, the Resolutions of the Faculty, the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended) and the Academic Board policies on Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism. Up to date versions of all such documents are available from the Policy Register: http://www.sydney.edu.au/policies.

Course Resolutions

**Terminology**

In the following resolutions, all reference to the Bachelor of Engineering degree apply to both the Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Engineering Honours degrees, except where otherwise indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHENGART</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENGART</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGCOM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENGCOM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGDAAR</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Design in Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENGDAAR</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Design in Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGLAW</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENGDAAR</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Design in Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGLAW</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENGDAAR</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Design in Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGMSC</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Medical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENGMSC</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Medical Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHENGPRM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGAM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGSCI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGPRM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGSCI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGBSCI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGBSCI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGBSCI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGBSCI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGBSCI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGBSCI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGBSCI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Attendance Pattern

1. The attendance pattern for the following programs is full-time only. The attendance pattern for all other Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined courses is full-time or part-time.

   a. Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Design in Architecture
   b. Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Design in Architecture
   c. Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Laws
   d. Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Laws

2. Part-time students must still satisfy appropriate enrolment progression and are subject to the same degree time limits as full-time students.

3 Streams

1. Completion of a stream is a requirement of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours and students in combined degrees are subject to the stream requirements in the Bachelor of Engineering Honours course resolutions.

2. Students in the Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees can change the stream of the BEHons portion of their combined degree in accordance with the same requirements specified in the Bachelor of Engineering Honours resolutions.

3. Flexible First Year
   a. Students gaining entry to any of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees may also choose to undertake the Flexible First Year program under the same requirements as specified in the Bachelor of Engineering Honours resolutions.

4. Within the Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Design in Architecture and the Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Design in Architecture, the Bachelor of Engineering Honours is available only in the Civil Engineering stream. For all other Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees, the streams available for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours are listed under the course resolution for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours.

5. The Bachelor of Science degree is available in the following streams:
   a. Advanced Mathematics
   b. Advanced Mathematics

4 Cross-Faculty Management

1. Candidates in the combined Engineering and Law courses will be under the general supervision of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies until the end of the semester in which they complete the requirements for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours. They may then be under the supervision of the Faculty of Law. Candidates in all other combined degree programs will be under the general supervision of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies for the duration of the combined program.

2. The Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies and the Dean of the Faculty hosting the associated combined degree shall jointly exercise authority in any matter concerned with the combined course not otherwise dealt with in these resolutions.

5 Admission to Candidature

Admission to these degrees is on the basis of a secondary school leaving qualification such as the NSW Higher School Certificate (including national and international equivalents), tertiary study or an approved preparation program. English language requirements must be met where these are not demonstrated by sufficient qualifications taught in English. Special admission pathways are open for mature aged applicants who do not possess a school leaving qualification, educationally disadvantaged applicants and for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Applicants are ranked by merit and offers for available places are issued according to the ranking.

Details of admission policies are found in the Coursework Rule.

2. Admission to the Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Music Studies will, in addition to the above, require the applicant to complete a music skills test or jazz aptitude test and:
   a. Principal Study in Composition, to submit three compositions in different performance media which should represent their present level of achievement as composers, and to attend an interview;
   b. Principal Study in Contemporary Music Practice, to submit a portfolio with original work; song(s) or composition(s) in any genre that demonstrates a high level of creative potential and technical ability, and to attend an interview;
   c. Principal Study in Musicology, to present an example of recent work and to attend an interview;
   d. Principal Study in Performance, to undertake a practical audition in their nominated instrument or in voice.

The results of this process will form part of the ranking of applicants.

6 Requirements for Award

1. To qualify for the award of the combined degree:
   a. For all Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees except the Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Laws, a candidate must complete 240 credit points and satisfy any additional requirements specified in the following clauses.
   b. For the Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Laws combined degree, a candidate must complete 288 credit points and any additional requirements specified in the following clauses.
   c. Where the requirements specified in the following clauses account for less than the total required credit, candidates must complete additional units of study (not including general electives) from the relevant Bachelor of Engineering Honours specialist stream table subject to any conditions specified in that table as may be necessary to satisfy the requirements of the degree.

2. For the Bachelor of Engineering Honours component of a combined degree:
Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees

(a) The units of study that may be taken for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours component of the combined degree are set out in the tables of units of study for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours single degree.

(b) Candidates must complete a total of 84 credit points from Table A, including:

(i) a major from Table A
(ii) at least 48 credit points of 2000/3000 level units of study.

(c) The units of study that may be taken are set out in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Tables of units of study.

(1) For the Bachelor of Science component of a combined degree:

(a) Candidates must complete 96 credit points of Science units of study, including at least one major in a Science subject area.

(b) Candidates must complete at least 48 credit points of senior Science units of study, of which at least 36 credit points shall be completed at the Advanced level or as Talented Student Program (TSP) units of study; and

(c) A minimum of 24 credit points of intermediate or senior Science units of study from the Bachelor of Medical Science Table IV (C).

(2) For the Bachelor of Music component of a combined degree:

(a) Candidates must complete 96 credit points of units of study selected from the Table of Undergraduate Units of Study from The University of Sydney Business School including:

(i) 36 credit points of core units of study (30 junior credit points and six senior credit points); and

(ii) at least 48 credit points of 2000/3000 level units of study.

(b) Candidates must complete 96 credit points from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Tables of units of study.

(c) Candidates must complete 96 credit points of units of study from The University of Sydney Business School including:

(i) 36 credit points of core units of study (30 junior credit points and six senior credit points); and

(ii) at least 48 credit points of 2000/3000 level units of study.

(3) For the Bachelor of Design in Architecture component of a combined degree:

(a) Candidates must complete 96 credit points of units of study from the Bachelor of Engineering Honours component of the combined degree that can be replaced by specified alternative units that would form part of the normal program for single degree students in that stream.

(b) Candidates must complete 108 credit points from the Engineering Stream Core Table pertaining to the specialist stream being undertaken, including all required units;

(c) Candidates completing the Bachelor of Science in the Advanced or the Advanced Mathematics stream must include as part of the above requirements:

(i) a minimum of 54 credit points of intermediate or senior Science units of study from the Bachelor of Medical Science;

(ii) a minimum of 24 credit points of senior Science units of study from the Bachelor of Medical Science;

(d) Except where varied by other clauses of these resolutions, all candidates must complete a minimum of 144 credit points comprising:

(i) 36 credit points from the Engineering Core Table, including all required units;

(ii) 108cp from the Engineering Stream Core Table pertaining to the specialist stream being undertaken, including all required units;

(c) The Faculty Board may approve, based on appropriate academic justification, a list of approved unit alternatives. These alternatives specify, for particular Engineering stream / combined degree combinations, units within the normal requirements for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours component of the combined degree that can be replaced by specified alternative units that would form part of the normal program for single degree students in that stream.

(4) For the Bachelor of Commerce component of a combined degree:

(a) The units of study that may be taken are set out in the normal program for single degree students in that stream.

(b) Candidates must complete 96 credit points of units of study from Table A, including:

(i) 102 credit points of compulsory units of study; and

(ii) 42 credit points of elective units of study, of which a maximum of 36 credit points are taken from Part 1 and a minimum of 6 credit points are taken from Part 2.

(c) Candidates completing the Bachelor of Science in the Advanced or the Advanced Mathematics stream must include as part of the above requirements:

(i) a minimum of 24 credit points of intermediate or senior Science units of study, of which at least 36 credit points shall be completed at the Advanced level or as Talented Student Program (TSP) units of study; and

(ii) a minimum of 24 credit points of senior Science units of study from the Bachelor of Medical Science Table IV (C).

(5) For the Bachelor of Engineering component of a combined degree:

(a) Candidates must complete 144 credit points of Law units of study taken from the Faculty of Law Undergraduate Table, comprising:

(i) a total of 84 credit points from Table A, including:

(ii) 24 credit points from intermediate units of study, comprising:

(iii) at least 48 credit points of 2000/3000 level units of study.

(b) Candidates must complete the core and elective units of study as set out in the Bachelor of Project Management Unit of Study Table.

(c) Candidates must complete 144 credit points comprising:

(i) 102 credit points of compulsory units of study; and

(ii) at least 48 credit points of 2000 and/or 3000 level units of study.

(d) The units of study that may be taken are set out in the Tables of Undergraduate Units of Study for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours single degree.

(e) The units of study that may be taken are set out in the normal program for single degree students in that stream.

(f) Candidates must complete 108 credit points from the Engineering Stream Core Table pertaining to the specialist stream being undertaken, including all required units;

(g) Candidates must complete 36 credit points of core units of study (30 junior credit points and six senior credit points); and

(h) A minimum of 54 credit points of 2000/3000 level units of study.

(6) For the Bachelor of Design in Architecture component of a combined degree:

(a) Candidates must complete 96 credit points of units of study from the Bachelor of Engineering Honours component of the combined degree, including:

(i) 102 credit points of compulsory units of study; and

(ii) 42 credit points of elective units of study, of which a maximum of 36 credit points are taken from Part 1 and a minimum of 6 credit points are taken from Part 2.

(b) The units of study that may be taken are listed in Table I of the Faculty of Engineering.

(c) Candidates completing the Bachelor of Science in the Advanced or the Advanced Mathematics stream must include as part of the above requirements:

(i) a minimum of 24 credit points of intermediate or senior Science units of study, of which at least 36 credit points shall be completed at the Advanced level or as Talented Student Program (TSP) units of study; and

(ii) a minimum of 24 credit points of senior Science units of study from either the Advanced level or as TSP units in a single Science subject area.

(7) For the Bachelor of Arts component of a combined degree:

(a) Candidates must complete 96 credit points of units of study from Table A, including:

(i) a major from Table A

(ii) a minimum of 54 credit points of 2000/3000 level units of study.

(b) The units of study that may be taken are listed in Table I from the Faculty of Science.

(c) Candidates completing the Bachelor of Science in the Advanced or the Advanced Mathematics stream must include as part of the above requirements:

(i) a minimum of 54 credit points of intermediate or senior Science units of study, of which at least 36 credit points shall be completed at the Advanced level or as Talented Student Program (TSP) units of study; and

(ii) a minimum of 24 credit points of senior Science units of study at either the Advanced level or as TSP units in a single Science subject area.

(8) For the Bachelor of Medical Science component of a combined degree:

(a) The units of study that may be taken are listed in Table IV for the Bachelor of Medical Science from the Faculty of Science.

(b) The mathematics requirement for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours component of the combined degree will also satisfy the mathematics requirements for the Bachelor of Medical Science component.

(c) Candidates must complete 96 credit points of units including:

(i) 12 credit points from Chemistry; and

(ii) 48 credit points from intermediate Science units of study, comprising:

(iii) at least 48 credit points of 2000/3000 level units of study.

(d) Candidates must complete the core and elective units of study as set out in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
<th>Minimum Level of Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Study</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Principal Study 1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Harmony and analysis 1-4 and Aural Perception 1-4; or Jazz Music Skills 1-4; or Music Fundamentals 1-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Skills</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>At least 12 credit points from Foundation units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis, history, and culture studies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>At least 12 credit points from Foundation units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
<th>Minimum Level of Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Study</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Principal Study 1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Instrumentation &amp; Orchestration; New Music, New Thinking; or Electroacoustic Music 1 &amp; 2; Composer Performer Workshop 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 credit points Ensemble or 6 credit points Composition Through Improvisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
<th>Minimum Level of Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music Skills</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18 credit points of music theory and aural skills; Creative Music Technology; Sound Recording Fundamentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis, history and culture</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Comp Techniques: Number &amp; Process Comp Techniques, Tonality &amp; Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Study</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6 credit points of Historical Studies; 6 credit points of Ethnographic Studies; 6 credit points in Analytical Studies; 18 credit points in senior Musicology Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Skills</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Harmony and Analysis 1-4 and Aural Perception 1-4; or Jazz Music Skills 1-4; or Music Fundamentals 1-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis, History and Culture</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>At least 24 credit points of Foundation units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) Contemporary Music Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
<th>Minimum Level of Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Study</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Contemporary Music Practice 1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Music Studies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12 credit points in popular music units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Skills</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Music 1, 2, and 3; 18 credit points in Harmony &amp; Analysis, Aural Perception, or Jazz Music Skills units; 6 credit points in Music Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis, History and Culture</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sounds, Screens, Speakers, New Music, New Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Majors and Principal Studies

(1) For the Bachelor of Engineering Honours component of a combined degree:
   (a) The conditions for awarding of a major, and the majors available, are the same as for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours degree.
   (b) Where a candidate wishes to complete a major, and that major requires completion of additional credit points beyond the standard requirements, then such enrolment will be allowed for the first major to be completed, up to 24cp in total, provided the candidate utilises all allowed elective components in satisfying the requirements of the major.

(2) For the Bachelor of Arts component of a combined degree:
   (a) completion of a Table A major is a requirement. The list of Table A majors is specified in the resolutions of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

(3) For the Bachelor of Science component of a combined degree:
   (a) completion of at least one major is a requirement. The list of majors available in the Bachelor of Science is specified in the course resolutions for the Bachelor of Science.

(4) For the Bachelor of Medical Science component of a combined degree:
   (a) If the senior Science units of study completed by a candidate form a Science Table 1 major, the candidate shall have that major recorded on the Bachelor of Medical Science testamur at the completion of the degree.

(5) For the Bachelor of Commerce component of a combined degree:
   (a) completion of a major is a requirement. The majors available and requirements are outlined in the resolutions for the Bachelor of Commerce.

8 Requirements for Honours

(1) Honours is available to candidates and is as defined for the constituent single degrees.

(2) Requirements for awarding of Honours is as defined in the course resolutions for the constituent single degrees.

9 Award of the Degrees

(1) Candidates will be awarded a separate testamur for each degree completed.

(2) The award grades, and the criteria for the grades, are as defined in the resolutions for the constituent degrees.

(3) Candidates who do not meet the requirements for the award of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours but who have otherwise satisfied the requirements of the Bachelor of Engineering shall graduate with the Bachelor of Engineering pass degree.

(4) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Arts (Honours) who do not meet the requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded the Bachelor of Arts pass degree.

(5) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Commerce (Honours) who do not meet the requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded the Bachelor of Commerce pass degree.

(6) The Bachelor of Laws can be awarded in the grades of either Pass or Honours. Honours in the Bachelor of Laws is awarded in First Class or Second Class in accordance with the resolutions of the Bachelor of Laws.

(7) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Medical Science (Honours) who do not meet the requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded the Bachelor of Medical Science pass degree.

(8) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Science (Honours) who do not meet the requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded Bachelor of Science pass degree.

10 Course Transfer

(1) For the Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined with Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Design in Architecture, Bachelor of Project Management, and Bachelor of Medical Science, a candidate may abandon the combined program and elect to complete either the Bachelor of Engineering Honours or the associated combined degree in accordance with the resolutions governing that degree.

(2) For the Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined with Bachelor of Laws, a candidate may withdraw from the combined degree program and elect to transfer to the Bachelor of Engineering, by written application to the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies, and complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions governing that degree at the time of transfer. Candidature in the Bachelor of Laws will cease in these circumstances.
For the Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined with Bachelor of Commerce a candidate may abandon the combined program and elect to complete either the Bachelor of Engineering Honours or the Bachelor of Commerce in accordance with the resolutions governing that degree. Transfer from a combined degree to the Bachelor of Commerce is also conditional on the student having met the entry requirements of the Bachelor of Commerce in force at the time of their enrolment in the combined degree. Completion of the abandoned degree in the future will require a new application for admission to that course and completion in accordance with the resolutions governing that degree.

Progression Rules

(1) General progression rules for the combined degrees are covered by the resolutions of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies.

(2) Candidates in a combined Science program with a stream in either Science (Advanced) or Science (Advanced Mathematics):
   (a) are required to maintain a minimum average mark of 65 in all intermediate and senior units of study in Science subject areas in each year of enrolment. Failure to maintain the required average will result in candidates being transferred to the Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Science without stream in their next year of enrolment with full credit for the units of study completed.
   (b) who fail to achieve an average mark of 65 across all Science units of study attempted in their final year but have otherwise completed all the requirements of the degree will be awarded the Bachelor of Science.

(3) Candidates in a combined law program:
   (a) must successfully complete LAWS1006 Foundations of Law before enrolling in any other Bachelor of Laws units of study;
   (b) who fail to achieve an average mark of 65 across all Science units of study attempted in their final year but have otherwise completed all the requirements of the degree will be awarded the Bachelor of Science.
   (c) except with permission of the Dean of the Faculty of Law, candidates must complete the requirements for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours before proceeding to Year Five of the Bachelor of Laws.

Transitional Provisions

(1) These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature on or after 1 January, 2016.

(2) Students who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2016 may:
   (a) complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions governing their candidature immediately prior to these changes; or
   (b) where approved by the Faculty, elect to proceed under these resolutions provided appropriate programs of study can be identified.

(3) Notwithstanding sub-rule (2), the admission and award requirement for Honours in the Bachelor of Laws will be determined according to the transitional provisions in rule 11 of the Resolutions for the Bachelor of Laws.

Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees
From: Wencong Chai
To: Christine Lacey
Cc: Roseanne Du; Steven Burns
Subject: FW: FEIT - course deletion
Date: Friday, April 29, 2016 11:48:33 AM

HI Christine

My apologies for the delayed response regarding this matter.

Roseanne Du is my admissions manager who managing the Engineering’s admissions. Roseanne confirmed that we do not have outstanding B. Engineering offers and the project was completed at the end of 2014. A further data clean-up was also conducted by admissions system team before March 2015.

I hope this helps and please talk to Roseanne directly if needed.
Regards,
Wen

---

From: Christine Lacey <christine.lacey@sydney.edu.au>
Date: 26 April 2016 at 9:52:22 AM AEST
To: Wencong Chai <wen.chai@sydney.edu.au>, Steven Burns <steven.burns@sydney.edu.au>
Subject: FEIT - course deletion

Dear Wen and Steve,

In 2015 the Faculty of Engineering & IT made a change such that new UG Engineering students enter a Bachelor of Engineering (Honours) instead of a straight Bachelor of Engineering. The BE(Hons) has a new CRICOS code and is essentially a new course. Currently students admitted to the BE(Hons) must meet a certain level of performance during their degree to graduate with BE(Hons) – if they don’t, they are awarded a BE.

A further change is now in progress, in order to meet requirements from Engineers Australia for accreditation, all students admitted to the BE(Hons) will graduate with BE(Hons). We are in the process of preparing a course deletion proposal for the Bachelor of Engineering (the non-Hons version).
As part of the course deletion process, we need to check with Admissions and Recruitment about any potential ramifications and how these might be handled. Would there be any students still with an outstanding offer from 2014, or would these have all been converted to BE(Hons) offers?

Are there any other issues we should consider? Very happy to meet with you if further discussion required.

Best regards,
Christine

**

CHRISTINE LACEY
Team Leader, Curriculum
Faculty of Engineering & Information Technologies

THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY
PNR Building J02 | The University of Sydney | NSW | 2006
University of Sydney
T: +61 2 9114 0678 | F: +61 2 9351 8642
E: christine.lacey@sydney.edu.au | W: http://www.sydney.edu.au/engineering
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RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board:

1. Recommend to the Vice Chancellor the adoption of the Academic Honesty Procedures as set out in Attachment 1;
2. Recommend to the Vice Chancellor the amendment of the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 as set out in Attachment 2;
3. Approve the amendment of the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Policy 2015 as set out in Attachment 3;
4. Recommend to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Research the amendment of the Research Code of Conduct 2013 as set out in Attachment 4;
5. Approve the amendment to the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015 Attachment 5.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This proposal seeks to establish a single set of Academic Honesty Procedures relating to both the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 and the Research Code of Conduct as it applies to students.

New provisions are summarised below. In summary the new Academic Honesty Procedures (Attachment 1):

For Coursework Students: (Part 3)
- move provisions in the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 that are procedural into the Procedures and adjust the policy accordingly;
- require the online Academic Education Online Module (AHEM) to be completed by the census date of the appropriate semester to ensure it is completed prior to assessment tasks being undertaken and spell out the procedures for students who do not take it (result suppression) [Part 3, Section 4:];
- revise and refine procedures for investigation and decision making in the light of experience with the online reporting module (sections 6 – 10);
- insert clause on reducing risk of educational dishonesty in assessments developed by a working party of the Academic Board and previously approved by the Academic Standards and Policy Committee (Section 10 and Schedule one);
- insert section on proof-reading and editing of written work: NOTE: Changes to this section were recommended by the SEG Education Committee on Monday 11 July and a revised version of this will be forwarded separately for consideration.
- clarify that appeals against decisions are appeals to the faculty (3.2 of the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against academic Decisions) Rule 2006: students should not be required to raise concerns with the lecturer (or EIC) in the first instance;

For HDR Students: (Part 4)
- describe inappropriate academic process, academic dishonesty, breach of the Research Code of Conduct (Code Breach) and Research Misconduct as they relate to HDR students;
- specify the process for managing potential breaches identified in the research integrity check at the first year milestone and allegations which arise during candidature;
Non-Confidential

- specify the process for managing potential breaches identified after thesis submission.

Consequential changes to the Academic Honesty Policy are also attached (Attachment 2). The definition of legitimate or reasonable cooperation has been amplified (Academic Honesty in Coursework 9A).

To accommodate the Academic Honesty Procedures for HDR candidates consequential amendments are also recommended to the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Policy 2015 and the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students.

**Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Policy 2015 (Attachment 3)**
- Changes to 9 (3) specifying that reports generated in accordance with the submission check in the Academic Honesty Procedures may be considered when determining the final outcome of the examination.
- Changes to 13 (8) indicating a faculty may decline to examine a thesis on the basis of inappropriate academic practice, a code breach, research misconduct, breach of ethics conditions or breach of the Data Management Policy, Procedures or faculty guidelines.
- Changes to 13 (4) indicating that the intention to submit must include certification of compliance with ethics approval and data management plan.

**Research Code of Conduct 2013 (Attachment 4)**
- Amendment to Section 10 clarifying that students must comply with the Code and with the Academic Honesty Procedures
- Insertion of 28 A, clarifying appeal rights for students for decision taken under the Code.

**Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students 2015. (Attachment 5)**
- Changes to 15 and 16 indicating that inappropriate academic practice, code breach, or research misconduct may be grounds for marginal or unsatisfactory progress.

Process diagrams reflecting the Procedures for HDR candidates agreed by SEG RTC are attached for information (Attachment 6).

**BACKGROUND / CONTEXT**

Part 1 of the report of the Vice Chancellor’s Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce (2015) recommended policy amendments which were carried out in 2015 resulting in the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy (2015). At the time it was noted that some of the provisions of the previous policy were actually procedural. However, the work of transferring them to the Procedures was delayed pending development of a procedures relating to HDR students contained in Part 2 of the report.

A summary of the Taskforce findings is given below.

The recommendations of the Taskforce for HDR students included the following:

- Introduce an integrity check (eg. with similarity detection software) as part of a centralised submission process to be carried out by the Higher Degree by Research administration office (a more detailed outline on how this would work is in section 2.5).
- Set clear and high standards for attribution for higher degree by research students, disallowing any revision of work found to be plagiarised once the thesis has been submitted for examination.
- Require the first milestone during a higher degree by research candidacy to include an integrity check as part of the progress review process.
- Introduce a clear policy obligation for supervisors to refer to the faculty cases of gross or repeated failure to attribute work in thesis drafts or other written products created during the degree candidature. This would be in addition to the obligation to refer any other type of misconduct, including data fabrication and mismanagement or any other potential research misconduct.
• Simplify, draw together into a single set of procedures and make easily available to students and supervisors all policy requirements related to academic dishonesty by higher degree by research students.

Part 4 of the Procedures set out in policy terms the process developed by the SEG RTC working group for integrity checks at the first year milestone and submission. They also set out the procedures to be followed for other issues that may arise during candidature (which are essentially the same as those that may arise during the first year milestone).

CONSULTATION

These Procedures were developed by a working party working in close liaison with the SEG RTC working party which developed the processes for academic integrity and data integrity checks at the first year milestone and at the point of thesis submission. They also give effect to the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015, adopted in December 2015. The changes from SEG RTC are incorporated and the changes from SEG Education will be tabled at the meeting or in a supplementary agenda. Following consideration the standing committees of the Academic Board (ASPC 20 July, Undergraduate and Postgraduate Studies 27 July) and put to the Academic Board on 17 August for approval (of the Policy Changes) and endorsement (of the Procedures). The Procedures will then be adopted by the Policy Owner, the Vice Chancellor.

IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of the Procedures, particularly in relation to changes to Procedures for Coursework Students, new provisions for AHEM, risk management and proof-reading and editing will be managed by communications coordinated by the Office for Educational Integrity in consultation with the Director of Education Strategy and the Director of Graduate Research. In addition, in relationship to new provisions for HDR candidatures, May Robertson and team (Archives and Records Management) are currently consulting with faculties to understand needs within each faculty. Training sessions will be scheduled as required.

Briefing sessions for Associate Deans Research Training and Postgraduate Coordinators may also be of value and will be organised according to need.

COMMUNICATION

The new procedures will be communicated by the Academic Board, by the consultation sessions mentioned above and by further briefing sessions for Associate Deans and Postgraduate Coordinators as required.

ATTACHMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 1</td>
<td>Academic Honesty Procedures 2016 (new)</td>
<td>4 – 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 2</td>
<td>Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 (amended)</td>
<td>34 – 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 3</td>
<td>Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Policy 2014</td>
<td>54 – 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 4</td>
<td>Research Code of Conduct 2013</td>
<td>73 – 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 5</td>
<td>Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015</td>
<td>97 – 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 6</td>
<td>Process diagrams for HDR academic honesty issues during candidature and after submission approved by SEG Research Training Committee</td>
<td>111 – 112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACADEMIC HONESTY PROCEDURES
2016

1 Purpose and application

(1) These procedures are to give effect to the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2014 and the Research Code of Conduct 2013 (jointly, “the policies”).

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

2 Commencement

These procedures commence on [date].

PART 2 - DEFINITIONS

3 Interpretation

Words and phrases used in these procedures and not otherwise defined in this document have the meanings they have in the policies.

Note: see clause 6 of each policy.
academic dishonesty has the meaning given in subclauses 8(1) and 8(2) of the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015. In relation to higher degree by research students, it refers to academically dishonest conduct by such a student undertaking a coursework unit of study.

administrative unit means the central University administrative unit responsible for the processes of candidature management.

Associate Dean means, as appropriate:
- the Associate Dean of a faculty with authority for matters relating to higher degrees by research within the faculty;
- 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 a faculty.

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

code breach has the meaning given in clause 19 of the Research Code of Conduct 2013.

copy editing and proof reading means identifying errors in, and correcting, the presentation of a text so as to conform with standard usage and conventions, including:
- spelling
- quotations
- use of italics
- lists
- word usage
- punctuation
- graphs
- charts
- citations
- references
- heading hierarchies
- symbols and equations
- headers and footers
- style of numbers

collusion means co-operation that is not legitimate co-operation.

course code means a unique alpha-numeric code which identifies a University course.

coursework student means any person enrolled in a unit of study offered by the University, regardless of whether or not they are enrolled in an award course or the nature of that award course. For the
avoidance of doubt, this includes:

- any student enrolled in a coursework award course
- any student, including a higher degree by research student, enrolled in a coursework unit of study
- non-award, exchange or study abroad students enrolled in a coursework unit of study.

means a student enrolled in a coursework award course or a non-award, exchange or study abroad student enrolled in a coursework unit of study.

Note: Higher Degree by Research students enrolled in coursework units of study are bound by the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 as set out in clause 13 of these procedures.

editor

means any person (whether or not accredited by an external organisation) providing paid or unpaid assistance to students in the preparation of writing. This includes University and faculty writing advisers, and any proof-reader.

inappropriate academic practice

means a deviation (whether intentional or negligent) from accepted academic standards of:

- referencing and due acknowledgement of the work others;
- ethics guidelines and ethical practice; or
- data management.

It includes academic dishonesty, code breaches and research misconduct.

relevant decision maker

means a person authorised to make decisions regarding academic honesty in the faculty.

- For coursework matters, this is the Educational Integrity Coordinator or a nominated academic.
- For higher degrees by research, this is the Associate Dean or a postgraduate co-ordinator.

research misconduct

has the meaning given in clause 18 of the Research Code of Conduct 2013.

Review Panel

means a panel established to conduct a progress review in accordance with clause 11 of the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015.

submission check

means a review of a higher degree by research thesis at the point of submission for examination, as required by clause 14 of the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015.

supervisor

means, in relation to a higher degree by research student, any person appointed to discharge the responsibilities set out in clause 14 of the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013. This includes any or all of research supervisors, co-
ordinating supervisors, and auxiliary supervisors.

suppression of academic record means that access to the student’s academic record is denied to the student and to anyone outside the University, in the absence of legal compulsion to provide it. This includes access to results, grades and evidence of awards.

PART 3 – COURSEWORK STUDENTS

4 Education in academic honesty and discipline specific requirements

(1) Faculties must provide education in the academic writing and referencing conventions of their discipline, at an early stage in the first semester each award course offered by the faculty, as required by the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015, and consistently with this clause.

Note: See clause 20 of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

(2)(3) All students commencing a coursework award course after 1 January 2016 must complete an online education module on academic honesty prior to the census date 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 years.

(3) Students commencing a new coursework award course include:

(a) students commencing a new award course;
(b) students transferring award courses within the University or from another institution;
(c) exchange students;
(d) students commencing honours, where honours has a different course code; and
(e) students in a combined degree program where the course 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 be considered to have failed the module in the first semester.

If a student does not successfully complete the module in the subsequent semester of enrolment by the last day of their first semester of enrolment, the student’s academic record will be suppressed until the module is successfully completed:

(a) the student will be considered to have failed the unit in that semester; and
(b) the student’s academic record will be suppressed until the module is successfully completed; and
(c) the student will not be permitted to undertake further assessment tasks until the module is completed.
(5) Results for the academic honesty module will be recorded on a student’s transcript as Satisfied Requirements (SR) or Failed Requirements (FR).

**Note:** See Schedule 1 to the Coursework Policy 2014.

(5) Students who successfully complete the module will have the date of completion recorded on their academic transcript.

(6) Faculties may do either or both of the following:
   
   (a) make successful completion of the module a course requirement in a unit of study or other component;
   
   (b) specify additional consequences of failure to complete the module.

5 Requirements for assessment tasks

(1) Where there is a possibility that ghost-writing or contract cheating (that is, commissioning another person to write all or part of an assessment) might occur, the unit of study co-ordinator must take reasonable steps to eliminate or minimise the opportunity to do so, so that examiners can be reasonably satisfied that the submitted work was written by the student without assistance except for legitimate co-operation. 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 learning outcomes 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 co-ordinator must take appropriate steps to assure its academic integrity, consistently with the policies 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 or in-department examinations contribute to the assessment mark, the unit of study co-ordinator 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.

**Note:** See also Schedule One.
6 Reducing risk of educational dishonesty in assessments

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

(2) Staff should also consider the likelihood of the risk, measured against the contribution of that particular assessment to the overall mark.

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

(4) The process used should include the following steps.

   (a) Unit of study co-ordinators complete a template using the assessment risk and mitigation table and risk assessment matrix set out in Schedules One and Two.

   (b) If an assessment has a risk that is high or very high, the relevant faculty committee may wish to discuss the use of that particular assessment with the unit of study co-ordinators and the implementation of mitigating strategies.

   (c) Relevant faculty 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 to the Academic Board on:

      (i) any issues that have been identified with particular assessments or assessment types;

      (ii) any consequential proposed changes to assessment or assessment types; and

      (iii) any further strategies to mitigate these issues.

7 Proof-reading and editing written work

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

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

(3) Where not otherwise specified in the unit of study outline, editors and proof-readers are permitted in accordance with these procedures.

(4) If permitted, students proposing to use an editor must:

   (a) discuss the use of an editor with the relevant tutor, lecturer or unit of study co-ordinator;

   (b) provide the editor with a copy of these procedures; and
require the editor to abide 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.

(5) 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.

(6) When an editor has been used:
   (a) the name of the editor and a brief description of the service rendered must be printed at the front of the work when it is submitted; 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.

8 Process after preliminary assessment of failure to understand referencing requirements

(1) This clause applies where the relevant decision maker has made a preliminary assessment that alleged conduct is likely to have been caused by a failure fully to understand referencing requirements rather than dishonesty.

Note: See clause 17 of the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015.

(2) If the relevant decision maker’s preliminary view is that the alleged conduct is likely to have been caused by a failure fully to understand referencing requirements rather than dishonesty, they must check the student’s record.

(3) If, after checking the student’s record, the relevant decision maker still considers that the alleged conduct is likely to have been caused by a failure fully to understand referencing requirements and not dishonesty, they must:
   (a) direct the student to attend and successfully 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 with a specified mark penalty;

or

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

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

Note: See the University Recordkeeping Policy and Recordkeeping Manual.

(5) If a student who has been required to attend and successfully complete an additional development course:
   (a) successfully completes the course; and
   (b) satisfactorily resubmits corrected work or undertakes an alternative assessment in accordance with the requirements imposed;

the relevant decision maker must:
   (c) record ‘development course completed’ as the outcome;
   (d) make no formal determination in relation to the allegation; and
   (e) take no further action.

(6) If a student who has been required to attend and successfully complete an additional development course:
   (a) fails to do so; or
   (b) does not satisfactorily resubmit corrected work or undertake an alternative assessment in accordance with the requirements imposed;

the relevant decision maker must:
   (c) require the student to respond to the allegation and follow the process set out in clause 9.

(7) The relevant decision maker must inform the examiner and the unit of study co-ordinator of the outcome of the preliminary assessment process, and record that outcome on the student’s file.

9 Process after preliminary assessment of no failure to understand referencing requirements

(1) This clause applies where the relevant decision maker has made a preliminary assessment that alleged conduct:
   (a) is not likely to have been caused by a failure fully to understand referencing requirements rather than dishonesty; and
   (b) does not require to be referred to either the Registrar or the Director, Research Integrity and Ethics Administration.
Note: See clause 17 of the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015.

(2) The relevant decision maker must provide the student with:
   (a) a clear expression of the allegation in sufficient detail to enable them to understand the precise nature of the allegations and to properly consider and respond to them;
   (b) any supporting material to be used in the determination of the matter;
   (c) the opportunity to respond to the allegation within a specified reasonable time; and
   (d) a copy of these procedures.

(3) Having given due consideration to procedural fairness, the relevant decision maker will determine the time and place for interviews.

(4) The relevant decision maker must inform the student in advance of any staff members who will attend an interview. This will usually include the decision maker and another member of professional staff.

(5) All participants in an interview should attend in person. However, if necessary, interviews may be held by telephone or other telecommunications method.

(6) The relevant decision maker may extend the time for a student to provide written responses to the allegations.

(7) The student is not required to provide written responses and may choose not to do so.

(8) The student may choose not to participate in an interview. However if a student who has been given reasonable notice fails to attend without good reason, the relevant decision maker may determine the matter in the student’s absence.

(9) Once:
   (a) any scheduled interview has been held or the appointed time for interview has passed; and
   (b) the student has responded to the allegations or the deadline to do so has passed;
   then
   (c) the relevant decision maker will make a determination in accordance with clause 18 of the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015.

(10) If the relevant decision maker determines that there is a credible allegation that:
   (a) if proven, would warrant a penalty more serious than failure in the relevant unit of study;
   (b) another person has been engaged to complete or contribute to an assessment instead of the student; or
   (c) the student has accepted such an engagement from another student they must refer the matter to the Registrar for action under the By-Law.

(11) If the relevant decision maker determines that there is a credible allegation that, if proven, would constitute:
   (a) a code breach; or
(b) research misconduct
they must refer the matter to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration for investigation.

10 Consequences - determination of no impropriety
If the relevant decision maker determines 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 co-ordinator;
       and
(b) if the work has not already been assessed, it must be returned to the examiner for assessment on its academic merit.

Note: The decision maker may inform the necessary parties using the online reporting form.

11 Consequences - determination of plagiarism or academic dishonesty
(1) If the relevant decision maker determines that the allegation of plagiarism or academic dishonesty is substantiated, they must inform the following:
(a) the student;
(b) the examiner;
(c) the unit of study co-ordinator; and
(d) if not the decision maker, the Educational Integrity Co-ordinator.

Note: The decision maker may inform the necessary parties using the online reporting form.

(2) If the relevant decision maker determines:
(a) that the work contains plagiarism but not dishonest plagiarism; and
(b) after consulting the student record, 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, an additional development course on academic integrity approved by the Office of Educational Integrity;
(d) inform the unit of study co-ordinator and, if not the decision maker, the Educational Integrity Co-ordinator, 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 with a specified mark penalty;

or

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

(3) The Office of Educational Integrity must record the student’s successful completion of any University-wide additional development course.

Note: See the University Recordkeeping Policy and Recordkeeping Manual.

(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:
   (a) apply one of more of the actions specified in sub-clause 11(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) Subject to subclause 11(7), if the relevant decision maker concludes:
   (a) that the work contains plagiarism which is not of the kind to which subclause 11(2) applies; or
   (b) that the student has engaged in academic dishonesty;

   the decision maker must either refer the matter to the Registrar for action under the By-Law (if appropriate) or take one or more of the following actions:
   (c) 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;
   (d) require the student to undertake other remedial action;
   (e) apply a fail grade, a mark penalty or a mark to the work which reflects its unsatisfactory standard; or
   (f) apply a fail grade or a mark penalty to the unit of study.

(6) In any case where there is a conclusion of academic dishonesty in a substantial assessment item (as determined by the decision maker in their absolute discretion), the penalty should be a mark of zero for the assessment unless there are exceptional mitigating circumstances. The relevant decision maker 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 co-ordinator of any determination made under subclause 11(5), and any penalties, resubmission or other remedial action imposed.

PART 4 – HIGHER DEGREE BY RESEARCH STUDENTS

12 Higher degree by research students undertaking research activities

(1) The obligations of higher degree research students undertaking research activities are set out in the Research Code of Conduct 2013.

(2) Any allegation of code breach, research misconduct, academic dishonesty or other inappropriate academic practice by a higher degree by research student in relation to research activity will be managed according to the Research Code of Conduct 2013 and these procedures.

(3) Conduct that is found not to be research misconduct may still be found to be any or all of:
   - a code breach;
   - inappropriate academic practice; or
   - academic dishonesty; or
   - other misconduct.

13 Higher degree by research students enrolled in coursework units of study

(1) A higher degree by research student enrolled in a coursework unit of study is subject to the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 and Part 3 of these procedures in relation to work undertaken in, or in relation to, that unit of study.

(2) A suspected or alleged breach by such a student of the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 will be managed according to that policy and these procedures.

14 Reporting allegations

(1) Supervisors and Review Panels must report any suspected breach of academic dishonesty, code breach, or research misconduct or other inappropriate academic practice by students whom they supervise or review, using the online reporting form.

(2) Students or staff members who become aware of suspected academic dishonesty or research misconduct by a student must report the allegations, using the online reporting form.

Comment [KH2]: Should the formulation of subclause 2 about what should be reportable mirror that of subclause 1 or is it intended to be more limited?
15 Handling allegations not relating to the examination process

(1) The relevant decision maker must consider all reports and come to a preliminary view as to whether the reported conduct potentially constitutes:
   (a) no impropriety;
   (b) inappropriate academic practice, but without a potential code breach or potential research misconduct;
   (c) a potential code breach; or
   (d) potential research misconduct.

(2) If the relevant decision maker’s preliminary view is that the alleged conduct:
   (a) is potentially research misconduct;
   (b) relates to research work on a project funded by a research grant; or
   (c) relates to research findings that have been published or which are about to be published;
   the decision maker must refer the matter to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration.

(3) If the relevant decision maker’s preliminary view is that the alleged conduct is:
   (a) a potential code breach; but
   (b) not potential research misconduct;
   the decision maker must consult with the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration; and
   (c) refer the matter to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration if requested.

(4) Matters referred to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration will be managed in the manner set out in the Research Code of Conduct.

(5) If the relevant decision maker’s preliminary view is that the alleged conduct is:
   (a) inappropriate academic practice; but
   (b) not a potential code breach; and
   (c) not a potential research misconduct;
   the decision maker must:
   (d) require the student to undertake additional education;
   (e) inform the supervisor through the online reporting form; and
   (f) require the student to make corrections to data, findings, drafts, papers or other research work for appraisal by the supervisor as appropriate.
   and the decision maker may additionally:
(g) require the student to attend an additional progress review in accordance with the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015.

Note: (1) in the event of a decision of inappropriate academic practice but not potential code breach or research misconduct, the supervisor must be informed automatically via the online reporting module, and (2) a decision maker may, additionally, require the student to attend an additional progress review in accordance with the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015. (3) in the case of persistent inappropriate academic practice by a student, the relevant decision maker may treat the matter as a potential code breach.

(6) If the relevant decision maker is satisfied that there is evidence of persistent inappropriate academic practice by a student, they may treat the matter as a potential code breach.

(4)(7) If:

(a) the relevant decision maker’s preliminary view is that the alleged conduct is potentially a code breach or academic dishonesty but not research misconduct; and

(b) the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration has not requested that the case be referred;

the relevant decision maker must deal with the matter in accordance with subclauses (28) – (143) of this clause.

(8) If the relevant decision maker determines that the alleged conduct is a code breach or academic dishonesty and not research misconduct, and the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration has not requested that the case be referred:

(a) the relevant decision maker must proceed to an interview with the student; and

(b) provide the student with:

(i) a clear expression of the allegation in sufficient detail to enable them to understand the precise nature of the allegations and to properly consider and respond to them;

(ii) any supporting material to be used in the determination of the matter;

(iii) the opportunity to respond to the allegation within a reasonable time; and

(iv) a copy of these procedures.

(5)(9) Having given due consideration to procedural fairness, the relevant decision maker will determine the time and place for interviews.

(6)(10) The relevant decision maker must inform the student in advance of any staff members who will attend an interview. This will usually include the decision maker and a member of professional staff.

(7)(11) All participants in the interview should attend in person. However, if necessary, interviews may be held by telephone or other telecommunications method.

(8)(12) The relevant decision maker may extend the time for a student to provide written responses to the allegations.

(9)(13) The student is not required to provide written responses and may choose not to do so.
The student may choose not to participate in an interview. However, if a student who has been given reasonable notice fails to attend without good reason, the relevant decision maker may determine the matter in the student's absence.

Once:
(a) any scheduled interview has been held or the appointed time for interview has passed; and
(b) the student has responded to the allegations or the deadline to do so has passed;
then:
(c) the relevant decision maker will make one of the following available determinations:
   (i) potential research misconduct;
   (ii) code breach;
   (iii) code breach, but not potential research misconduct;
   (iv) inappropriate academic practice, but not a code breach or potential research misconduct;
   (v) other misconduct; or
   (vi) no impropriety.

The relevant decision maker must inform the student and co-ordinating supervisor of the determination and consequent actions in writing.

If the relevant decision maker makes a determination of potential research misconduct, they must refer the case to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration for investigation.

If the relevant decision maker makes a determination of potential code breach but not potential research misconduct they:
(a) must consult with the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration; and
(b) if requested by the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration, refer the case for investigation.

If the relevant decision maker makes a determination of:
(a) potential code breach but not potential research misconduct, which is not requested to be referred to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration; or
(b) inappropriate academic practice but not a potential code breach or potential research misconduct;
they must proceed in the manner specified in subclauses 18(5) (d)-(g).
(c) treat the matter as inappropriate academic practice but not to be a code breach check the student's record; and either:
(d) require the student to undertake additional education; and
(e) require the student to make corrections to data, findings, drafts, papers or other research work as appropriate; and either.
require the student to attend an additional progress review in accordance with the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015; or
require (18)(d), (e) and (f). Note: in the event of a decision of inappropriate academic practice but not potential code breach or research misconduct, the supervisor must be informed automatically via the online reporting tool.

(20) If the relevant decision maker makes a determination of other misconduct, the must refer the matter to the Registrar for investigation under the By-Law.

(16)

(17) refer the matter to the Registrar for investigation under the By-Law;

(18) If:

(a) the relevant decision maker makes a determination of any of:
   (i) potential research misconduct;
   (ii) code breach but not potential research misconduct; or
   (iii) inappropriate academic practice but not a code breach;
   or:
   (b) an allegation of potential research misconduct has previously been made against a student;
   then the relevant decision maker must:
   (c) require the student to attend an additional progress review; and
   (d) inform the coordinating supervisor.

(19) Subject to subclause 15(18), if the relevant decision maker makes a determination of no impropriety no further action will be taken.

16 Handling allegations relating to the examination process

(1) If, after conducting the checks required by the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015, the administrative unit suspects possible inappropriate academic practice, code breach or research misconduct, the administrative unit will use the online reporting form to refer the matter to the relevant decision maker.

(2) Based on the evidence in the reports received from the administrative unit, the relevant decision maker will come to a preliminary view, and determine the required action according to this clause.

(3) If the preliminary view is that there is evidence of potential code breach or research misconduct, the relevant decision maker must refer the matter to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration.

Note: See the Research Code of Conduct 2013.

(4) If the preliminary view is that the apparent deficiencies in the thesis:
   (a) constitute minor inappropriate academic practice that could be satisfactorily addressed by emendations to the thesis; and
(b) could not possibly constitute academic dishonesty, a code breach or research misconduct;

the relevant decision maker must

(c) forward the thesis to examiners for examination; and

(d) lodge a report of any changes or emendations required to address deficiencies in the thesis using the online reporting form.

(5) If the preliminary view is that the apparent deficiencies in the thesis:

(a) constitute inappropriate academic practice that could not be satisfactorily addressed by emendations to the thesis; but

(b) could not constitute academic dishonesty, a code breach or research misconduct;

the relevant decision maker:

(c) must lodge a report of any changes or emendations required to address deficiencies in the thesis using the online reporting form; and

(d) must refer the thesis and report to the relevant faculty committee to consider whether the thesis is suitable to examine in the light of information discovered in the submission check; and

(e) may make a recommendation to the relevant faculty committee that the faculty should decline to examine the thesis.

(6) If the preliminary view is that there is no impropriety in the thesis, the relevant decision maker must:

(a) forward the thesis to examiners for examination; and

(b) lodge a report of their investigation using the online reporting form.

(7) A report of the relevant decision maker’s preliminary findings, including any emendations or changes required to address deficiencies in the thesis, must be:

(a) included on the student’s file; and

(b) forwarded to the committee determining the examination outcome for their consideration.

Note: The committee determining the outcome for the examination will be either the relevant faculty committee or the PhD Awards Sub-Committee of the Academic Board. See the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015 and Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015.

(8) If the relevant faculty committee is asked to consider whether the thesis is suitable to examine on the referral of the relevant decision maker or an investigation managed by the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration, it must do one of the following:

(a) decline to examine the thesis; 

(b) forward the thesis to examiners for examination; or

(c) refer the matter to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration in accordance with clause 21 (1) of the Research Code of Conduct.
(9) A report of the findings of the relevant faculty committee, including any determination of inappropriate academic practice and any emendations or changes required to address deficiencies in the thesis, must be:

(a) lodged using the online reporting form; and
(b) considered by the committee determining the examination outcome for their consideration.

Note: The committee determining the outcome for the examination will be either the relevant faculty committee or the PhD Awards Sub-Committee of the Academic Board. See the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015 and Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015.

(10) Any cases referred to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration will be managed in accordance with the Research Code of Conduct.

(11) Where the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration determines either to:

(a) dismiss a matter; or
(b) refer it back to the faculty as a code breach but not research misconduct, the relevant faculty committee will determine the outcome and any consequent action consistently with this clause.

(12) If the relevant faculty committee declines to examine a thesis, 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.

(13) If the relevant faculty committee declines to examine a thesis, the Dean will decide whether the student will be permitted to re-enrol or required to show good cause.

(14) If, during the examination process, there is a determination of any of:

(a) inappropriate academic practice;
(b) code breach; or
(c) research misconduct
the committee determining the outcome of the examination must consider the reports of those determinations when forming its conclusion.

Note: See the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Procedures 2015.
(15) If the committee determining the outcome of examination is the relevant faculty committee, the committee’s conclusion must be referred to the PhD Awards Subcommittee for review.

(16) All reports by the Associate Dean, postgraduate co-ordinator, relevant faculty committee, or the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration must be forwarded to the PhD Awards Subcommittee.

(17) If the reports of the relevant decision maker or any subsequent decision maker require changes or emendations to address deficiencies in the thesis, these changes or emendations must be included in the emendations or changes required to be addressed under the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Procedures 2015.

(18) If an examiner of a thesis reports allegations of potential code breach or research misconduct, the Office of Educational Integrity relevant faculty committee will refer these matters for consideration, as required by the policies and these procedures.

17 Proof-reading and editing of theses

Students are permitted to use editors or proof-readers in the preparation of their thesis for submission, as provided in the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Policy 2015 and the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Procedures 2015.

18 Rescissions and replacements

This document replaces the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Procedures 2012, which commenced on 1 January 2012, and which are rescinded as from the date of commencement of this document:
<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&lt;br&gt;Randomisation of the question order&lt;br&gt;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.&lt;br&gt;Password protected entry to quiz if electronically accessed.&lt;br&gt;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&lt;br&gt;Don’t use confidential papers if possible&lt;br&gt;Always change at least some 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>Questions from confidential papers memorized and then reproduced</td>
<td>Don’t use confidential papers if possible</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>Assessment Type</td>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Suggested Mitigating Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</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>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>Assessment Type</td>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Suggested Mitigating Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</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>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>Plagiarism of report or reflective diary used to assess placement</td>
<td>Have a mid-way “check” of student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forged signature of external educators on assessment reports or competency documents</td>
<td>Require student to produce ID card to placement site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forgery of signature of external educators on assessment reports or competency documents</td>
<td>Use Turnitin for submitted work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Performances</td>
<td>Identity of who completed report, reflective diary etc associated with placement</td>
<td>Include short interview about placement activities, include preceptor if possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## UoS Assessment Integrity Risk Assessment and Mitigation Strategy

**Unit of Study Code**

**Unit of Study Name**

**Faculty**

**School**

**Co-ordinator Name**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Type</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigating Strategy</th>
<th>% Weighting of assessment</th>
<th>Overall Risk</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>

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

Reasons for not using a particular mitigating strategy:

---
## Schedule Two - Educational Integrity of Assessments Risk Assessment Matrix

### Potential Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning &amp; Teaching Activity</th>
<th>Low weighted assessment e.g. short quiz. Content can be retested in formal exam</th>
<th>Assessment that contributes to a significant proportion of marks (~30%). Content can be retested in formal exam</th>
<th>Major assessment (~50%) but content can be retested in a formal exam or OSCE.</th>
<th>Major assessment e.g. final exam Honours thesis, dissertation, test of essential professional skills. Cannot be further examined.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not Significant</strong></td>
<td><strong>Minor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Moderate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Major</strong></td>
<td><strong>Highly Significant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected to occur regularly</strong></td>
<td><strong>Almost Certain</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td><strong>Very High</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected to occur</strong></td>
<td><strong>Likely</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td><strong>Very High</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderately likely</strong></td>
<td><strong>Possible</strong></td>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not likely to occur</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unlikely</strong></td>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May happen, but not often</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rare</strong></td>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Likelihood

- **Expected to occur regularly**
  - Almost Certain
  - Medium
  - High
  - Very High
  - Very High
  - Very High

- **Expected to occur**
  - Likely
  - Medium
  - High
  - Very High
  - Very High

- **Moderately likely**
  - Possible
  - Low
  - Medium
  - High
  - High
  - Very High

- **Not likely to occur**
  - Unlikely
  - Low
  - Low
  - Medium
  - Medium
  - High

- **May happen, but not often**
  - Rare
  - Low
  - Low
  - Low
  - Low
  - Medium
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PART 1 - PRELIMINARY

1 Name of policy

This is the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015.
2 Commencement
This policy commences on 1 January 2016

3 Policy is binding
Except to the extent that a contrary intention is expressed, this policy binds the University, staff, affiliates and students.

4 Statement of intent
This policy:
(a) states the University’s unequivocal opposition to, and intolerance of, plagiarism and academic dishonesty;
(b) sets out the principles underpinning the University’s approach to plagiarism and academic honesty;
(c) identifies individual responsibilities for promoting the principles of academic honesty; and
(d) provides for a transparent process for handling allegations of plagiarism and academic dishonesty by students enrolled in coursework award courses.

5 Application
(1) This policy applies to:
(a) staff and affiliates;
(b) all students enrolled in a coursework award course or undertaking coursework while enrolled in a research degree; and
(c) non-award students, exchange students and study abroad students in a unit of study at the University.
(2) It is a condition of each student’s admission to candidature that the student complies with this policy.

PART 2 - DEFINITIONS

6 Definitions
In this document:
academic dishonesty has the meaning given in subclauses 8 (1) and 8 (2).
academic integrity has the meaning given in subclause 10 (2).
acknowledgement of the source means identifying, in accordance with the conventions of the discipline, at least:

- the author(s) of the work; and
- the place from which the work or part of the work was sourced.

assessment means evaluation of a student's demonstration of specified learning outcomes, including by written or oral examination, assignments, presentation, and thesis.

By-law means the *University of Sydney By-law 1999* (as amended) or any University Rule or policy which may replace it.

coursework means a program of learning in which the dominant mode of instruction is through a program of classes, lectures, tutorials practical session, online tasks and other modes of instruction that are not supervised research.

coursework award course means a formally approved program of study which can lead to an academic award granted by the University and which is not designated as a research award course. While the program of study in a coursework award course may include a component of original, supervised research, other forms of instruction and learning will generally be dominant. All undergraduate award courses are coursework award courses.

dean means the dean of a faculty or chairperson of a board of studies.

dishonest plagiarism means knowingly presenting another person's ideas, findings or work as one's own by copying or reproducing them without due acknowledgement of the source, with intent to deceive the examiner into believing that the content is original to the student.

Educational Integrity Co-ordinator means the nominated academic to whom the relevant dean has given responsibility for co-ordinating and reporting on allegations of plagiarism and academic dishonesty within the faculty.

examiner means the person responsible for assessing a student's work.

faculty means a faculty or college board, as established in each case by its constitution or, where applicable, a board of studies.

group work has the same meaning as provided in the *Coursework Policy 2014*, which at the date of this policy is:

- a formally established project to be carried out by a number of students working together that results in a single piece of assessment or a number of associated pieces of assessment.

investigation means an investigation conducted by the Registrar under Chapter 8 of the *By-law* or the equivalent provisions of any University Rule or policy which may replace it.
legitimate co-operation means any constructive educational and intellectual practice that aims to facilitate optimal learning outcomes through interaction between students, including:

- researching, writing or presenting joint work;
- discussing general themes and concepts;
- interpreting assessment criteria;
- informal study or discussion groups; and
- strengthening and developing academic writing skills through peer assistance.

Co-operation is not legitimate if it unfairly advantages a student or group of students over others.

nominated academic means an academic staff member responsible for handling plagiarism and academic dishonesty as nominated by the relevant dean, in accordance with the University’s Delegations of Authority.

Office of Educational Integrity means the office established within the portfolio of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) to provide university-wide oversight of academic integrity and the implementation of this policy.

procedures means the Academic Honesty Procedures 2016.

student misconduct means conduct which, if proven, would constitute student misconduct under the By-law.

text-based written assignments means assignments that use prose as the main, or as a significant, method of presenting an answer.

work means any or all of ideas, findings, or written or published material.

PART 3 – ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM

8 Academic dishonesty

(1) For the purpose of this policy, academic dishonesty means 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.

(2) Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to:

(a) recycling – that is, the resubmission for assessment of work that is the same, or substantially the same, as work previously submitted for assessment in the same or in a different unit of study (except in the case of legitimate resubmission with the approval of the examiner);

Note: Work which builds on work previously submitted in the same, or a previous, unit of study will not constitute recycling provided that such resubmission is allowed by the examiner and the previous work and the extent and nature of its use is acknowledged.
(b) dishonest plagiarism;
(c) fabricating data;
(d) engaging another person to complete or contribute to an assessment in place of the student;
(e) submitting work for assessment which has been completed by another person in place of the student or to which the other person has made a contribution, whether for payment or otherwise;
(f) accepting an engagement from another student to complete or contribute to an assessment in the place of that student;
(g) communicating, by any means, with another candidate during an examination;
(h) bringing into an examination forbidden material such as textbooks, notes, calculators or computers;
(i) attempting to read another student’s work during an examination;
(j) writing an examination paper, or consulting with another person about the examination, outside the confines of the examination room without permission;
(k) copying from another student during an examination; and
(l) inappropriately using electronic devices to access information during an examination.

9 Plagiarism

(1) For the purpose of this policy, plagiarism means presenting another person’s work as one’s own work by presenting, copying or reproducing it without appropriate acknowledgement of the source.

(2) Plagiarism includes presenting work for assessment, publication, or otherwise, that includes:
   (a) phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs or longer extracts from published or unpublished work (including from the internet) without appropriate acknowledgement of the source; or
   (b) the work of another person, without appropriate acknowledgement of the source and in a way that exceeds the boundaries of legitimate co-operation.

(3) Presenting work which contains any of the elements in subclause 9 (2) constitutes plagiarism, regardless of the author’s intentions.

(4) Plagiarism is unacceptable in academic work, even where it is not intended to deceive the examiner into believing that the work is original to the student, but instead arises from, for example:
   (a) poor referencing;
   (b) error;
   (c) inability to paraphrase; or
   (d) inhibition about writing in the student’s own words.

(5) Where plagiarism exists but intention to deceive cannot be established, the matter must still be handled in the manner specified in this policy and the procedures.
9A Legitimate co-operation.

(1) Provided that it meets the requirements of this clause, any constructive educational and intellectual practice that aims to facilitate optimal learning outcomes through interaction between students constitutes legitimate co-operation. This includes:

(a) researching, writing or presenting joint work;
(b) discussing general themes and concepts;
(c) interpreting assessment criteria;
(d) informal study or discussion groups; and
(e) strengthening and developing academic writing skills through peer assistance.

(2) Co-operation is not legitimate if it unfairly advantages a student or group of students over others.

(3) Legitimate co-operation is characterised by a process which:

(a) is transparent and open;
(b) is fair, with no unfair advantage to any particular student or group of students working together;
(c) advances student learning; and
(d) results in students submitting work which demonstrates what they know.

PART 4 –ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

10 General principles

(1) The role of the University is to create, preserve, transmit and apply knowledge through teaching, research, creative works and other forms of scholarship. The University is committed to academic excellence and integrity as the cornerstones of scholastic achievement and quality assurance.

(2) The academic integrity of the University and its programs requires:

(a) scrupulous ethical behaviour from individuals;
(b) a collective culture that champions academic honesty fostered by all staff, affiliates and students;
(c) effective education and authentic assessment; and
(d) an effective framework of education, prevention, detection and record keeping that enables the University to monitor and respond to threats to academic integrity.

(3) The University is opposed to, and will not tolerate, plagiarism or academic dishonesty by staff, affiliates or students.

(4) It is the responsibility of all students to:

(a) ensure that they do not commit or collude with another person to commit plagiarism or academic dishonesty; and
(b) comply with this policy and the procedures.
11 Fostering academic integrity

(1) Fostering academic integrity within the University is an essential element of an ethical education and culture.

(2) The University's approach to academic integrity is based on the following strategies.

(a) **Clear expectations.** University policies, procedures and faculty local provisions should clearly document what is expected of students and set out fair processes for dealing with allegations of academic dishonesty.

(b) **Education in academic honesty and discipline specific requirements.** 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.

[Note: See Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016.](hyperlink)

(c) **Support in understanding the importance and value of academic honesty.** Students should be supported in learning the value and importance of academic honesty as a basis for university scholarship and research enriched learning.

(d) **Well-designed assessment which encourages demonstrated academic achievement, including academic integrity.** Assessment should encourage scholarship, creativity and originality in ways consistent with research-enriched learning.

(e) **Effective detection.** Assessment processes should detect plagiarism, correct errors and poor referencing, and deter dishonesty.

(f) **Systematic record keeping** to monitor the University’s goal to maintain a high standard of academic integrity.

(g) **An open culture** in which academic integrity is championed by staff, affiliates and students and in which information is shared appropriately and acted upon.

[Note: See also Privacy Policy 2013 and Privacy Management Plan.]

12 Requirements for assessment tasks

(1) Faculties and unit of study co-ordinators must design the assessment for each award course and each unit of study to eliminate or minimise opportunities for students to gain unfair advantage through plagiarism or academic dishonesty.

(2) Faculties and unit of study co-ordinators must review and renew the assessment for each unit of study each time the unit is offered, including redesigning assessment tasks to prevent on any breaches of academic integrity that may have occurred previously from recurring.

(3) Assessment tasks must not be reused in a way that enables students with knowledge or prior experience of those tasks to gain an unfair advantage for themselves or others.
(4) Examination questions and assignment questions must not be reused except where the unit of study co-ordinator is satisfied that such reuse will not:
(a) jeopardize the academic integrity of the assessment; or
(b) create unfair advantage.

(5) 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 co-ordinator 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.

(6) If a quiz or online assessment contributes significantly to the assessment mark for the unit, the unit of study co-ordinator must take appropriate steps to assure its academic integrity, consistently with this policy and the procedures.

(7) 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 integrity of assessment for the unit may be through consideration of the complete assessment approach.

(8) If class tests and mid-semester examinations contribute to the assessment mark, the unit of study co-ordinator 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 sitting with adjacent students taking different exams;
(b) scrambling multiple choice answers between candidates; or
(c) another appropriate method.

Note: See the procedures for further information.

13 Compliance statements

(1) Students must submit a signed statement of compliance with each piece of work submitted to the University for assessment, presentation or publication.

Note: Signature may be manual or by an electronic submission.

(2) Where students are required to submit frequent assignments, the relevant unit of study co-ordinator may permit a single compliance statement covering an entire unit, or an entire group of assessment tasks, to be used.
14 Detecting plagiarism

(1) The principles of fair and transparent assessment (as set out in the Coursework Policy 2014) dictate that plagiarised work not be given credit.

Note: See Part 14 of the Coursework Policy 2014.

(2) Detecting and identifying plagiarism is fundamentally a judgement made by an examiner who is aware of the responsibilities involved in the task of academic assessment. Web search and similarity detecting software, and other such means, should be regarded only as tools assisting an examiner to make that judgement.

(3) The University has authorised and mandated the use of text-based similarity detecting software for all text-based written assignments. Faculties must inform students of this in introductory courses, unit of study outlines and informational material provided to them.

(4) Similarity detecting software may also be used for work that is not a text-based written assignment if the faculty or unit of study co-ordinator determines that it is of value in ensuring the academic integrity of assignments. Where such software is used, faculties must inform students in introductory courses, unit of study outlines and informational material provided to them.

(5) The unit of study co-ordinator must require all text-based written assignments to be submitted electronically and checked with the applicable similarity detecting software during the assessment process.

(6) For work that is not a text-based written assignment, unit of study co-ordinators must take all reasonable steps to design an assessment matrix that:
   (a) eliminates or minimises the possibility of breaches of academic honesty; and
   (b) as far as possible ensures that:
      (i) the assignment is the student's own original work;
      (ii) the work of others is appropriately acknowledged;
      (iii) the assignment has not been previously submitted; and
      (iv) the input of others does not exceed the bounds of legitimate cooperation.

(7) Where plagiarism is suspected by an examiner, or the possibility of plagiarism is detected by similarity detecting software, the examiner should employ all reasonable means to clarify whether the relevant work contains plagiarism.

(8) Where, as the result of a student’s performance in another assessment task within a unit of study, an examiner forms the reasonable suspicion that an assessment may not be a student’s own unaided work (excepting reasonable co-operation), the examiner must report the matter consistently with this policy and the procedures.

PART 5 – DEALING WITH ALLEGATIONS OF PLAGIARISM OR ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

15 Procedural fairness

(1) The process for enquiring into and determining allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty by coursework students is set out in the procedures.
(2) A faculty may only impose a penalty for plagiarism or academic dishonesty on a coursework student in accordance with this policy and the procedures.

(3) The University is committed to dealing with allegations of academic dishonesty by students in accordance with the principles of procedural fairness, including the rights of students to:

(a) be informed of the allegations against them in sufficient detail to enable them to understand the precise nature of the allegations and properly to consider and respond to them;

(b) have a reasonable period of time within which to respond to the allegations;

(c) have the matter resolved in a timely manner;

(d) be informed of their rights under this policy and these procedures and under the By-law;

(e) invite a support person or student representative to any meeting regarding alleged academic dishonesty;

(f) be treated impartially in any enquiry or investigation process; and

(g) be treated with an absence of bias by the decision-maker.

16 Reporting concerns

An examiner who suspects plagiarism or academic dishonesty by a student must report it to the relevant Educational Integrity Co-ordinator or nominated academic in the manner prescribed in the procedures (if any).

17 Preliminary assessment

(1) Where an Educational Integrity Co-ordinator 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 an Educational Integrity Co-ordinator or nominated academic forms the preliminary view that the alleged conduct:

(a) could not amount to plagiarism or academic dishonesty; and

(b) was not caused by a failure fully to understand referencing requirements rather than dishonesty;

then:

(c) they must record 'no impropriety' as the decision; and

(d) the work must be assessed according to its academic merit without penalty and according to the advertised criteria.

Note: See Part 3 of the Academic Honesty in Coursework Procedures 2016.
If the Academic Integrity Officer’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 17(3), he or she must record ‘no impropriety’ as the decision and take no further steps.

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

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 fully to 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.

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.

If a student satisfactorily completes an additional development course required under 17(4) the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must record ‘development course completed’ as the outcome and take no further steps beyond those in 17(4).

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 this policy.

If the Educational Integrity Co-ordinator or nominated academic form’s the preliminary view is that the alleged conduct:

(a) could amount to plagiarism or academic dishonesty; but

(b) is likely to have been caused by a failure to fully understand referencing requirements;

then

(c) they will deal with the matter refer the student for additional development in the manner prescribed in the procedures.
(4) 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 fully to understand referencing requirements, then the alleged conduct:

(a) is potential impropriety; and

(b) is not likely to have been caused by a failure to understand referencing requirements

then they must determine whether the matter should be:

(c) referred to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Integrity for action under the Research Code of Conduct 2013;

(d) referred to the Registrar for action under the By-Law; or

(e) dealt with by the faculty under this policy and the procedures.

(5) The Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must refer to the Registrar any credible allegation that:

(a) would, if proven, warrant a penalty more serious than failure in the relevant unit of study;

(b) another person has been engaged to complete or contribute to an assessment instead of the student; or

(c) the student has accepted such an engagement from another student.

(6) The Educational Integrity Coordinator must refer to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration any credible allegation that would, if proven constitute:

(a) a breach of the Research Code of Conduct 2013; or

(b) research misconduct.

Note: The Research Code of Conduct 2013 applies to coursework students engaged in research activities as defined in the Code, including research where human or animal ethics approvals have been granted, or as part of an externally funded research project.

(7) The Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must inform the student in writing of any decision to refer an allegation to another decision maker under subclause 17(6).

(9) 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 this 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 an 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.

(10) 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 17(6), the student must be informed of this in writing.
The Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must inform the examiner and the unit of study co-ordinator and the examiner of the outcome of the preliminary consideration process, and record that outcome on the student’s file.

Note: See the University Recordkeeping Policy and Recordkeeping Manual.

18 Determining allegations of plagiarism and academic dishonesty

(1) If the outcome of the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic’s preliminary assessment is that the matter is not one in which the student should be dealt with under subclauses 17(2), 17(3), 17(4)(b) or (c), or 17(7)(a) or 17(7)(b), the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic will:

(1) inform the student in writing of the allegation as formulated;
(2) appoint a time and place for the student to attend an interview, which must be conducted in the manner specified in the procedures; and
(3) provide the student with:
(4) any further information and materials required by the procedures; and
(5) a copy of this policy and the procedures.

(1) Where allegations concern group work, the steps required by this policy must be undertaken separately in relation to each student involved. In particular:
(a) separate allegations must be formulated for each student;
(b) separate notifications must be provided to each student;
(c) each student must be the subject of separate consideration;
(d) students must not be interviewed together; and
(e) a determination made about one student must not be taken into consideration when determining allegations against another.

(2) The decision maker must be the Educational Integrity Co-ordinator or a nominated academic, and may be, but need not be, the same person who formed a the preliminary view of the case as set out in 17(1).

(3) The decision maker must consider:
(a) the allegation as formulated;
(b) any supporting material (copies of which must be provided to the student); and
(c) any submissions made by or on behalf of the student.

19 Available determinations

(1) The decision maker must determine whether the student has engaged in:
(a) no impropriety;
(b) plagiarism; or
(c) academic dishonesty.

(2) The consequences of each determination are as specified in the Academic Honesty Procedures 2015.
If a student who has been given reasonable notice does not attend an interview without good reason, the decision maker may determine the matter in the student’s absence.

20 Conclusion of no impropriety

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 co-ordinator;

and

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

21 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;
(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, an additional development course on academic integrity approved by the Office of Educational Integrity;
(d) inform the unit of study co-ordinator 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 or more of the penalties specified in subclauses 20(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 co-ordinator.

(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 co-ordinator of the results obtained from any resubmission or other remedial action imposed.

220 Appeals

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

(2) Such an appeal:

(a) is an appeal to the faculty, as set out in section 3.2 of the University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006; and.
PART 6  RESPONSIBILITIES

23 Responsibilities

(1) Demonstrating and embedding academic integrity is the responsibility of all members of the University community.

(2) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) through the Office of Educational Integrity is responsible for:
(a) overseeing the maintenance of academic integrity in all courses across the University;
(b) co-ordinating the work of faculties, Educational Integrity Co-ordinators and other decision makers to ensure consistency of practice and standards in education, detection and penalties;
(c) developing and regularly updating one or more online academic integrity modules to be taken by all students in the early stages of the first semester of the award course in which they are enrolled;
(d) maintaining University-wide systems and practices for prevention, detection and recordkeeping in relation to the maintenance of academic integrity;
(e) making development courses available to all students in the University which:
   (i) build on education provided by faculties and any online modules; and
   (ii) provide additional education where problems are detected in student work that fall short of academic dishonesty.
(f) reporting to the relevant Educational Integrity Co-ordinator the results of any student required to undertake further development courses under this policy;
(g) providing information from the centralised record-keeping system about allegations and findings of plagiarism and academic dishonesty to the Educational Integrity Co-ordinators for reporting to faculties and the Academic Board.

(3) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) is responsible for:
(a) conducting investigations under the By-law; and
(b) making arrangements for University-administered examinations that eliminate or minimise the possibility of breaches of academic honesty.

(4) The Academic Board is responsible for:
(a) monitoring academic integrity throughout the University;
(b) scrutinising annual reports from faculties on breaches of academic integrity in coursework and research award courses; and
(c) making recommendations to faculties, the Vice-Chancellor and Deputy Vice-Chancellors.

(5) Faculties are responsible for:
(a) monitoring and overseeing the implementation of this policy and the procedures within the faculty;
(b) promoting good practice for all units of study and award courses which they administer;

(c) responding to requests information from the Deputy Vice-Chancellors, the Office of Educational Integrity and the Academic Board;

(d) providing to all students, during the early stages of the first year of all undergraduate and postgraduate award courses, formal education (including tutorial exercises and scaffolded writing tasks) about:
   (i) principles and practices of academic integrity;
   (ii) appropriate acknowledgement;
   (iii) paraphrasing;
   (iv) developing effective written communication; and
   (v) avoiding plagiarism and academic dishonesty.

(e) establishing and maintaining processes to require and monitor that all students successfully complete any online academic integrity modules endorsed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) through the Office of Educational Integrity;

(f) monitoring and overseeing unit of study co-ordinators’ development and review of assessment requirements within each unit of study to provide academic integrity processes within the faculty that are consistent, aligned and effective;

(g) reporting annually to the Academic Board on steps taken to support academic integrity within the faculty, based on reports of breaches provided by the Office of Educational Integrity from the centralised record-keeping system.

(6) Deans are responsible for:

(a) developing and supporting academic integrity within their faculty;

(b) monitoring and overseeing the implementation of this policy and the procedures within their faculty;

(c) appointing an Educational Integrity Co-ordinator within their faculty;

(d) assigning appropriate duties to professional staff to implement this policy; and

(e) appointing, as deemed appropriate, one or more additional nominated academics as decision makers in appropriate cases.

(7) Educational Integrity Co-ordinators are responsible for:

(a) monitoring and reporting on instances of plagiarism and academic dishonesty within their faculties consistently with this policy and the procedures;

(b) maintaining consistent decision making and high standards of academic integrity within their faculty, in line with guidelines from the Office of Educational Integrity;

(c) complying with the requirements of this policy and the procedures; and

(d) presenting a report, based on information from the Office of Educational Integrity, on all allegations of plagiarism and academic dishonesty each year to the faculty board and to the Academic Board as required by this policy.

(8) Nominated Academics are responsible for
(a) working with the Educational Integrity Co-ordinator to maintain consistent decision making and high standards of academic integrity within their faculty, in line with guidelines from the Office of Educational Integrity; and
(b) complying with the requirements of this policy and the procedures.

(9) **Unit of study co-ordinators** are responsible for:
(a) developing and supporting the academic integrity of assessment within the units of study for which they are responsible;
(b) designing and reviewing the assessment matrix of a unit of study each time it is offered to:
   (i) embed academic integrity; and
   (ii) eliminate or minimise opportunities for plagiarism or academic dishonesty, in light of any breaches of academic integrity that occurred when the unit was previously offered.
(c) providing unit of study outlines, or sites on the University’s Learning Management System, for each unit of study which:
   (i) give clear information about the University’s policies and procedures on plagiarism and academic dishonesty; and
   (ii) where appropriate, provide discipline or subject specific examples;
(d) reporting instances of suspected plagiarism and academic dishonesty; and
(e) implementing the requirements for assessment specified in this policy and the procedures, including the use of similarity detection software.

(10) **Teachers, including examiners**, are responsible for:
(a) educating students about academic integrity consistently with the plans of faculties and unit of study co-ordinators;
(b) advising students on academic integrity;
(c) maintaining academic integrity in all activities relating to learning and assessment;
(d) distinguishing original from plagiarised work; and
(e) reporting breaches of academic integrity consistently with this policy.

(11) **Students** are responsible for ensuring academic integrity in all learning and work completed by them.
(a) Students undertaking group work who become aware of plagiarism or other academic dishonesty in their group’s work should make all reasonable attempts either:
   (i) ensure the work is correctly referenced prior to submission; or
   (ii) report the plagiarism or academic dishonesty to the unit of study co-ordinator.
(b) Failure to do so may amount to collusion in unacceptable conduct.
PART 7 – ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

24 Reporting to the faculty and the Academic Board

(1) Each Educational Integrity Co-ordinator must provide an annual report to the Faculty Board and other appropriate committees containing:

(a) the number of allegations of plagiarism and academic dishonesty received by the faculty during the previous year organised according to:

(i) enrolment type (part time/full time);
(ii) International or domestic status;
(iii) gender;
(iv) award course; and
(v) year of award course;

(b) a de-identified summary table of the outcomes of the allegations following investigation.

(2) In March each year, faculties must report information specified in subclause 24 (1) to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee of the Academic Board, along with a commentary on any further steps taken by the faculty to promote compliance with this policy and to ensure the academic integrity of its programs.

25 Rescissions and replacements

This document replaces the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy 2012 which is rescinded as from the date of commencement of this document.
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1 **Name of policy**
This is the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015.

2 **Commencement**
This policy commences on 1 January 2015.

3 **Policy is binding**
Except to the extent that a contrary intention is expressed, this policy binds the University, staff, students and affiliates.

4 **Statement of intent**
This policy:
(a) describes the nature of the thesis for a higher degree by research; and
(b) prescribes the requirements for the examination of a higher degree by research.

5 **Application**
(1) This policy applies to the thesis for, and examination of, all higher degrees by research, including:
(a) masters degrees by research;
(b) the Doctor of Philosophy; and
(c) doctorates by research other than the Doctor of Philosophy.
(2) This policy does not apply to higher doctorates as defined in section 5 of the *University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011*.

6 **Definitions and interpretation**
(1) In this policy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AQF</td>
<td>means the Australian Qualifications Framework (see <a href="http://www.aqf.edu.au/">http://www.aqf.edu.au/</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrative unit</td>
<td>means the central University administrative unit responsible for the processes of candidature management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Associate Dean** means the Associate Dean of a faculty with authority for matters relating to higher degrees by research within the faculty, or the Deputy Chairperson of a Board of Studies, or a person appointed by the Dean to have authority for matters relating to higher degrees by research within the faculty.

**cotutelle agreement** means an agreement between the University and another university or institution that permits joint candidature in the Doctor of Philosophy consistently with the Cotutelle Scheme Policy.

**course resolutions** means resolutions made by the Academic Board in accordance with sections 2.1 and 3.1 of the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011.

**Dean** means the Dean of a faculty or the chairperson of a board of studies.

**department** means the academic unit or disciplinary grouping (however named) within a faculty primarily responsible for the teaching and examining of higher degree by research students. If a faculty does not have an internal departmental structure, a reference to a department is a reference to the faculty.

**doctorate by research** includes the PhD and all faculty doctorates and has the meaning provided in the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (as amended) which at the date of this policy is:

- a degree with the word ‘Doctor’ in the title comprising a minimum of two-thirds research that is approved by the Academic Board.

**Note:** The Academic Board will not approve a Doctorate by research unless it complies with the Australian Qualifications Framework at AQF level 10.

**examination** means the examination of a thesis as the basis for the award of a higher degree by research.

**examiner** means a person appointed to examine a higher degree by research thesis. An examiner may be an internal or an external examiner.

**external examiner** means a suitably qualified person who is neither an employee or an honorary title holder (as defined by the Honorary Titles Policy 2013) of the University. Persons who have previously been employed by the University, and who have not been involved in the candidature, may be approved as external examiners.

**faculty** means the faculty in which the student is enrolled.

**faculty committee** means the committee that is responsible for the examination of a higher degree by research student for the faculty in which the student is enrolled. This may be a faculty, divisional or other relevant committee or board.
head of department has the meaning provided in the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 which at the date of this policy is:

the head of the relevant department or discipline.

Note: see also “department”

internal examiner means a suitably qualified person who is an employee or honorary title holder (as defined by the Honorary Titles Policy 2013) of the University.

joint award means an agreement between the University and another university or institution pursuant to an agreement that permits such awards.

Note: See also Cotutelle Scheme Policy

masters degree by research has the meaning provided in the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 which at the date of this policy is:

a degree with the word ‘Master’ in the title comprising a minimum of two thirds research that is approved by the Academic Board.

Note: The Academic Board will not approve a masters degree by research unless it complies with the Australian Qualifications Framework at AQF Level 9.

outcome means the outcome of an examination for a higher degree by research as defined in clause 23 of this policy.

PhD Award Sub-Committee means the PhD Award Sub-Committee of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board.

Note: The terms of reference of these committees are available from the Graduate Studies Committee website.

plagiarism has the meaning provided in the Academic Dishonesty-Honesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy 2012 which at the date of this policy is:

presenting another person’s work as one’s own work by presenting, copying or reproducing it without appropriate acknowledgement of the source. Plagiarism is a form of academic dishonesty.

postgraduate co-ordinator means the member of academic staff within a department with responsibility for matters relating to higher degrees by research.

student has the meaning provided in the University of Sydney By-law 1999 (as amended) which at the date of this policy is:

a person who is currently admitted to candidature in an award course at the University.
submission check means a review of a higher degree by research thesis undertaken at the point of submission by the central University administrative unit responsible for the processes of candidature management, as specified in clause [   ].

Note: See also Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Procedures 2015 and Academic Honesty Procedures 2016.

supervisor has the meaning provided for co-ordinating supervisor in the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013 which at the date of this policy is:

the research supervisor in a supervisory team who has designated academic delegations and responsibility for administrative requirements.

thesis means the whole of the assessable work submitted for examination. This may include previously published material, creative or artistic components, software, codes, models, and appendices.

(2) Subject to the requirements of the applicable faculty constitution, an action to be undertaken by a faculty pursuant to this policy may be undertaken by a staff member, academic or professional, to whom the Dean has allocated responsibility for the relevant activity.

7 Roles of thesis and examination

(1) The thesis is the complete body of assessable work submitted by a student for examination for a higher degree by research.

(2) The examination of the thesis is the basis for the award of a higher degree by research (subject to the completion of coursework where required by degree resolutions).

Note: Some masters degrees by research and doctorates may include coursework requirements.

(3) The examination determines whether a higher degree by research is awarded or not awarded.

(4) Subject to Section 6 of the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research Rule) 2011, a candidate for a higher degree by research will not be permitted to undertake a program of advanced study and research that is likely to result in the lodgement in the University Library of a thesis that cannot be made available for public use.

8 The thesis

(1) The thesis must:

(a) be the student’s own work;

(b) embody the results of the work undertaken by the student during candidature;

(c) form a substantially original contribution to the area of knowledge concerned;
(d) afford evidence of originality by the:
   (i) discovery of new knowledge; and
   (ii) exercise of independent critical ability;
(e) form a cohesive and unified whole;
(f) include a substantial amount of material that may be suitable for publication;
(g) satisfactorily demonstrate that the student is able to identify, access, organise and communicate new and established knowledge;
(h) be written to a standard generally acceptable to the discipline; and
(i) be written in English except where permitted under the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research Rule) 2011.

(2) The thesis must document, generally in the preface, or in the notes, or elsewhere as appropriate:
   (a) the animal and human ethics approval obtained;
   (b) the sources from which the information in the thesis is derived;
   (c) the nature of collaborations, or assistance, with the work described in the thesis, including:
      (i) any assistance provided during the research phase; and
      (ii) any editorial assistance in the writing of the thesis.
   Note: In relation to editorial assistance see clause 3 of the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015.

(3) The thesis must contain a written component generally in the form of one or more critical hypotheses that investigate the subject of the thesis in the relevant body of knowledge.

(4) The thesis may contain:
   (a) artistic or creative works, software, computer code, or models which must be documented or recorded in a way sufficient for the purpose of assessment;
   (b) material that has been published during candidature with the student as either sole or joint author, provided that the supervisor or corresponding author submits evidence identifying the student’s contribution to the published material;
   (c) appendices.

(5) The role of an appendix is to provide a place for the inclusion of supplementary material that is related to the research but not directly relevant to the argument of the thesis.
   (a) Material in appendices is assessable except where written entirely by authors other than the candidate.
   (b) Appendices may include:
      (i) data sets; or
      (ii) software code; or
      (iii) examples of surveys or instruments used to gather research data; or
      (iv) handbooks and manuals; or
      (v) publications arising from the research but not directly relevant to the arguments included in the thesis; or
(vi) documentary recordings of exhibitions or installations mounted during the candidature but not part of the thesis; or
(vii) archival and primary texts; or
(viii) other material as deemed necessary by the student and supervisor.

(6) The required length of the thesis depends on the degree for which it is submitted.

(a) For doctoral degrees:
   (i) the total upper limit is 80,000 words which may be exceeded by no more than 20,000 words with the written permission of the Dean, Associate Dean, or the Chair of the faculty committee;
   (ii) subject to clause 8(6)(a)(i), a shorter required length may be specified by course resolutions, or in the case of the PhD, by local provisions;
   (iii) this word limit does not include appendices.

(b) For masters degrees by research:
   (i) The total upper limit is 50,000 words which may be exceeded by no more than 10,000 words with the written permission of the Dean, Associate Dean, or the Chair of the faculty committee.
   (ii) Subject to Clause 8(6)(b)(i), a shorter required length may be specified in course resolutions.
   (iii) The word limit does not include appendices.

9 The examination generally

(1) The examination is an assessment of the total thesis presented.
(2) The examination process proceeds on the basis that:
   (a) the thesis consists of advanced research which makes an original contribution to knowledge; and
   (b) the awarded thesis will be lodged in the University library in electronic format.

Note: See also University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 and Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures.

(3) The result of the examination is an academic decision based on a body of evidence which includes:

   (a) mandatory items:
      (i) the thesis;
      (ii) examiners’ reports specified in clause 21 of this policy;
      (iii) a recommendation from the relevant head of department, which is based on the examiners’ reports;
      (iv) where applicable, any reports of investigations of inappropriate academic practice, research misconduct or a breach of the Research Code of Conduct under the Academic Honesty Procedures 2016 or its related policies.

Note: See Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 and Research Code of Conduct 2013.
10 Oral examinations

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

   Note: See also clauses 15 – 16 of the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015.

(2) Oral examinations will only be undertaken if approved by the head of department.

(3) Oral examinations may be conducted:
   (a) as an integral part of the whole examination process; or
   (b) as an in-person consultation with the student at the conclusion of the standard examination.

(4) The purpose of an oral examination is to:
   (a) reduce the potential length of the examination process;
   (b) fit the convention of the discipline;
   (c) test the student’s understanding of the knowledge described within the thesis;
   (d) clarify points of principle or detail within the thesis; or
   (e) assess the contribution made by the student to the content and presentation of the thesis.

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

11 Examination of cotutelle and joint award degrees

(1) For joint degrees, including cotutelle degrees, the examination processes to be used must be specified in the individual student agreement at the beginning of the candidature.

(2) The examination of such degrees must be conducted:
   (a) by the University, in accordance with this policy; or
   (b) by the partner institution, consistently with the terms of the applicable individual student agreement.

(3) If the examination is to be conducted by the partner institution:
   (a) the proposed examination process must be approved before the agreement is executed, by one of:
(i) the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board; 
or
(ii) the PhD Award Sub-Committee of the Graduate Studies Committee of
the Academic Board; and

(b) the relevant individual student agreement should require consistency with
the following clauses of this policy:
(i) the qualifications of examiners (clause 15)
(ii) the examiners’ reports (clause 21); and
(iii) the outcome of the award (clause 23).

Note: See also Cotutelle Scheme Policy and clause 18 of the Thesis and Examination of
Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015.

12 Thesis with publications

(1) The University will accept for examination a thesis which contains previously
published material provided that:

(a) the thesis makes an original and substantial contribution to the field of
knowledge;
(b) the thesis forms a consistent, coherent and unified whole;
(c) the previously published material relates to research undertaken during the
 candidature and was published during the candidature; and
(d) in addition to the published material, the student provides, at the minimum:
   (i) an introduction which argues for the aim(s) of the thesis and
       contextualises the research problems it purports to address; and
   (ii) a conclusion which draws together the findings of the studies in the
        context of the stated aims of the thesis.

(2) The student may also provide other separate chapters to supplement the published
papers such as a literature review, background information, or description of the
methodology used.

(3) Acceptable publications (including material already published, accepted for
publication, or submitted for publication) include:

(a) papers in a refereed journal;
(b) book chapters;
(c) conference papers;
(d) a documentary record of an exhibition or installation mounted during
    candidature which is not part of the creative or artistic component of a thesis.

(4) A blog is not an acceptable publication.

(5) A collection of disparate publications, no matter what their quality, must not be
approved for the award of a higher degree by research if they do not meet the
criteria for the award.

(6) A thesis containing published material must be examined using the same criteria,
and by the same process, as one which does not.

13 Form of thesis for examination
(1) The student must submit their thesis for examination as an electronic document.
   (a) A thesis in paper format may be accepted in addition to the electronic document, with the prior approval of the head of the administrative unit.
   (b) If an examiner expresses a preference for examining a paper copy of the thesis, then this must be supplied by the administrative unit.
   (c) The administrative unit must apply similarity detecting software to all theses submitted for examination.

(2) The following information must appear on the title page:
   (a) the full title of the thesis;
   (b) the student’s name;
   (c) the words “A thesis submitted in fulfilment [or “partial fulfilment”, if determined by the degree resolutions] of the requirements for the degree of [degree name, e.g. Doctor of Philosophy]”;
   (d) the faculty in which the student is enrolled;
   (e) the name of the University of Sydney.

(3) If a thesis includes an artistic or creative component such as an exhibition, performance, model, software or data, a documentary record of this component of sufficient quality for assessment must be included as part of the submitted thesis.

(4) The thesis must be accompanied by an abstract in the format prescribed by the Academic Board. Some faculties may require the abstract in advance of submission of the thesis for examination.

   Note: See the Library and Sydney eScholarship Repository Final Thesis Lodgement Guidelines for Students for information about the prescribed format. See also clause 23 of the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures.

(5) Students must submit a statement with the thesis certifying their understanding that, if their candidature is successful, their thesis will be lodged with the Director of University Libraries and made available for immediate use.

   Note: See also University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 for requirements for lodging theses.

(6) The thesis must be accompanied by a statement from the supervisor stating whether, in the supervisor’s opinion, the thesis:
   (a) is sufficiently well presented to be examined; and
   (b) does not exceed the prescribed word limit or any extended word limit for which prior approval has been granted.

(7) If a thesis is submitted for examination without the supervisor’s statement, the faculty committee will decide whether it will be accepted for examination.

(8) The faculty committee may decline to examine a thesis if:
   (a) the supervisor does not certify that it is ready for examination;
   (b) it exceeds the prescribed word limits without prior approval to do so;
   (c) suitable examiners, as determined by the faculty committee, cannot be found;
   (d) the student requests withdrawal from the examination and the faculty committee determines there is good reason to do so;
   (e) the student has not successfully completed required research training activities, including any required units of study; or.
(f) there is a finding of inappropriate academic practice, or research misconduct or a breach of the Research Code of Conduct 2013.

Note: See Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015; Research Code of Conduct 2013 and Academic Honesty Procedures 2016.

The faculty may decline to examine a thesis that is:

(g) it is not compliant with ethics approvals; or

(h) it breaches any of:
   (i) the Research Data Management Policy 2014;
   (ii) the Research Data Management Procedures 2015; or
   (iii) any applicable faculty local provisions relating to research data management.

(f)

(9) When a faculty committee declines to examine a thesis, they 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) asked to show good cause why they should be permitted to re-enrol.
   (d) The Dean will decide whether the student will be permitted to re-enrol or required to show good cause.

Note: The show good cause process is specified in the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011.

14 Notice of intention to submit

(1) The student must provide written notice of their intention to submit a thesis for examination prior to the final submission date.

Note: See the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011.

(2) Notice should be given at least three months prior to the intended submission date to allow sufficient time for:
   (a) the appointment of examiners; and
   (b) the organisation of other examination requirements such as oral examinations, exhibitions or performances.

(3) The notice of intention to submit must include certification by the student that they have complied with:
   (a) any ethics approvals given; and
(b) their data management plan and report to their supervisor.


(3)(4) The supervisor, head of department, or postgraduate coordinator should discuss with the student:

(a) the possibility of an oral examination; and
(b) the selection of possible examiners, noting that students:
   (i) may advise the supervisor, in writing, of the names of individuals that they consider appropriate to be appointed as examiners; and
   (ii) may advise the supervisor, in writing, of the names of individuals that they would prefer not to be appointed as examiners; and
   (iii) are not permitted to communicate with examiners regarding the examination during the examination.

15 Qualifications of examiners

(1) Nominated examiners must be approved:
   (a) for doctoral degrees, by the PhD Award Sub-Committee;
   (b) for masters degrees, by research by the faculty committee.

(2) Examiners should be active in research or scholarship. A research active examiner is understood to be someone who pursues research on an ongoing basis, as a major focus of their academic activity.

(3) Examiners should have the following qualifications appropriate to the discipline, and as determined by the faculty committee:
   (a) a qualification equivalent to the level being examined; or
   (b) equivalent professional or research experience.

(4) Examiners should have experience of, or be familiar with, the supervision and examination of research theses for the University or other local and international educational institutions, as determined by the faculty committee.

(5) The faculty should take all reasonable steps to ensure that examiners are:
   (a) free from bias for or against the student or the supervisor; and
   (b) free from actual, potential or perceived conflicts of interests.

(6) A person must not be an examiner if they:
   (a) have been involved in the student’s research;
   (b) are a co-author on any part of the work;
   (c) have a past or current close personal relationship with the student or supervisor;
   (d) have had substantial contact with the student or supervisor in any other circumstances which might jeopardise the independence, or the perceived independence, of the examination;
   (e) have been a research student of the supervisor within the last ten years; or
(f) have supervised the student at any time.

Note: See also External Interests Policy 2010

(7) Subject to this clause 15, a person from another institution, who has held the role of supervisor for other higher degree by research students at the University of Sydney, may be appointed as an external examiner.

(8) Former research students of the supervisor must not be appointed as examiners for at least ten years after graduation, except with the specific approval of the PhD Award Sub-Committee and in exceptional circumstances.

16 Approving examiners

(1) The supervisor must make recommendations regarding the appointment of examiners to the faculty committee, as follows:

(a) for a doctorate by research, a minimum three examiners; and
(b) for a masters degrees by research, a minimum of two examiners.

(2) The supervisor should inform the faculty committee of any preferences regarding examiners received from the student.

(3) Each group of examiners approved to examine a thesis should include:

(a) no more than one from any given university or institution; and
(b) at least one examiner affiliated with a university or degree granting institution; and
(c) no more than one internal examiner.

(4) The supervisor may recommend one or more additional individuals who are qualified to examine to be held in reserve and commissioned, consistently with clause 17 of this policy, as required.

(5) Once the faculty committee has received recommendations from the supervisor regarding the examiners it may consult with the supervisor or head of department as required.

(6) The faculty committee may:

(a) proceed with the nomination of examiners as recommended; or
(b) nominate different examiners after consultation with the supervisor or head of department.

(7) The supervisor and the faculty committee should ensure that examiners are nominated at least four weeks before the submission of the thesis.

(8) If the student does not submit the thesis for examination within three months following the approval of examiners, the faculty must:

(a) request a revised submission date from the student and the supervisor; and
(b) write to each examiner:

(i) to inform them of the delay; and
(ii) ask if they are still willing to conduct the examination of the thesis at a future date.

17 Commissioning of examiners
Once approved examiners must be commissioned by the faculty in the manner provided in the *Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015*.

**Note:** See Clause 6 of those procedures.

At least the minimum number of approved examiners for the degree must be commissioned.

Approved examiners who are not initially commissioned may be used at a later stage as replacement or additional examiners.

At the time of commissioning, the faculty must ensure that examiners are informed that:

(a) the contents of the thesis, including any intellectual property rights contained in the thesis, remain strictly confidential;

(b) the thesis can only be used for the purposes of performing the examination;

(c) their names may be released to the student during or after the examination; and

(d) their reports may be released to the student during or after the examination.

**Note:** Students have the right to access information about themselves, including their examinations. See the *Privacy Policy 2013* and the *Privacy Management Plan*.

### 18 Approving and commissioning of additional examiners

Additional approved examiners may be commissioned to examine a thesis if:

(a) an original examiner is unable to examine subsequent to appointment; or

(b) an original examiner does not complete their examination within the required time frame

**Note:** see clause 20 below

or

(c) as required by the faculty committee or the PhD Award Sub-Committee.

An internal examiner may only replace an original internal examiner.

Any additional examiners must be approved consistently with clause 16 of this policy. This may include examiners approved, but not commissioned, at the time of submission.

### 19 Appointing examiner-as-assessor

Where the faculty committee or the PhD Award Sub-Committee is unable to form an intention regarding the award, the faculty committee may appoint an examiner-as-assessor to examine the thesis and act as an assessor of the original examiners’ reports.

Previous approval as an examiner is not sufficient to act as examiner-as-assessor.

Examiners appointed as assessors must:

(a) be an external appointment;

(b) have the qualifications required in Clause 15 of the policy;

(c) possess very high standing in the subject of the thesis; and
(d) be approved by the PhD Award Sub-Committee.

20 Replacing examiners

(1) Replacement examiners must be appointed when:
   (a) a report has not been received from an original examiner within ten weeks of
       the twelve weeks of the receipt of the thesis; or
   (b) an examiner is unable to examine subsequent to appointment.

(2) The faculty committee must:
   (a) inform the original examiner that their services are no longer required; and
   (b) commission a previously approved examiner; or
   (c) approve a new examiner in accordance with clause 16 of this policy.

(3) Once commissioned, the new examiner must examine the thesis consistently with
    clause 9 of this policy.

(4) If the original examiner returns a report after the replacement examiner has been
    sent a copy of the thesis, the original examiner’s report will not form part of the
    body of evidence used to determine the award of the degree.

21 Examiners reports

(1) Within six weeks of the receipt of the thesis, each examiner must:
   (a) complete the examination; and
   (b) submit a report to the faculty.

(2) Each examiner must submit an independent report, which will remain confidential
    until:
   (a) all reports have been received; or
   (b) the Dean or Associate Dean considers that special circumstances exist
       which warrant its earlier release.

(3) Examiner’s reports must be in English, except where the language of the thesis is
    in a language other than English.

   Note: See the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research Rule) 2011.
   (a) If the thesis is in a language other than English, the preferred language of
       the examiner’s report is English, but the examiner’s report may be provided
       in the same language as the thesis.
   (b) An examiner who provides a report in a language other than English must
       also submit a summary of their report in English. This summary must be
       sufficient for:
          (i) the faculty committee and the PhD Award Sub-Committee to review
              the examination as necessary; and
          (ii) reviewers to understand the key aspects of the report.

(4) Examiners’ reports must
   (a) state whether, in the opinion of the examiner, the thesis fulfils the criteria in
       clause 8 of this policy; and
include any other material required by the *Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures*.

### 22 Communication during examination process

#### (1) Between examiners

(a) The names of examiners must not be disclosed to other examiners until a determination has been made about the awarding of the degree, except if required:

(i) by the use of an oral examination; or

(ii) during the examination of a creative or artistic component of a thesis.

(b) Examiners must not correspond or communicate with other examiners regarding the examination or the thesis, except in discussion:

(i) at an oral examination; or

(ii) at the examination of a creative or artistic component of a thesis.

#### (2) Between examiners and students

(a) The names of examiners may be disclosed to students, on request, after the thesis has been submitted for examination.

(b) Students, or persons acting on their behalf, must not communicate with the examiners regarding their thesis or examination during the examination process (i.e. from submission to award of degree).

(c) If a student, or a person acting on their behalf, communicates with an examiner during the examination process:

(i) the examination must be discontinued; and

(ii) a new examination process must commence with newly commissioned examiners.

*Note:* Breaches of the *Code of Conduct for Students* may result in disciplinary action.

#### (3) Between the University and examiners

(a) University staff, including academic and professional staff, may contact examiners:

(i) to arrange for an oral examination or the examination of a creative or artistic component of a thesis; or

(ii) to ascertain if progress of the report is delayed.

(b) If University staff, including academic and professional staff, communicate with an examiner they should not make any comment which could be seen as influencing, or having the potential to influence, the examination outcome.

(c) The faculty will inform the examiners of the outcome of the examination at the conclusion of the examination.

#### (4) Between the faculty and the student

(a) Students may be provided with status updates on the examination process, at the stages specified in the *Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015*.

*Note:* See clause 15 of those procedures.
(b) The faculty should provide the student with the names of the examiners at the conclusion of the examination process.

(c) The faculty must also contact any student who is required to:
   (i) comment on the examination; or
   (ii) fulfil conditions related to the outcome of the examination.

23 **Outcome of the examination**

(1) The outcome of the examination will be decided:
   (a) for masters degrees by research, by the relevant faculty committee.
   (b) for doctorate by research degrees, by the PhD Award Sub-Committee or by the relevant faculty committee.

(2) The outcome of the examination must be one of the following:
   (a) Award without qualification: the degree can be awarded without any further action by the student.
   (b) Award with minor corrections: the degree can be awarded once minor corrections to the thesis have been addressed by the student to the satisfaction of the head of department.
   (c) Award with emendations: the degree can be awarded once all required emendations to the thesis have been addressed by the student to the satisfaction of the head of department.
   (d) Non-award - revision and re-examination: the degree is not awarded; and the option is provided for the student to revise and resubmit the thesis for a new examination subject to the following:
      (i) the revision and re-examination process must be conducted consistently with the *Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015*, and
      Note: See clause 14 of those procedures.
      (ii) no further opportunity to revise and resubmit the whole thesis may be permitted.
   (e) Non-award - option to award another degree: the thesis is not considered satisfactory for the award of the degree for which it was submitted, but another degree for which the student is eligible may be awarded instead.
   (f) Non-award: the thesis is unsatisfactory for the award of the degree for which it was submitted and for any other another degree for which the student is eligible, and does not demonstrate sufficient ability to achieve this standard through resubmission.

(3) The student and supervisor will be notified when the decision has been made.

(4) When the decision to award the degree has been made, the faculty may certify that the student is eligible to graduate subject to the student:
   (a) fulfilling any conditions of award to the satisfaction of the head of department; and
   (b) lodging a final copy of the thesis in the University Library.

24 **Rescissions and replacements**
This document replaces the following, which are rescinded as from the date of commencement of this document:

(1) Postgraduate: Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
(2) Higher degree theses policy
(3) Oral examinations of PhD Theses at the University of Sydney
(4) PhD: Appointment of Additional Examiner as Assessor
(5) PhD: Submission of Doctor of Philosophy Theses containing published work
(6) Proof reading and editing of theses and dissertations
(7) Submission of treatise containing published work
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1 Name of policy

This is the Research Code of Conduct 2013.

2 Commencement

This policy commences on 27 May 2013.

3 Policy is binding

Except to the extent that a contrary intention is expressed, this policy binds the University, staff, students and affiliates.

4 Statement of intent

This policy:

(a) states the University’s commitment to responsible research practice;
(b) describes good research practice;
(c) promotes integrity in research;
(d) explains the University’s expectations of researchers; and
(e) sets out the process for dealing with allegations of research misconduct and code breaches.

5 Application

This policy applies to the University, staff, students and affiliates.

6 Definitions

affiliate has meaning given in the Code of Conduct – Staff and Affiliates which at the date of this policy is:

clinical title holders; adjunct, conjoint and honorary appointees; consultants and contractors to the University; holders of offices in University entities, members of Boards of University Foundations, members of University Committees; and any other persons appointed or engaged by the University to perform duties or functions on its behalf

animal means any live, non-human vertebrate, i.e. fish, amphibia, reptiles, birds and mammals, encompassing domestic mammals, purpose-bred animals, livestock, wildlife and also cephalopods such as octopus and squid.

clinical trial means a form of human research designed to find out the effects of an intervention, including a treatment or diagnostic procedure. A
clinical trial can involve testing a drug, a surgical procedure, other therapeutic procedures and devices, a preventive procedure, or a diagnostic device or procedure.

code breach has the meaning given in clause 19 of this policy.

designated person means the person designated by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) under clause 23 of this policy to conduct an initial inquiry into an allegation.

DVC(R) means Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research).

Enterprise Agreement means the University of Sydney Enterprise Agreement 2013-2017 or any replacement agreement.

intellectual property has the meaning given to it in the University of Sydney (Intellectual Property) Rule 2002 (as amended). As at the date of this policy, that is:

includes rights (including, without limitation, rights of registration or application for registration) relating to:

- literary (including computer programs), artistic, musical and scientific works;
- multimedia subject matter;
- performances of performing artists, phonograms and broadcasts;
- inventions in all fields of human endeavour;
- scientific discoveries;
- industrial designs;
- trade secrets and confidential information;
- trademarks, service marks and commercial names and designations;
- plant varieties; and
- circuit layouts;

but does not include any moral right.

peer review means impartial and independent assessment of research by others working in the same or a related field.

plagiarism means presenting another's work as one's own work by presenting, copying or reproducing it without appropriate acknowledgement of the source.

research means investigation undertaken to gain or advance knowledge, understanding and insight. It does not include routine testing and routine analysis of materials, components and processes or the development of teaching materials or similar work.

research trainee includes research students and inexperienced researchers.

researcher means any staff member, student or affiliate engaged in research.

research misconduct has the meaning given in clause 18 of this policy.

research means an investigation conducted in accordance with clause 27 of
misconduct investigation means all activities conducted with the aim of acquiring, developing or demonstrating knowledge or techniques in all areas of science including teaching (at primary, secondary, tertiary and post-graduate levels).

PART 1 – PROPER CONDUCT OF RESEARCH

7 Principles of responsible research

(1) Responsible research is characterised by:
   (a) honesty and integrity;
   (b) respect for human research participants, animals and the environment;
   (c) good stewardship of public resources used to conduct research;
   (d) appropriate acknowledgement of the role of others in research, and
   (e) responsible communication of research results.

(2) The University acknowledges its responsibility to:
   (a) promote the responsible conduct of research;
   (b) establish good governance and management practices;
   (c) provide appropriate training;
   (d) promote mentoring and effective supervision of researchers and research trainees; and
   (e) ensure a safe research environment.

8 General responsibilities of researchers

(1) Researchers must foster and maintain high standards of responsible research.
   This includes:
   (a) respecting truth;
   (b) respecting the rights of those affected by their research;
   (c) appropriately referencing and attributing the work of others;
   (d) managing conflicts of interests appropriately, so that ethical and scholarly considerations are not compromised;
   (e) adopting methods appropriate for achieving the aims of each research proposal;
   (f) following proper practices for safety and security;
(g) citing awards, degrees conferred and research publications accurately, including the status of any publication such as “under review” or “in press”;
(h) using and managing resources responsibly;
(i) promoting compliance with this policy and any other applicable laws, regulations, and codes; and
(j) compliance with the terms of contracts relating to the research.

(2) Researchers should report research findings responsibly.

Note: See also the following:
- Public Comment Policy
- Charter of Academic Freedom (2008)
- Research Agreements Policy (2011)

(3) Researchers must respect research participants.

(a) Human research is conducted with or about people, or their data or tissue. Human participation in research is therefore to be understood broadly, to include the involvement of human beings through:

(i) taking part in surveys, interviews or focus groups;
(ii) undergoing psychological, physiological or medical testing or treatment;
(iii) being observed by researchers;
(iv) researchers having access to their personal information or other materials, including information in existing sources or databases (published or unpublished); or
(v) the collection and use of their body organs, tissues or fluids (e.g. skin, blood, urine, saliva, hair, bones, tumour and other biopsy specimens or their exhaled breath).

(b) It is the researchers’ responsibility to inform themselves about the requirements for conducting such research in their chosen field, including all laws, regulations and codes applicable to human subjects of research.

(c) Written approvals from appropriate ethics committees, safety and other regulatory bodies must be obtained when required. In particular, ethics approval is required for any research within the scope of the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research.

Note: As at the date of this policy, this can be found at http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/_files_nhmrc/publications/attachments/e72_national_statement_may_2015_150514_a.pdf. Information and assistance with procedures for compliance can be found on the Research Support – Human Ethics website.

(4) Researchers must respect animals used in research.

(a) Researchers must comply with all applicable laws, regulations and codes.

Note: See also the following which at the date of this policy can be found at the listed URL’s:
(b) Ethics approval is required for all work involving animals for scientific purposes, including field trials, environmental studies, research, diagnosis, teaching, product testing and the production of biological products.

(5) Researchers should respect the environment, and conduct their research so as to minimise adverse effects on the wider community and the environment.

(6) Researchers should report research misconduct, and do so in a timely manner.

Note: See also the following:
- Code of Conduct-Staff and Affiliates
- Code of Conduct for Students
- External Interests Policy 2010
- Reporting Wrongdoing Policy 2012
- University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006
- Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015
- Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy
- Academic Honesty Procedures 2016

(7) Researchers should encourage appropriate consumer and community involvement in research.

Note: See also the following, which at the date of this policy can be found at the listed URL:
- Statement on Consumer and Community Participation in Health and Medical Research

Researchers have special responsibilities towards Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

(a) Research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples spans many methodologies and disciplines. There are wide variations in the ways in which Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander individuals, communities or groups are involved in, or affected by, research.

Note: Researchers should refer to the following, which at the date of this policy can be found at the listed URLs:
- Guidelines for Ethical Research in Australian Indigenous Studies (Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, 2012)
- Values and Ethics: Guidelines for Ethical Conduct in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Research (NHMRC 2003)
- Keeping Research on Track: A Guide for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples About Health Research Ethics (NHMRC 2006)

(8) Other groups for whom researchers have special responsibilities

In addition to the responsibilities in clauses 8(1) to 8(8), researchers also have special responsibilities in research in respect of:

(a) women who are pregnant and the human foetus;
(b) children and young people;
(c) people in dependent or unequal relationships;
(d) people highly dependent on medical care who may be unable to give consent;
(e) people with a cognitive impairment, an intellectual disability or a mental illness; and
(f) people who may be involved in illegal activities.

9 Recordkeeping and management of research data and primary materials

(1) Responsible conduct of research includes the proper management and retention of research data, and proper recordkeeping.

Note: The University’s recordkeeping requirements are set out in the University Recordkeeping Policy and University Recordkeeping Manual.

(a) In particular, it is important to ensure that sufficient data and materials (including primary research materials such as laboratory notebooks) are retained to justify the outcomes of research, and if necessary to defend them against challenge.

Note: See clause 9(6) for applicable time limits.

(b) It is also important that data and materials are retained in circumstances where the research would be difficult or impossible to repeat.

(2) The researcher is ultimately responsible for arranging the appropriate retention of data and primary materials, consistently with legislative, University policy and contractual obligations. If necessary, researchers should consult with the University’s Archives and Records Management Service for advice about the appropriate length and manner of retention.

(3) It is not possible to apply a uniform definition of research data across all disciplines. It is therefore the responsibility of each discipline to define research data and primary materials in a manner appropriate to the discipline.

(4) It is the responsibility of research teams and individuals undertaking research to familiarise themselves with the relevant definitions prior to undertaking research.

(5) Faculties must develop local provisions which address, for each discipline for which the faculty is responsible, and consistently with the requirements of legislation and University policy:

(a) the applicable definition of research data;
(b) appropriate methods for managing research data and primary materials;
(c) the applicable time periods for retention of data or materials of particular kinds;
(d) managing data and records when a researcher leaves the University;
(e) the records necessary for the proper management of research projects, including appropriate creation, control and storage processes; and
(f) what original materials are to be retained.

Note: The University of Sydney (Policies Development and Review) Rule 2011 defines the University’s policy framework and the role of local provisions.
(6) Local provisions for research data management must comply with the following minimum retention periods, calculated from the later of the date of completion or date of publication of the research:

(a) the following must be retained permanently:
   (i) data of international significance;
   (ii) data of projects of major national significance; and
   (iii) data relating to areas such as gene therapy (e.g. patient records);

(b) data relating to research subjects who were children at the time it was collected must be retained for the longer of 20 years or until the subject(s) reaches the age of 25;

(c) where de-identified personal information is used, the original participants’ consents must be retained separately for the longer of 20 years or, for any participant who was a child at the time the information was collected, until the participant reaches the age of 25;

(d) data with long term human or environmental effects must be retained for at least 20 years;

(e) data that relates to any patent applications must be retained for the life of the patent (generally 20 years);

(f) data from clinical trials must be retained for a minimum of 15 years or otherwise in accordance with the applicable requirements of the Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA), or Department of Health and Ageing;

(g) other research data must be retained for at least 5 years.

Note: This sub-clause applies to student generated data collected for research purposes, but does not apply to student generated data collected only for assessment purposes.

(7) If the results from research are challenged or are subject to a dispute (including litigation), all relevant data and materials must be retained for at least 6 months after notification by the University that an investigation or dispute has been finalised, regardless of the expiration of any otherwise applicable retention periods.

(a) In particular, research records that may be relevant to allegations of research misconduct must not be destroyed until such allegations have been determined, including any appeals.

(8) Research data, primary materials and records must be collected, stored and secured in compliance with the University Recordkeeping Policy, University Recordkeeping Manual, Privacy Policy 2013 and Privacy Management Plan. In particular:

(a) clear and accurate records must be kept of the research methods and data sources, including approvals granted and consent forms signed, during and after the research process;

(b) a catalogue of the research data must be maintained in an accessible form;

(c) where participants have signed consent forms for the use and disclosure of their personal information, the forms must be retained with the participant information statements for as long as the data are kept;
(d) personal information collected and used for research must be kept secure from unauthorised access for the relevant retention period and then destroyed securely;

(e) where external service providers are used, the contract must include adequate safeguards for the security of the data and records and for notification of any breaches of their security;

(f) email communications to research participants must not disclose the email addresses of participants to others (for example by placing addresses in the “CC” field rather than in the “BCC” field of an email form);

(g) particular care should be taken to prevent loss of portable storage devices such as laptops or USB drives; and

(h) any personal information arising from the research regarding participants or researchers involved must be collected, stored, used and disclosed in accordance with relevant privacy laws.

(9) Research teams and individuals undertaking cross-disciplinary or collaborative research must discuss and resolve the applicable method for retaining and storing research data before commencing their joint research.

(10) Unless otherwise specifically agreed, research data and primary materials relating to joint research will be retained by the lead researcher, faculty, institute or organisation, which will also be responsible for its appropriate storage and disposal.

Note: See also the Privacy Policy 2013.

(11) Research data should be made available for use by other researchers unless this is prevented by the requirements of University policy or other ethical, privacy or confidentiality considerations.

(12) Researchers given access to confidential material (including personal information) must:

(a) establish and record the conditions governing the confidentiality, including the circumstances in which it may be accessed;

(b) maintain that confidentiality by:

(i) clearly identifying all data or information which is confidential;

(ii) storing such material securely;

(iii) recording details of who has access and why; and

(iv) disposing of it securely at the appropriate time.

(c) use or disclose the information only in ways agreed with those who provided it.

10 Supervision of research trainees

Students undertaking research and research trainees must comply with this code in all of their research activities.
The University recognises its responsibility to ensure that students undertaking research and research trainees work in an appropriate intellectual and academic environment and receive appropriate training and supervision.

The University's approach to research supervision is set out comprehensively in its Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013.

The University's approach to academic honesty in higher degree by research students is set out in the Academic Honesty Procedures 2016.

11 Publication and dissemination of research findings

This clause applies to all forms of dissemination, including for example:

(a) academic journals or books;
(b) non-refereed publications such as web pages;
(c) other media such as exhibitions or films; and
(d) professional or institutional repositories.

Researchers have a responsibility to their colleagues and the wider community to disseminate a full account of their research as broadly as possible.

(a) Publication activities must take account of any restrictions relating to intellectual property, confidentiality, privacy or culturally sensitive data.
(b) Researchers must, where feasible, also provide research participants with an appropriate summary of the research results.

Note: See for example the Statement on Consumer and Community Participation in Health and Medical Research at Appendix 3:

Researchers must take all reasonable steps to ensure that their findings are accurate and properly reported. If they become aware of misleading or inaccurate statements about their work, they must correct the record as soon as possible.

Researchers must cite other relevant work appropriately when disseminating research findings. The University regards plagiarism very seriously, and staff and students must take responsibility for ensuring that their work includes accurate and complete references to the work of others.

Note: See also the following:
Enterprise Agreement
Code of Conduct - Staff and Affiliates
Code of Conduct for Students
Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015

It is unacceptable to include the same research findings in several publications, except where clearly explained and accompanied by appropriate referencing. An author who submits substantially similar work to more than one publisher, or who submits work similar to work already published, must disclose this at the time of submission.

A publication must include information on all sources of financial and in-kind support for the research and any potential conflicts of interest. Researchers must
also comply with the requirements of the University's "External Interests Policy 2010."

(7) Researchers must register clinical trials with the Australian New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry (http://www.anzctr.org.au) to promote access to information about all clinical trials.

(8) Third parties who fund or support research sometimes seek to delay or otherwise restrict the release of research results. The University’s position on such requests is set out in detail in the "Research Agreements Policy 2011."

(9) The chief investigator or lead researcher must ensure that all parties to the research are made aware of:

(a) the nature and scope of any applicable confidentiality agreements; and
(b) any contractual arrangements which restrict, delay or limit publication.

(10) The University will provide researchers with communications resources and support in order to assist them to communicate research findings through the media.

(11) If the confidentiality requirements of a third party who funds research prevent or delay peer review of research until after delivery to the third party, the researcher must:

(a) explain to the third party at the outset that the requirements will prevent peer review before delivery of the work to the sponsor; and
(b) inform the third party at the time of delivery of the research results that they have not been subject to peer review.

12 Authorship

(1) This clause states the fundamental principles of the University’s approach to academic authorship. It is neither possible nor desirable to prescribe in a central policy detailed authorship requirements for application to every discipline.

(2) Faculties should develop local provisions and guidelines which address the authorship requirements of the disciplines for which the faculty is responsible. Where more than one faculty is responsible for a discipline, the relevant faculties should jointly develop appropriate local provisions and guidelines.

Note: It is the responsibility of research teams and individuals conducting research to familiarise themselves with the local provisions and guidelines relevant to their discipline prior to conducting research.

(3) The University acknowledges the importance of disseminating research outcomes. The provisions of this clause apply to all forms of publication, including web-based publications, conference publications, presentations, media such as exhibitions or films, as well as professional and institutional repositories.

(4) To be named as an author, a researcher must have made a substantial intellectual contribution to the published work in one or more of:

(a) conception and design of the project;
(b) analysis and interpretation of research data or of the eligibility or suitability of potential subjects of research;
(c) drafting significant parts of the work or critically revising it so as to contribute to the interpretation.

**Note:** Authorship requirements vary according to discipline, journal requirements and funding provisions; they may be more stringent in some cases. International best practice guidelines may also apply (e.g. ICMJE: Authorship and Contributorship). Researchers should seek advice when planning publication.

(5) The following are not relevant considerations for the purposes of attribution of authorship:

(a) the position or profession of a proposed author;
(b) the existence of a personal relationship between the author(s) and a proposed author;
(c) whether or not a contribution was paid or voluntary;
(d) the provision of materials or equipment;
(e) the provision of access to study participants or data;
(f) the provision of routine assistance in some aspect of the project;
(g) the provision of, or assistance with acquisition of, funding for the project;
(h) general supervision of the research team; or
(i) having made the measurements on which the publication is based, without other intellectual input to the project or publication.

(6) A person who qualifies as an author must not be included or excluded as an author without their permission, which should be recorded in writing where possible.

(7) If an author is deceased, or cannot be contacted, publication may proceed provided that there are no grounds to believe that the person would have objected to inclusion as an author.

(8) Where a work has several authors, one should be appointed as executive or corresponding author to record authorship and to manage communication about the work with the publisher.

(9) Where an editor of a significant collective work or anthology has responsibilities analogous to those listed above for authorship, the criteria set out in this paragraph should be applied as far as possible to the role of editor.

(10) Researchers should:

(a) adhere to the authorship requirements of this policy, and follow guidelines issued by any applicable funding body or journal publisher;
(b) when working in collaboration with others, agree on authorship of a publication at an early stage and review their decisions periodically; and
(c) offer authorship to all people, including research trainees, who meet the criteria for authorship listed in sub-clause 12(5).

(11) Contributions other than authorship must be properly acknowledged. Such contributors may include, for example, research assistants and technical writers.

(12) The department of the executive or corresponding author should retain any written acknowledgements of authorship received in relation to a project, preferably in the form of an original document with hand-written signature.
13 Peer review

(1) The University encourages participation in peer review processes, because they:
   (a) provide expert scrutiny of a project;
   (b) help to maintain high standards;
   (c) encourage accurate, thorough and credible research reporting; and
   (d) may draw attention to deviations from this and other applicable policies and
       requirements.

(2) Researchers in receipt of public funding have a responsibility to participate in peer
    review.

(3) Participants in peer review must:
   (a) be fair and timely in their review;
   (b) respect confidentiality, and in particular, not disclose the content or outcome
       of any process in which they are involved;
   (c) ensure that they are informed about, and comply with, the criteria to be
       applied;
   (d) declare all conflicts of interests and give proper consideration to whether
       they should take part in the review; and
   (e) give proper consideration to research that challenges or changes accepted
       ways of thinking.

Note: See also External Interests Policy 2010

(4) Participants in peer review must not:
   (a) introduce considerations that are not relevant to the review criteria;
   (b) take undue or calculated advantage of knowledge obtained during the peer
       review process;
   (c) agree to participate in peer review outside their area of expertise; or
   (d) permit personal prejudice to influence the peer review process.

(5) Researchers whose work is undergoing peer review must not seek to influence the
    process or outcomes.

(6) Supervising researchers have a responsibility to assist trainee researchers in
    developing the necessary skills for peer review and understanding their obligation
    to participate.

14 Conflicts of interests

(1) A conflict of interests will exist when there is a divergence between the duties or
    interests of a person and their professional responsibilities, including but not limited
    to their duties to the University.

(2) The University's expectations in relation to the declaration and management of
    conflicts of interests are set out in the External Interests Policy 2010.
(3) Conflicts of interests in the research area are common and it is imperative that they are disclosed and dealt with properly. An individual researcher should expect to be conflicted from time to time, and be ready to acknowledge, disclose and manage the conflict as appropriate.

(4) The University's expectations in relation to approval and management of outside earnings activities by academics, which are additional to the requirements of the External Interests Policy 2010, are set out in the Outside Earnings of Academic Staff Policy 2011.

(5) Researchers must:
   (a) familiarise themselves, and comply, with the requirements of the External Interests Policy 2010;
   (b) maintain records of activities or interests that may lead to conflicts;
   (c) when invited to join a committee or equivalent, review current activities and interests for actual and apparent conflicts, and bring possible conflicts to the attention of those running the process; and
   (d) disclose any actual or apparent conflict of interests as soon as it becomes apparent.

(6) Conflict management plans relating to research matters should provide for a person with a conflict of interest to take no part in decision making processes affected by that conflict of interest. This includes presence in the room, even if silent, while the matter is debated and decided.

15 Collaborative research

(1) Research can involve a wide range of collaborations, within the University, with other institutions including commercial organisations, domestically and internationally. The University requires that the principles set out in this clause be adhered to in all such collaborations, unless departure from them is specifically approved by the DVC(R).

(2) Each research collaboration evidenced by a written agreement must be consistent with the Research Agreements Policy 2011.

(3) A research collaboration agreement must address each of the following matters:
   (a) ownership of and dealing with intellectual property;
   (b) confidentiality;
   (c) responsibility for ethics and safety clearances;
   (d) reporting requirements;
   (e) protocols for dissemination of research outcomes; and
   (f) management of primary research materials and research data, including the nomination of a person from each collaborating party as responsible for this.

Note: See also University of Sydney (Intellectual Property) Rule 2002 (as amended).

(4) Researchers involved in a collaborative research project must familiarise themselves, and comply, with the written agreement governing the collaboration and all policies and agreements affecting the project.
16 Notification of research subject to specific statutes and other restrictions

(1) The chief investigator or lead researcher of any project must notify the Office of Research Integrity in writing when there is a known breach of any law relating to the conduct of that research, including but not limited to breach of any of the following:

(a) Human Tissue Act 1983 (NSW);
(b) Research Involving Human Embryos Act 2003 (NSW);
(c) Animal Research Act 1985 (NSW).
(d) Therapeutic Goods Act 1989 (Cth).


(2) Stem cell research is restricted in certain University premises. Researchers should seek advice from the relevant Head of School before conducting such research on University premises.

PART 2 – RESEARCH MISCONDUCT AND CODE BREACHES

17 Research misconduct generally

(1) In addition to the University’s other policies for dealing with allegations of misconduct against staff, students or affiliates, there are special matters to be taken into consideration if the allegation is one of research misconduct.

(2) The University considers research misconduct by a staff member to be misconduct or serious misconduct (as defined in the Enterprise Agreement) and a breach of the Code of Conduct – Staff and Affiliates.

(3) The University considers research misconduct by a student to be misconduct as defined in the University of Sydney By-Law 1999 (NSW) (as amended) and a breach of the Code of Conduct for Students.

(4) The University considers research misconduct by an affiliate to be a breach of the Code of Conduct – Staff and Affiliates.

(5) Allegations of research misconduct should be made honestly and reasonably.

18 Definition of research misconduct

(1) A complaint or allegation relates to research misconduct if it involves all of the following:

(a) an alleged breach of this policy;
(b) intent and deliberation, recklessness or gross and persistent negligence; and
(c) serious consequences, such as false information on the public record, or adverse effects on research participants, animals or the environment.

(2) Research misconduct includes any of the following on the part of any researcher:

(a) fabrication, falsification, or deception in proposing, carrying out or reporting the results of research;

(b) plagiarism in proposing, carrying out or reporting the results of research;

(c) failure to declare or manage a serious conflict of interests;

(d) avoidable failure to follow research proposals as approved by a research ethics committee, particularly where this failure may result in unreasonable risk to humans, animals or the environment or breach of privacy;

(e) wilful concealment or facilitation of research misconduct by others;

(f) misleading ascription of authorship;

(g) intentionally and without authorisation taking, sequestering or materially damaging any research-related property of another;

(h) deliberately conducting research without required human ethics committee approval;

(i) conducting research involving animals without required animal ethics committee approval;

(j) risking the safety of human participants or the wellbeing of animals or the environment; and

(k) deviations from this policy which occur through gross or persistent negligence.

(3) Repeated or continuing breaches of this policy may also constitute research misconduct, and will do so where these have been the subject of previous counselling or specific direction.

(4) Research misconduct does not include honest differences in judgement, and may not include honest errors that are minor or unintentional.

Note: See clause 19.

19 Definition of code breach

(1) A code breach involves conduct which deviates from the requirements of this policy or any other code of conduct applicable to the relevant research, but which does not meet the definition of research misconduct.

(2) Repetition or continuation of code breaches may constitute research misconduct.

20 Roles and responsibilities

(1) The Director of Research Integrity heads the Research Integrity team within the Research portfolio and is responsible for receiving complaints of possible research misconduct or other code breaches.

(a) The Director of Research Integrity may refer a complaint for an initial inquiry or dismiss it on the basis that it lacks substance.
Following receipt of a complaint or information about possible research misconduct or other code breaches, the Director of Research Integrity may take interim action to protect human safety, animal welfare, external funds or material that may be relevant to any investigation.

Note: See clauses 21 to 23.

(2) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research):

(a) receives reports of initial inquiries conducted under clause 23 of this policy and then determines whether to commission an investigation or take other (or no further) action; and

(b) receives reports from investigators under clause 27 of this policy, determines what (if any) further action is required and informs relevant parties.

Note: See clauses 23 to 27.

(3) The Associate Deans (Research) will appoint one or more staff as Research Integrity Advisers for each division.

(4) Research Integrity Advisers will be appointed at the divisional level to provide advice to staff on issues relating to research practice and possible research misconduct or other code breaches. They:

(a) must be familiar with this policy and other relevant policies, procedures and codes of conduct for research;

(b) should explain the options open to a person considering making, or having made, an allegation, including:

(i) referring the allegation directly to the person against whom it is made;

(ii) not proceeding with, or withdrawing, the allegation if discussion resolves the concerns;

(iii) referring the allegation to a person in a supervisory capacity for resolution at the local or departmental level; or

(iv) making a written allegation to the Director of Research Integrity under clause 21 of this policy.

(5) Staff, students and affiliates are encouraged to raise any concerns they may have about the conduct of research with a relevant Research Integrity Adviser, Head of Department, Supervisor or Chair of the relevant Faculty Research Committee prior to making an allegation.

21 Receipt of allegations of research misconduct or code breaches

(1) 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.

(2) Allegations of code breaches may be managed and resolved at faculty level. The Director of Research Integrity may refer allegations of code breaches to the relevant faculty for resolution.

(3) Allegations must be handled carefully and all interested parties protected as far as possible. Interested parties may include:
(a) the person bringing the allegation;
(b) the person against whom the allegation is made;
(c) participants in human-based research whose interests may be affected;
(d) research students, trainees and staff working with the person concerned;
(e) journals in which allegedly fraudulent papers have been or may be about to be published;
(f) funding bodies that have contributed to the research; and
(g) in some cases, the public.

(4) Allegations should preferably be made in writing.
(5) At this or at any later appropriate stage, the Director of Research Integrity may take any interim administrative action reasonably necessary to protect:
(a) human safety;
(b) animal welfare;
(c) funds provided by external funding bodies; and or
(d) material which might be relevant to any investigation.

22 Summary dismissal

If, upon receipt of an allegation, the Director of Research Integrity concludes that it lacks substance and could not, even if proved, amount to either research misconduct or a code breach, the Director of Research Integrity may summarily dismiss the allegation and take no further action.

23 Initial inquiry into allegations

(1) Upon receipt of an allegation and after collection of all relevant materials, the Director of Research Integrity will designate one of the following to conduct an initial inquiry into the allegation:
(a) the Director, Graduate Research;
(b) the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Strategic Collaborations & Partnerships);
(c) the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education);
(d) the Provost; or
(e) in exceptional circumstances, another appropriate person nominated in writing by the DVC(R).

(2) The purpose of the initial inquiry is to determine how to respond to the allegation.
(3) As far as possible, all affected persons will be afforded confidentiality.
(4) The initial inquiry may include interviewing the people involved, inspecting research facilities or records or examining relevant documents.
(5) The Director of Research Integrity may obtain appropriate expertise from within or outside the University to assist in the initial inquiry, provided that appropriate precautions are taken to ensure that no real or perceived conflict of interests exists.
(6) The initial inquiry must be conducted as expeditiously as possible.

(7) At the conclusion of the initial inquiry, the designated person will provide the DVC(R) with a report which:
   (a) states whether or not a prima facie case has been established; and
   (b) recommends how the matter should proceed.

(8) The options for proceeding available to a designated person in making a recommendation under subclause (7) are:
   (a) dismissing the allegation(s);
   (b) instructing the relevant faculty or department on how to deal with the allegations, and referring the matter back to that faculty or department;
   (c) initiating a research misconduct investigation; or
   (d) referring the matter elsewhere in the University (for example, Audit and Risk Management, Human Resources or the Privacy Officer) to be dealt with under other relevant provisions.

24 Action on completion of initial inquiry into a complaint about a student

(1) If, after consideration of the designated person’s report, the DVC(R) concludes that an allegation about a student has substance but does not warrant investigation, the DVC(R) will refer the matter back to the student’s supervisor with recommendations for action (including no further action, if appropriate).

(2) If, after consideration of designated person’s report, the DVC(R) concludes that an allegation about a student warrants investigation, the DVC(R) will refer the matter to the Registrar in accordance with clause 62(1) of the University of Sydney By-Law 1999 (as amended).

(3) The Director of Research Integrity will determine if other individuals or organisations need to be informed at this point. Relevant considerations in this determination include, but are not limited to:
   (a) the degree of confidentiality which has been achieved;
   (b) the reputations of those against whom allegations are made but not proved; and
   (c) the need to protect the interests of those who have made allegations in good faith.

25 Action on completion of initial inquiry into a complaint about a staff member

(1) If, after consideration of the designated person’s report, the DVC(R) concludes that an allegation about a staff member has substance but does not warrant investigation, the DVC(R) will refer the matter back to the relevant faculty for such action (including no further action) as the DVC(R) considers appropriate.
(2) If, after consideration of the designated person’s report, the DVC(R) concludes that an allegation about a staff member warrants investigation, the DVC(R) will initiate an investigation in accordance with clause 27.

26 Action on completion of initial inquiry into a complaint about an affiliate

(1) If, after consideration of the designated person’s report, the DVC(R) concludes that an allegation about an affiliate has substance but does not warrant investigation, the DVC(R) will refer the matter back to the relevant faculty or University officer for such action (including no further action) as the DVC(R) considers appropriate, consistently with the terms of any applicable affiliation agreement.

(2) If, after consideration of the designated person’s report, the DVC(R) concludes that an allegation about an affiliate warrants investigation, the DVC(R) will initiate an investigation in accordance with clause 27 or the terms of any applicable affiliation agreement.

(3) If the affiliate is in receipt of a grant from an external funding body the DVC(R) will take appropriate interim administrative action to protect funds granted by external funding bodies.

27 Research misconduct investigation

(1) If the DVC(R) concludes that an allegation warrants investigation, he or she will appoint an investigator or investigation panel to conduct a formal investigation.

(2) The DVC(R) will determine whether to use internal or external investigator(s) or investigation panel members.

(3) The investigator or investigation panel:
   (a) should be from outside the relevant academic unit, and may be from outside the University, but should have experience and expertise relevant to the field of study of the staff member the subject of the complaint;
   (b) may obtain appropriate expertise from within or outside the University to assist in the initial assessment, provided that appropriate precautions are taken to ensure that there are no real or perceived conflict of interests; and
   (c) will conduct the investigation as expeditiously as possible.

(4) If the staff member is in receipt of a grant from an external funding body the DVC(R) will take appropriate interim administrative action to protect funds granted by external funding bodies.

(5) The Director of Research Integrity will determine if other individuals or organisations need to be informed at this point. Relevant considerations in this determination include, but are not limited to:
   (a) the degree of confidentiality which has been achieved;
   (b) the reputations of those against whom allegations are made but not proved; and
   (c) the need to protect the interests of those who have made allegations in good faith.
(6) The investigator or investigation panel will submit a final report to the DVC(R) as expeditiously as possible.

(7) In appropriate circumstances, such as where incorrect information on the public record may be dangerous to the community the DVC(R) may inform the editors of a journal that the authenticity of a paper or papers is in doubt.

28 Action on completion of research misconduct investigation

(1) If a staff member is found to have breached the Code or to have committed research misconduct the University will take disciplinary action according to applicable policies and the provisions or any applicable contract of employment and or Enterprise Agreement, and commensurate action (such as termination of an honorary appointment) will be taken in the case of research misconduct by an affiliate.

(2) The DVC(R) will inform relevant parties of the research misconduct inquiry findings and the actions taken by the University. Relevant parties may include:

(a) the complainant;
(b) affected staff;
(c) participants in human-based research whose interests may be affected;
(d) research collaborators, including those at other institutions;
(e) all funding organisations;
(f) journal editors; and
(g) professional registration bodies.

(3) The DVC(R) may also make recommendations requiring the correction of the public record, including publications, if research misconduct has affected the research findings and their dissemination.

28A Student appeals

(1) Students may appeal against academic decisions made under this code or Academic Honesty Procedures 2016 [insert hyperlink] in the manner provided in the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended).

(2) Such an appeal:

(a) is an appeal to the faculty, as set out in section 3.2 of the University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006; and
(b) should be determined by the Dean or Associate Dean.
29 Transitional provisions

(1) The Code of Conduct for Responsible Research Practice and Guidelines for Dealing with Allegations of Research Misconduct ("the prior policy") is rescinded, with effect from the date of commencement of this policy.

(2) All allegations received before the date of commencement of this policy will be dealt with under the provisions of the prior policy.

(3) In relation to any allegation received after the date of commencement of this policy but which relates to conduct occurring before that date:

(a) the Code of Practice for Responsible Research Practice contained in the prior policy will apply; but

(b) the allegation will be dealt with in accordance with the process and outcomes provided in this policy.
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Schedule 1: University milestones and activities

Notes

Amendment history
PART 1 PRELIMINARY

1 Name of policy

This is the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015.

2 Commencement

This policy commences on 1 January 2016.

3 Policy is binding

Except to the extent that a contrary intention is expressed, this policy binds the University, staff, students and affiliates.

4 Statement of Intent

(1) The University aspires for all higher degree by research students to have a quality research training experience and to produce research of the highest calibre. This includes the development of skills and knowledge necessary to be a successful researcher in the chosen discipline and the timely completion and successful examination of their research projects and theses.

(2) The University will partner with students to plan their progression throughout their candidature and set clear expectations of satisfactory progress. The University will provide appropriate institutional support and resources, regular reviewing, including a written submission and meeting, and support students to maintain research integrity and quality.

(3) This policy details the elements of the higher degree by research progress planning and review process. It should be read in conjunction with the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (‘the Rule’), the Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions, and the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Procedures 2015 (‘the Procedures’).

5 Application

(1) Except to the extent that a contrary intention is expressed, this policy applies to higher degree by research students, staff and affiliates.

   Note 1: See clause 20 for transitional provisions.

(2) It is a condition of each student’s admission to candidature that the student complies with his or her obligations under this policy.
6 Definitions

(1) In this policy:

activity means a specific requirement in a student's candidature that contributes to the completion of a milestone.

Associate Dean means the Associate Dean responsible for overseeing higher degrees by research in the relevant faculty.

Dean means the Dean of the relevant faculty.

coordinating supervisor means the supervisor in a supervisory team who has designated academic delegations and responsibility for administrative requirements.

degree means the relevant higher degree by research.

department means the academic unit responsible for a student’s higher degree by research candidature. It may be called a department, discipline or school within the University.

faculty means a faculty or a board of studies as established by Senate in each case by its constitution, and refers to the student's faculty of enrolment.

head of department means the head of the relevant department.

Note: Functions performed by the head of department may be performed by the Head of School, Dean or Associate Dean, in accordance with paragraph 1.4(4) of the Rule, particularly in faculties that are not organised into departments or disciplines.

higher degree by research means a doctorate by research or master’s by research, as defined in the Rule.

milestone means a significant event in a student’s candidature that is useful in monitoring and guiding the student’s progress to successful completion. Milestones may comprise a number of activities.

postgraduate coordinator means the postgraduate coordinator for the relevant department.

progress means the student’s progress against the requirements specified in subclause 13(1).

progress plan means a progress plan developed in accordance with Part 2.

progress review means a progress review conducted in accordance with Part 3.

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

Note: Research periods are published at: http://sydney.edu.au/study/study-dates.html
Review Panel means a panel established to conduct a progress review in accordance with clause 11.

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

student means a person who is currently admitted to candidature in a higher degree by research award course of the University.

supervisor means a person appointed to discharge the responsibilities set out in the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013, including research supervisors, coordinating supervisors and auxiliary supervisors.

supplementary progress review means a progress review conducted in accordance with clause 17.

PART 2 PROGRESS PLANNING

7 Progress plans

(1) Students and supervisors must begin progress planning at an early stage in each student's higher degree by research candidature.

(2) All students must have a progress plan within three months from the date of commencement of candidature, or within six months for part-time students.

Note 2: See clause 20. This subclause does not apply to students enrolled as at 31 December 2015 with a latest completion date later than 30 June 2016.

(3) The purpose of a progress plan is to align and manage student, University and faculty expectations about what is required to achieve the award of the degree.

(4) A student’s progress plan must include all activities and milestones required to achieve the award of the degree, including:

   (a) formulation and approval of research proposal;
   (b) formulation and approval of research projects;
   (c) thesis development and examination;
   (d) research training activities;
   (e) coursework requirements;
   (f) compliance and risk management activities.

Note 3: See Part 4 for information on activities and milestones.

8 Creating progress plans

(1) Students are responsible for creating their progress plan, based on current University templates, with the participation and support of their coordinating supervisor.

(2) Progress plans must be:

   (a) endorsed by the student’s coordinating supervisor; and
9 Maintaining and varying progress plans

(1) Students are responsible for maintaining their progress plan, and for identifying any variations required, with the participation and support of their coordinating supervisor.

(2) Students must review their progress plan, in consultation with their coordinating supervisor, at least twice per year, with at least one review being conducted as part of the student’s preparation for a progress review.

(3) A variation to a progress plan may be required for many reasons, including:
   (a) where a student:
      (i) changes attendance mode;
      (ii) requests a leave of absence or suspension of candidature;
      (iii) transfers to another course or program;
      (iv) achieves a milestone;
      (v) fails to achieve or is delayed in achieving a milestone;
      (vi) submits a request for an extension of candidature;
      (vii) has encountered unanticipated barriers to progress; or
   (b) where it becomes clear that the student’s research project needs improvement or is not viable.

(4) Variations to progress plans may be material or non-material.

(5) Material variations are variations that:
   (a) extend the date for achievement of a University, faculty or department milestone by more than three months from the original date;
   (b) require a change to the thesis submission date to:
      (i) a new research period; or
      (ii) a date that is beyond the latest date for submission, as defined in clause 2.20 of the Rule;
   (c) substantially change the nature of the research.

   Note 5: Clause 2.20 of the Rule authorises a Dean or Associate Dean to permit a student to submit his or her thesis after a period of time greater than the maximum periods specified in that clause.

(6) Material variations to progress plans must be:
   (a) endorsed by the student’s coordinating supervisor; and
   (b) approved by the head of department or postgraduate coordinator.

(7) Students should discuss non-material variations to progress plans with their coordinating supervisor.
PART 3  PROGRESS REVIEW

10  Progress reviews

(1) Progress reviews (including supplementary progress reviews) must be conducted in accordance with this policy and the procedures.

(2) The purpose of a progress review is to:
   (a) assess whether the student has adequate support and resources to complete his or her research project and thesis in accordance with the progress plan;
   (b) assess whether the current supervisory arrangements are satisfactory;
   (c) assess the feasibility of the progress plan; and
   (d) assess and rate the student's progress.

(3) A copy of the student's progress plan will be provided to all parties involved in the progress review.

(4) A progress review must be conducted for each student as required by the head of department or postgraduate coordinator and at least once per year.

(5) Students re-enrolling for a period of more than six months as a result of a requirement to revise and resubmit in a previous thesis examination, must participate in a progress review between three and six months from the date of re-enrolment.

(6) Progress reviews should be supported by continuous evaluation of progress and regular meetings between students and supervisors.

11  Review Panel

(1) The head of department or postgraduate coordinator must appoint two or more academic staff members to form a review panel for each student's review, and nominate one of the panel members to act as chair.

(2) Each Review Panel member must have one or more of:
   (a) relevant disciplinary expertise;
   (b) experience in supervising and managing higher degree by research candidatures; or
   (c) other relevant specialist knowledge.

(3) In appointing members of a Review Panel, the head of department or postgraduate coordinator:
   (a) may appoint from outside the department or faculty;
   (b) must not appoint any of a student's supervisors; and
   (c) must consider and manage any actual, potential or perceived conflicts of interests.

   Note 6: For information on evaluating and managing conflicts of interest, see the External Interests Policy 2010.
12 Progress review meetings

(1) Students must participate in a progress review meeting as required by the head of department or postgraduate coordinator and at least once per year.

(2) Students may be accompanied at the progress review meeting by a support person, such as a colleague, friend, family member or student representative.

(3) Progress review meetings will be conducted by the Review Panel.

(4) The Review Panel:
   (a) may invite any or all of the student’s supervisors to attend part of the progress review meeting;
   (b) must discuss the progress plan, and any required variations to the progress plan, with the student and (when in attendance) his or her supervisors; and
   (c) must provide the student with an opportunity to speak to the Review Panel without any of the student’s supervisors present.

13 Progress review outcomes

(1) The student’s progress will be measured against:
   (a) University, faculty, department and student milestones and activities that are within the student’s control;
   (b) action items identified in the student’s previous progress reviews; and
   (c) compliance with student responsibilities set out in relevant University policies and procedures.

(2) Students must meet the requirements specified in subclause 13(1) to the required standard or quality.

(3) The progress review ratings are:
   (a) meets or exceeds objectives;
   (b) marginal progress;
   (c) unsatisfactory progress.

(4) The Review Panel must prepare a written report for the head of department or postgraduate coordinator:
   (a) giving its assessment of the feasibility of the progress plan;
   (b) setting out any required variations to the progress plan;
   (c) identifying any actions to be taken as a result of the progress review, and who will be responsible for them;
   (d) recommending whether a supplementary progress review is required;
   (e) indicating, where relevant, whether the student’s scholarship is at risk, and the time frame for any potential termination of scholarship; and
   (f) recommending a progress review rating based upon its assessment of the student’s progress.

(5) The Review Panel may prepare a report and recommend a progress review rating in the student’s absence, if:
(a) the student fails to attend the progress review meeting without notice or good cause; or
(b) the student is unable to attend and the Review Panel forms the reasonable view that the progress review meeting can properly be conducted in the student’s absence.

6 The student will have an opportunity to respond to the Review Panel’s report.

7 The head of department or postgraduate coordinator must:

(a) determine a progress review rating, taking into account:
   (i) the recommendation of the Review Panel;
   (ii) the student’s response; and
   (iii) any exceptional circumstances related to the candidature and beyond the reasonable control of the student;
(b) specify any actions to be taken as a result of the progress review, including who will be responsible for them and timeframes for their completion;
(c) state whether the proposed supervision arrangements are satisfactory;
(d) determine whether a supplementary progress review is required; and
(e) monitor the implementation of any action items for the department, faculty or University identified by the Review Panel. Such items should be completed within three months of the date of the progress review.

14 ‘Meets or exceeds objectives’

1 A rating of ‘meets or exceeds objectives’ means that the student’s progress since the last progress review, or since commencement of candidature, has been satisfactory or exceeded expectations.

2 To achieve a rating of ‘meets or exceeds expectations’ the student must:

(a) have satisfactorily met all requirements (as specified in subclause 13(1)) since the last progress review; and
(b) be expected to submit the thesis for examination on time, or in a timely fashion, allowing for any previous delays.

15 ‘Marginal progress’

1 A rating of ‘marginal progress’ indicates that:

(a) the student has not satisfactorily met all requirements (as specified in subclause 13(1)) since the last progress review; or
(b) there is some risk that the student’s thesis will not be submitted for examination on time, or in a timely fashion, allowing for any previous delays.

(c) there has been a finding of inappropriate academic practice, academic dishonesty, research misconduct or a breach of the Research Code of Conduct.

Note: See Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015; Research Code of Conduct 2013 and Academic Honesty Procedures 2016 [insert hyperlink].
(b)(d)

(2) If a student receives a rating of 'marginal progress', the head of department or postgraduate coordinator:

(a) must specify a set of required actions and due dates; and
(b) must set a date for a supplementary progress review; and
(c) may:
   (i) refer the Review Panel's report to the postgraduate coordinator or Associate Dean; and
   (ii) take such other action as the head of department or postgraduate coordinator considers appropriate, consistent with the Rule and this policy.

(3) A rating of 'marginal progress' will be considered satisfactory for the purposes of a student's scholarship, where the terms and conditions of the scholarship are under the University's control.

(4) A rating of 'marginal progress' cannot be used as a trigger for the requirement for a student to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

(5) If a student is required to meet a required set of actions and due dates, the coordinating supervisor is responsible for overseeing their completion.

16 ‘Unsatisfactory progress’

(1) A rating of ‘unsatisfactory progress’ indicates that:

(a) the student has not satisfactorily met all requirements (as specified in subclause 13(1)) since the last progress review; or
(b) there is a significant risk that the thesis:
   (i) will not be submitted for examination on time, or in a timely fashion, allowing for any previous delays; or
   (ii) will not be completed at all; or
   (c) there has been a finding of inappropriate academic practice, academic dishonesty, research misconduct or a breach of the Research Code of Conduct.

Note: See Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015; Research Code of Conduct 2013 and Academic Honesty Procedures 2016.

(2) If a student receives a rating of 'unsatisfactory progress', the head of department or postgraduate coordinator:

(a) must, except where the student is asked to show good cause:
   (i) specify a set of required actions and due dates;
   (ii) set a date for a supplementary progress review;
   (iii) refer the Review Panel's report to the postgraduate coordinator or Associate Dean; and
   (iv) take such other action as the head of department or postgraduate coordinator considers appropriate, consistent with the Rule and this policy.
(b) may:
   (i) where relevant, recommend to the University that the student’s research scholarship be terminated;
   (ii) recommend to the Associate Dean that the student be asked to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

(3) In determining what action to take in accordance with subclause (2), the head of department or postgraduate coordinator will take into account:
   (a) any injury, illness or misadventure experienced by the student that has had an impact on progress since the last progress review;
   (b) any difficulties caused by, or fault on the part of, the University; and
   (c) any exceptional circumstances related to the candidature and beyond the reasonable control of the student.

(4) If a student receives a rating of ‘unsatisfactory progress’ at two consecutive progress reviews, the head of department or postgraduate coordinator must recommend to the Associate Dean that the student be asked to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

(5) If a student must meet a required set of actions and due dates, the coordinating supervisor is responsible for overseeing their completion.

17 Supplementary progress reviews

(1) If the head of department or postgraduate coordinator requires a student to undertake a supplementary progress review, that supplementary progress review:
   (a) should take place in one of the scheduled review cycles;
   (b) must take place no sooner than two months and no later than six months from the date of the previous review; and
   (c) must be conducted in accordance with this policy.

(2) Subject to sub-clause (3), if a student receives a rating of ‘marginal progress’ at a supplementary progress review, clause 15 of this policy will apply.

(3) If after two consecutive supplementary progress reviews the student fails to achieve a rating of ‘meets or exceeds expectations’, the student must receive a rating of ‘unsatisfactory progress’ for the second supplementary progress review, and clause 16 of this policy will apply.

PART 4 MILESTONES AND ACTIVITIES

18 Milestones and activities

(1) There are three types of milestones and activities:
   (a) University;
   (b) faculty and department;
   (c) student.
(2) University milestones and activities are:
   (a) set out in Schedule 1 of this policy;
   (b) mandatory (including the items listed in bullet-points); and
   (c) common for all candidates.
(3) Faculty and department milestones and activities:
   (a) are additional to University milestones and activities;
   (b) are mandatory specialist requirements specific to the faculty or department;
   (c) are common for all candidates in the faculty or department;
   (d) may include department specific activities required to achieve University milestones; and
   (e) must be approved by the SEG Research Training Committee.
(4) Student milestones and activities are:
   (a) specific to the student’s candidature;
   (b) set in consultation with the student, and endorsed by the coordinating supervisor.
(5) Progress plans must include at least one faculty or department milestone between the University milestones ‘Confirmation’ and ‘Intent to Submit’.

19 Rescissions and replacements

This document replaces the Progress Review of Higher Degree by Research Students Guidelines, which commenced on 21 August 2014, which is rescinded as from the date of commencement of this document.

20 Transitional provisions

(1) For students enrolled as at 31 December 2015 with a latest completion date earlier than 1 July 2016:
   (a) Part 2 does not apply; and
   (b) Part 3 applies, but is amended to exclude requirements for, and reference to, progress plans.
(2) For students enrolled as at 31 December 2015 with a latest completion date later than 30 June 2016, the following provision applies in place of subclause 7(2):
   (a) All students must have a progress plan by the earlier of:
      (i) 30 June 2016; or
      (ii) one month prior to the date of their next scheduled progress review.
### SCHEDULE 1: UNIVERSITY MILESTONES AND ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Research Project &amp; Thesis</th>
<th>Research Training</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Outcome Checklist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary appraisal</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>• Review research idea.</td>
<td>• Complete training needs analysis.</td>
<td>• Complete Responsible Research Practice module.</td>
<td>• Have all relevant action items been identified and included in the progress plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Draft research plan.</td>
<td>• Schedule relevant training activities.</td>
<td>• Complete induction(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Draft data management plan.</td>
<td>• Review communication skills (especially writing).</td>
<td>• Identify any need for ethics approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify subsequent actions in progress plan.</td>
<td>• Conduct intellectual property review, and consider need for IP agreements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct autonomous sanctions check.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider potential for restricted information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHS (Activity, within Preliminary Proposal Milestone)</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Complete WHS training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>• Finalise research proposal/plan.</td>
<td>• Ensure student has adequate written English to write thesis, or that measures are in place to assist the student to meet this requirement within a specified timeframe.</td>
<td>• Confirm ethics plan and commence ethics application process (where relevant).</td>
<td>• Is the research project feasible? If not, consider next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Finalise data management plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct resources review, including information technology, hardware, software, space, funding, supervision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone</td>
<td>Time frame</td>
<td>Research Project &amp; Thesis</td>
<td>Research Training</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Outcome Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Finalise Research Proposal [Activity, within Confirmation Milestone] | 12 months                         | • Agree a final research proposal                                                       |                                                                                |                                                                            | • Is the research proposal feasible?  
  • Is the research proposal agreed by all parties? |
| Intent to submit                  | 3 months from projected submission | • Check thesis draft.  
  • Student to provide input on potential examiners. | • Ensure all training activities from training needs analysis are complete.         | • Check compliance with ethics approvals, data management plan, IP agreements.  
  • Consider whether the thesis contains restricted information. | • Will the thesis be ready for examination?  
  • If no, does the progress plan need to be updated and an extension sought? |
| Submit for examination            | Submission date                   | • Coordinating supervisor confirms thesis is in a form suitable for examination.  
  • Faculty decides to proceed with examination. |                                                                                | • Consider whether confidentiality agreements are required for examiners.       | • Is the thesis examinable?  
  • If yes, have examiners been appointed? |
| Examination                       | Complete within 4 months of submission | • Determine outcome of examination.                                                      |                                                                                |                                                                            | • Does the thesis satisfy the requirements for award?  
  • If yes, are there any conditions that must be satisfied?  
  • If no, can the student revise and resubmit? |
| Award                             | Within 4 months of award notification | • Complete requirements for award, including emendations.  
  • Lodge final version of thesis. |                                                                                | • Comply with data management plan.  
  • Comply with any ethics approval and protocol. | • Can the degree be conferred? |
| Confer degree                     |                                  |                                                                                         |                                                                                |                                                                            |                                                                               |
NOTES
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1st Year Integrity Check + During Candidature Issues

**Student**
- (1st year milestone only)
  - Submit written work into LMS and Turnitin
  - Records satisfactory completion of 1st year milestone
    - no issues

**HDRAC**
- Review TII report
  - possible issues
    - refer issue using online reporting form
      - no issue
      - potential research misconduct or breach of code
        - dismissed
        - Manage code breach within faculty
          - code breach to be managed
          - no impropriety

**Supervisor**
- Refer issue using online reporting form
  - no impropriety
  - Ensure student completes further development
    - inappropriate academic practice
      - End

**Investigators**
- Initial inquiry (Designated Person)
  - dismissed
  - inappropriate academic practice
    - no impropriety
    - inappropriate academic practice
      - no impropriety
      - no impropriety
      - End

- Registrar (SAU)
  - appropriate academic practice
    - Manage code breach within faculty
      - code breach manage within faculty
      - no impropriety
      - End

- A/D HDR
  - inappropriate academic practice
    - no impropriety
    - no impropriety
    - no impropriety
    - End
  - research misconduct
    - Registrar
  - End

**Registrar**
- Student to complete annual progress review
  - no issues
  - records satisfactory completion of 1st year milestone
    - potential research misconduct or breach of code
      - refer issue using online reporting form
Non-Confidential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Matthew Charet, Committee Secretary</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer/Approver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper title</td>
<td>Faculty Reports on Academic Dishonesty 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To present the Faculty Reports on Academic Dishonesty for the 2015 academic year to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee of the Academic Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the 2015 Faculty Reports on 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. These reports are attached, as received from faculties.
IN 2015, THE FACULTY RECEIVED THE FOLLOWING NUMBER OF ALLEGATIONS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course level</th>
<th># allegations</th>
<th># allegations upheld</th>
<th># referred to the Registrar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTGRADUATE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P=plagiarism  *AD=academic dishonesty  *NP=negligent plagiarism  *DP=dishonest plagiarism

The above figures represent:
2 % of enrolled undergraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
2 % of enrolled undergraduate students having allegations upheld;
0 % of enrolled postgraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
0 % of enrolled postgraduate students having allegations upheld.

Where allegations of academic dishonesty/plagiarism were upheld, the following penalties were applied:
In all cases 0 was given for the assessment task in which plagiarism occurred.

THE FACULTY HANDLED THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER

1. Unit of Study Coordinator identifies what form of plagiarism they are dealing with, i.e. negligent plagiarism (where student has failed to reference correctly and has not realised they made a mistake in the way they recorded material in their work) or dishonest plagiarism (where student clearly has tried to pass off another person’s work as their own) and how much plagiarism appears throughout the document.

2. Once the type of plagiarism has been identified, it is reported to the A/Dean T&L who notifies the student (by email) that they have allegedly plagiarised. In cases of negligent plagiarism a meeting is arranged with the UoS coordinator who points out the plagiarism with their work, the University’s (Academic Board’s) policy on plagiarism and the student is also advised to undertake referencing courses with the library. For more serious cases, a meeting with the student, Unit of Study Coordinator and the A/Dean for T&L is scheduled and the student made aware of the reason for the meeting, and the decision reached is discussed and communicated to the student (with an email formally setting the decision taken and reason for same).

3. Determination of the penalty that should be applied is made by the Unit of Study Coordinator, and Associate Dean for Teaching and Learning. If work clearly reflects dishonest plagiarism, then the
decision to be applied can range from lowering of marks, asking the student to resubmit work or failing the student for the piece of assessment or unit of study.

THE FOLLOWING STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN BY THE FACULTY TO PROMOTE COMPLIANCE WITH THE EDUCATION STRATEGIES TO FOSTER ACADEMIC HONESTY IN THE ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM POLICY

All undergraduate students in the Faculty complete AGEN1001 where completion of the library module on academic honesty is a compulsory requirement. In addition guidelines are published in the unit of study outlines. In addition, students are required to provide a form on the front of each piece of assessment, stating that the work they submit is their own. From 2016 TurnItin is mandatory.

TEXT MATCHING SOFTWARE IS MANDATED FOR ALL STUDENTS IN THE FOLLOWING UNITS OF STUDY:
All units in FAE.

FURTHER COMMENTS
Data is stored in a locked office on the computer of the Student Services Coordinator
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FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE, DESIGN AND PLANNING
ANNUAL REPORT ON CASES OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY
2015

*PLEASE NOTE, NO STUDENT DETAILS, OR INFORMATION WHICH COULD BE USED TO IDENTIFY INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS, ARE TO BE INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT

IN 2015, THE FACULTY RECEIVED THE FOLLOWING NUMBER OF ALLEGATIONS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course level</th>
<th>#allegations</th>
<th>#allegations upheld</th>
<th># referred to the Registrar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*P  *AD  *NP  *DP  AD</td>
<td>NP  DP  AD  AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>38  00  12  06  00</td>
<td>00  00  00  00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTGRADUATE</td>
<td>29  00  18  09  00</td>
<td>00  00  00  00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>01  00  00  00  00</td>
<td>00  00  00  00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68  00  30  15  00</strong></td>
<td><strong>00  00  00  00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P=plagiarism  *AD=academic dishonesty  *NP=negligent plagiarism  *DP=dishonest plagiarism

The above figures represent:

2.92 % of enrolled **undergraduate** students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,

2.08 % of enrolled **undergraduate** students having allegations upheld;

3.72 % of enrolled **postgraduate** students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,

3.59 % of enrolled **postgraduate** students having allegations upheld.

Where allegations of academic dishonesty/plagiarism were upheld, the following penalties were applied:

Of the 68 cases, 23 resulted in a fail grade for the assessment, one resulted in a fail grade for the unit of study, and 20 resulted in resubmission of the assessment.

Of the 20 students allowed to resubmit the work, 12 were required to engage in an educational program (e.g. workshop at the Learning Centre, the online module offered by the library) and 11 received a mark penalty. These penalties were:

- Six students: if the resubmitted assessment would earn a pass grade or higher, the student would receive 50% of the total possible marks for the assessment item.
- Four students: 15% penalty on earned marks
- One student: 20% penalty on earned marks

THE FACULTY HANDLED THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER

Procedure followed in 2015:

- Academic staff provided a description of the suspicion(s) and any supporting documentation to the Associate Dean Education (ADE) or Education Support Officer (ESO).
- The ADE reviewed the case and made a preliminary assessment. She consulted with the unit coordinator, if necessary.
- If the ADE determined that she needed to meet with the student, the ESO drafted a letter for the ADE to sign, notifying student of the meeting.
- The ESO scanned and sent the notification, with supporting documents, to the student. She accommodated rescheduling requests, as required, and answered queries.
• The ADE met with the student. The academic staff member that reported the case was invited to attend the meeting, but not required to attend.
• The ADE made a decision about the case and notified the ESO and unit of study coordinator.
• The ESO drafted the outcome letter. The ADE signed the letter.
• The ESO emailed the outcome letter to the student and cc’ed the student affairs unit.
• When applicable, the student resubmitted the work to the unit coordinator for marking.

This procedure changed in 2016, consistent with changes in University policy.

Detection methods included:
• Turnitin
• Staff recognition of images, designs, and text included in students’ works from familiar online and hardcopy sources.
• Staff recognition of similarities between assessment items submitted by different students.

The Faculty began using Turnitin widely in semester 2, 2015.

THE FOLLOWING STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN BY THE FACULTY TO PROMOTE COMPLIANCE WITH THE EDUCATION STRATEGIES TO FOSTER ACADEMIC HONESTY IN THE ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM POLICY
Information about academic honesty is included in all unit of study outlines and integrated into individual units of study within all degree programs. In particular, first-semester units in undergraduate programs have dedicated lecture(s) and/or tutorial(s) addressing academic honesty. Faculty members have been trained on policy matters and given support for implementing practices that foster academic honesty.

TEXT MATCHING SOFTWARE IS MANDATED FOR ALL STUDENTS IN THE FOLLOWING UNITS OF STUDY:
The Faculty began using Turnitin widely in semester 2, 2015. Now, Turnitin is used in all units of study across the Faculty, when possible and reasonable, for text-based assignments, in accordance with University policy. Turnitin’s file size upload limit is a serious limitation for the Faculty.

FURTHER COMMENTS
Of the 1297 students enrolled in at least one undergraduate unit of study in the Faculty in 2015, 38 allegations of plagiarism/academic dishonesty (this distinction was not made by those making allegations) were made. Ultimately, 27 of those allegations were upheld, though not all of those cases were finalised in 2015 (the data in the table represents findings made in 2015 only). Of the 779 students enrolled in at least one postgraduate unit of study in the Faculty, 29 allegations of plagiarism/academic dishonesty were made. Ultimately, 28 of those cases were upheld, but not all findings were made in 2015. The “other” was a case involving an exchange student.

Turnitin is useful, but many of the assessments in the Faculty’s unit are not text-based.
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IN 2015, THE FACULTY RECEIVED THE FOLLOWING NUMBER OF ALLEGATIONS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course level</th>
<th>#allegations</th>
<th>#allegations upheld</th>
<th># referred to the Registrar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P  AD  NP  DP AD</td>
<td>NP  DP  AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>155 16 60 81 17</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTGRADUATE</td>
<td>23  7 11  8  7</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178 22 71 89 24</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P=plagiarism  *AD=academic dishonesty  *NP=negligent plagiarism  *DP=dishonest plagiarism

The above figures represent:
1.08% of enrolled undergraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
0.99% of enrolled undergraduate students having allegations upheld;

0.89% of enrolled postgraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
0.77% of enrolled postgraduate students having allegations upheld.

*There were cases where 1 student had multiple allegations made against them resulting in the student having two or more allegations upheld against them.
Where allegations of academic dishonesty/plagiarism were upheld, the following penalties were applied:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penalty</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Negligent</th>
<th>Dishonest</th>
<th>Academic Dishonesty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative task, maximum mark of 50%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative task, maximum mark of 60%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative task, penalty of 30%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative task, penalty of 20%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative task, penalty of 15%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative task, penalty of 10%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative task, No penalty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marked on merit, penalty of 50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marked on merit, penalty of 30%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marked on merit, penalty of 25%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marked on merit, penalty of 15%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marked on merit, Penalty of 5-10%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No penalty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resubmit, fail grade stands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resubmit, maximum mark of 50%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resubmit, penalty of 40%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resubmit, penalty of 30%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resubmit, penalty of 20%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Faculty handled the allegations in the following manner:

Responses should focus on procedures, not details of students or staff involved.

Outline the faculty procedures followed for dealing with allegations of academic dishonesty.

What detection methods does the faculty use to identify academic dishonesty?

Does the faculty use text matching software? If so, has any mandatory use been reported to Academic Board previously?

The Faculty did investigate several cases of academic dishonesty. In some cases, this included comparison of previous submitted work which indicated that the assessment had been produced by different authors. There was also cases that were brought to the attention of the Academic Honesty team due to improper exam invigilation. The use of the Turnitin software allowed academic staff to recognise instances of recycling and report student cases with clear evidence.

The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences has continued with the centralised Academic Honesty process which was established in 2014. Academic staff are able to submit cases through a workflow program in TRIM which is then forwarded to the Academic Integrity team for review. As the workflow has been in place since 2014, the numbers of cases have remained relatively stable after an initial increase when the system was first implemented.

When cases are submitted to the Faculty, the Student Services Assistant (Academic Integrity) reviews the case to ensure there is enough information to proceed. If any further information is required, the Academic Integrity Assistant (AIA) will request this information from the academic who has lodged the case.

Once the case has sufficient evidence to proceed, the AIA will prepare the case for the review of the Educational Integrity Coordinator (EIC). The EIC reviews the case and determines if a meeting with the student is required and will determine if an allegation of plagiarism or academic dishonesty is warranted. The case is returned to the AIA who prepares a letter which outlines the allegation for the student and notifies them of the meeting time as well as their rights and responsibilities. Students may reschedule the meeting or respond in writing if they are unable to attend. They are also informed of support services in the university (such as the SRC) that can assist them in preparing for the meeting.

The EIC meets with the student to hear their responses to the allegations and reviews any evidence the student provides at the meeting. The AIA attends the meeting to take minutes to ensure accurate records of the student’s response and advice provided by the EIC. A copy of meeting notes and any supporting evidence provided by the student are added to the confidential Academic Honesty files.
When the EIC determines the outcome, he takes into account the student’s progress in the unit and throughout their degree. If a grade penalty is applied, it is determined based on the type and extent of plagiarism, the student’s response and the weighting of the assessment task in relation to the unit. If the student has had previous allegations made against them, a heavier penalty may be imposed. The EIC also refers students to additional resources and education if it is necessary for the student’s future academic success.

Once the EIC has considered the student’s response and any new evidence the student provided, a final determination is made on the case. The AIA will draft a determination letter for the final approval of the EIC which informs the student of the outcome of the allegation, any remedial action they are required to take and notification of any penalties that will be applied. The unit of study coordinator receives a copy of the decision letter that is sent to the student.

Where a student is required to complete an alternative assessment, or to revise the assessment and resubmit, a due date is set. The student submits their work to fass.academichonesty@sydney.edu.au. The new submission is run through Turnitin to check for compliance. If the assessment is found to be compliant, it is forwarded to the unit of study coordinator. The unit of study coordinator then marks the assessment and applies a penalty if required. If a student fails to meet the due date without notice, or submits something that has either not been corrected as instructed the student receives a failing grade for the assessment task.

Once the case is finalised, the case is closed in the system. If the student receives an outcome of plagiarism or academic dishonesty, the outcome is communicated to the Student Affairs Unit.

THE FOLLOWING STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN BY THE FACULTY TO PROMOTE COMPLIANCE WITH THE EDUCATION STRATEGIES TO FOSTER ACADEMIC HONESTY IN THE ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM POLICY

The Faculty implemented a Faculty wide Academic Honesty module which was optional for students to complete in 2014. In 2015, completion of this module was mandatory for all commencing students in the Faculty. This has now been replaced by the University wide module.

The Academic Integrity team created an Academic Honesty Guide for the Faculty to instruct academic staff on how to lodge a case and ensure compliance with the policy in the unit of study outlines and assessment instructions. The Academic Integrity team and the Academic Honesty Coordinator held meetings with academics to introduce the new guide and address any concerns they had about lodging a case. This also included making academic staff aware that the Academic Integrity team could assist them with any questions or concerns about the process. The Academic Honesty Guide was also sent out to the Teaching and Curriculum Coordinators in each School as a reference tool if academic staff requested their advice on lodging academic honesty cases. The Academic Integrity team also sends out email reminders each semester requesting that academic staff lodge cases as soon as possible.

The Academic Integrity team organised a faculty forum on academic integrity in late February to ensure that FASS was compliant with the 2015 Academic Honesty policy and to troubleshoot any transition into the 2016 process of referral.

The Academic Integrity team also hosts a website which links students to resources regarding proper referencing and citation. This site also outlines how the Faculty handles allegations of academic dishonesty and plagiarism. The process also informs students of their rights and responsibilities and how to prepare for a meeting with the Educational Integrity Coordinator.

The Faculty also participated in the University wide task force regarding Academic Honesty. The Academic Integrity team had previous raised issues with the policy and ensuring compliance with the policy at the unit of study level. Several initiatives have now been put in place for 2016 such as the revised policy and the central Office of Educational Integrity.
TEXT MATCHING SOFTWARE IS MANDATED FOR ALL STUDENTS IN THE FOLLOWING UNITS OF STUDY:

The Educational Design team in the Faculty has confirmed they are not able to provide a detailed list of all units of study which utilised Turnitin in 2015. However they have confirmed a marked increase in the use through several units. Turnitin and online submission are mandatory in all units of study within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences as of 2016.

FURTHER COMMENTS
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BUSINESS SCHOOL
ANNUAL REPORT ON CASES OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY
2015

PLEASE NOTE, NO STUDENT DETAILS, OR INFORMATION WHICH COULD BE USED TO IDENTIFY INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS, ARE TO BE INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT

IN 2015, THE FACULTY RECEIVED THE FOLLOWING NUMBER OF ALLEGATIONS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course level</th>
<th>#allegations</th>
<th>#allegations upheld</th>
<th># referred to the Registrar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P=plagiarism  *AD=academic dishonesty  *NP=negligent plagiarism  *DP=dishonest plagiarism
**= Response includes informal warning, no action taken by Dean’s delegate (donor).
*** Cases may be recorded as both Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism

INSTANCES - ENROLMENTS
The above figures represent:
1.18% of enrolled undergraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them, 0.37% of enrolled undergraduate students having allegations upheld;
1.97% of enrolled postgraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them, 0.66% of enrolled postgraduate students having allegations upheld.

UNIQUE SID
The above figures represent:
2.96% of enrolled undergraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them, 0.93% of enrolled undergraduate students having allegations upheld;
7.03% of enrolled postgraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them, 2.35% of enrolled postgraduate students having allegations upheld.

In 2015 SAU/OGC investigated a series of cases concerning purchased essays. The Business Schools has attempted to include a list of these cases however it is not complete. SAU/OGC should provide the data for all centrally handled cases, either from this incident or other incidents, that faculties were not involved with in order to have a complete picture of activity in 2015.
WHERE ALLEGATIONS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY/PLAGIARISM WERE UPHELD, THE FOLLOWING PENALTIES or OUTCOMES WERE APPLIED:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penalty Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Registrar</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply a fail grade to the whole unit of study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply a fail grade to the assessment in question</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require the student to resubmit the work, or undertake remedial work (no penalty)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require the student to resubmit the work (warning or partial penalty/mark deduction imposed on resubmit)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply a partial penalty/mark deduction - ie 50%</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Penalty</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write and submit new assignment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g. will receive mark from first attempt at assessment)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning given</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require student to attend educational development course and resubmit assessment correctly referenced</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment marked with maximum mark available</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Deputy Dean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed Decision</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB TOTAL</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impropriety</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*3 students were found to have engaged in both academic dishonesty and dishonest plagiarism, however there is only one penalty applicable.
Some cases referred to Registrar had a penalty applied at faculty level prior to referring.
** Still outstanding are some ghost writing cases identified by SAU

THE FACULTY HANDLED THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER

Academic honesty is a core value of the University of Sydney, and 'breaches of academic honesty will not be tolerated.'

The Business School values education about and prevention of academic dishonesty and plagiarism, and regards recourse to these procedures as a last resort. Students are encouraged to use the many learning resources available to avoid plagiarising or academic dishonesty.

1. When an Examiner suspects or is made aware of alleged plagiarism or academic misconduct, the Examiner must report this to the Dean's nominee, the Director of Academic Appeals. The Director of Academic Appeals will handle all cases of alleged plagiarism or academic dishonesty within the Business School.

2. The Director of Academic Appeals and the Examiner will make a preliminary assessment on the nature of the alleged plagiarism or dishonesty taking into account factors such as:
   - the extent of the alleged plagiarism measured against the student's original contribution of the work;
   - the percentage value of the work in the unit of study or course;
ACADEMIC STANDARDS & POLICY COMMITTEE

- the student's overall academic performances in the unit of study or course; and
- the circumstances in which the plagiarism is alleged to have occurred.
- the nature and extent of the alleged dishonesty.

3. Where the Director of Academic Appeal assesses that the alleged conduct is likely plagiarism but was contributed by a lack of education:
   - on the basis of carelessness or inexperience, and
   - affects a relatively insignificant portion or element of the work, and
   - where the student has not previously had any work referred under these procedures,

The Director may refer the work back to the student for correction and resubmission. The student will be required to attend a remedial workshop of literacy and referencing and then resubmit the work, correctly referenced but otherwise unchanged, to the Director's office. If the alleged plagiarism is corrected, the work will be returned to the original Examiner for marking. If there are unresolved issues, the following step will apply. If a student wishes, they can refuse to attend the remedial learning and can request a meeting and process as described below.

4. Where the Director of Academic Appeals assesses that the alleged conduct is potentially Negligent Plagiarism, Dishonest Plagiarism, some other form of academic dishonesty, affects a significant proportion or element of the work, the student has previously had work referred or more information is required in order to make an assessment, the Director of Academic Appeals and Examiner will meet with the student to discuss the issue.

The student will be sent an email notifying them of the exact nature of the problem, the details of the meeting, their rights of support and notice of the policy as well as being provided with marked up copies of their assignment and any other relevant supporting documents. The student will normally receive notification 3 days before the meeting.

5. If the Director of Academic Appeals forms the view that the student has engaged in Negligent Plagiarism they will:
   - Inform the student of this conclusion and provide counselling, including explaining referencing guidelines and referring the student to services for assistance (where relevant); and
   - The Director of Academic Appeals may also take other appropriate action including requiring the student to resubmit the work for assessment, undertake another form of assessment, undertake other remedial action or apply a fail grade or mark penalty to all or part of the work.

6. If the Director of Academic Appeals forms the view that the student has engaged in Dishonest Plagiarism or other Academic Dishonesty, and the conduct is not serious enough to constitute potential student misconduct, they will:
   - Inform the student of the conclusion reached;
   - Counsel the student by explaining referencing guidelines, and referring the student to services for assistance (where relevant); and
   - Issue a written warning about the consequences of any subsequent breaches of the policy and procedures. A copy of the written warning must be signed and dated by the Dean's nominee and the student. One copy is retained by the student and a second copy is placed on a central file maintained by the Registrar.
   - The Director of Academic Appeals may also take other appropriate action including requiring the student to resubmit the work for assessment, undertake another form of assessment, undertake other remedial action, apply a fail grade or mark penalty to all or part of the work, or apply a fail grade or mark penalty to the unit of study.

7. Where the Director of Academic Appeals assesses that the Dishonest Plagiarism or other academic dishonesty is serious enough, if proven, to constitute potential student misconduct under Chapter 8 of the University of Sydney By-Laws 1999 (as amended):
ACADEMIC STANDARDS & POLICY COMMITTEE

- Considering the extent of the conduct when measured against the student's original contribution to the work, the capacity of the conduct to adversely affect the student's peers of teachers, the capacity of the conduct to adversely impact on the academic standards of the University;
- whether the student has previously received a written warning and, if so, the content of that warning.

The Director of Academic Appeals will refer the alleged dishonesty to the Registrar for investigation.

The student will be advised of the right to appeal against the decision of the Director of Academic Appeals. Appeals relating to decisions on matters of academic honesty follow the same procedure as appeals against academic decisions.

Under the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework policy, the Business School requires the mandatory use of Turnitin, for all assessments. This mandatory use has been reported to the Academic Board.

Turnitin will not be used by the Business School as a sole or even the primary mechanism for detecting plagiarism. Detection of plagiarism and academic dishonesty is the responsibility of teaching staff as part of standard assessment mechanisms designed to foster good academic practices. All assessments will be checked for plagiarism. Assessments will be fully checked and monitored using manual processes, Google checks and text matching software checks.

THE FOLLOWING STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN BY THE FACULTY TO PROMOTE COMPLIANCE WITH THE EDUCATION STRATEGIES TO FOSTER ACADEMIC HONESTY IN THE ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM POLICY

Under the direction of an Academic Honesty Working Party, sponsored by the Pro-Dean, the Business School has undertaken a long-term project (2009-date) to improve academic honesty outcomes. Following a trial in selected Disciplines in semester 1, 2010, the School applied new academic honesty procedures to all units of study in Semester 2, 2010 and then continued the procedures till now.

The changes undertaken can be grouped into three categories:
1. Increased student education to prevent unintentional academic dishonesty and encourage good practice.
2. Increased staff education and use of text-matching software to allow effective and consistent detection of plagiarism.
3. Changes to procedures for managing detected plagiarism, including expanded opportunities for students to revise and resubmit their work.

1. Student education

In the past, all students were required to complete a detailed online academic honesty module and indicate on the coversheet for each assignment submitted that they had done so. Anecdotal evidence suggested, however, that many students were not completing the module, and that student knowledge about academic honesty could be improved.

To address this issue, the School revisited the AH module, clarifying some content and building in a final self-assessment which referred students to further information and assistance, including in-person assistance, in areas of weakness. The School also made the module a mandatory assessment task in all units, notifying students in classes and UoS outlines that failure to complete the module with a mark of 80% would result in an Absent Fail grade in all units of study undertaken.
within the Faculty. Students could take the online module as many times as they found necessary to obtain this grade, and need to pass it only once in their candidature.

The School continues to refine the content of the module and the resources attached to the module.

Academic Honesty is also being included as a topic in key core units in many Business School degree programs. Academic Honesty is taught in core first year units and is integrated and embedded into the learning and assessments within the units.

For all undergraduate students, there are compulsory tutorials that cover academic honesty, referencing and also literacy skills such as effective summarising and writing. In week 1 of the core first year unit, all students undertake a diagnostic assessment on their writing and referencing skills. The outcomes from the diagnostic assessment are:

1. No problems shown. Student is a competent writer and able to reference properly
2. Able to write but referencing shows problems
   a. Student must attend a compulsory workshop on referencing and then resubmit the diagnostic assessment.
   b. If the resubmission shows the referencing problems are resolved the student need not attend any further workshops although they are made available.
   c. If the resubmission shows the referencing problems are not resolved, the student is referred to their tutor for one to one assistance and teaching.
3. Able to reference but writing, summarising etc. shows problems
   a. Student must attend a compulsory workshop on writing and then resubmit the diagnostic assessment.
   b. If the resubmission shows the writing problems are resolved the student need not attend any further workshops although they are made available.
   c. If the resubmission shows the writing problems are not resolved, the student is referred to their tutor for one to one assistance and teaching.
4. If problems with both referencing and writing, must attend both workshops
5. Previously student’s which were identified as benefiting from further instruction in academic writing and referencing were automatically enrolled in either BUSS1900 Business Communications or BUSSS100 Communications Skills. These units covered literacy skills, summarising, effective study techniques, correct referencing etc. These units has been in place since 2012.

In addition to online and in class education, small-group AH workshops are run by the Faculty’s Student Learning Support Officer twice a week through semester time in 2015. These are available to all students. Further, students who had been identified as having problems were referred to one of these additional sessions before being required to resubmit their work.

2. Detection of Plagiarism and Academic Dishonesty

The School implemented a training program among academics and markers to assist markers in the detection of plagiarism in 2010. This program has continued for all new academic staff and markers. Techniques and tools taught to academics include traditional methods such as “reminds me of something”, looking for embedded data in assignments, use of Google and other search engines as well as access to text matching software.

All tools and techniques are used by markers when assessing assessments.

Regarding text matching software, as stated in the School’s 2009 report on Academic Honesty to the Board:

‘While there is currently uneven detection of plagiarism across units and Disciplines in the Faculty, the use of TurnItIn will provide the Faculty with a mechanism to ensure greater consistency in the monitoring and detection of plagiarism. This will benefit students in terms of greater consistency and equity of treatment of academic honesty issues, and inform longer-
term initiatives to identify areas in which additional support or education in academic honesty are required.'

The School used TurnItIn text matching software throughout 2015 in addition to other detection methods such as full text internet searches, metadata searches and other methods. As previously advised, academics were provided with detailed training about how to interpret TurnItIn reports and other reports. TurnItIn was used only as one tool in the detection of plagiarism. All judgements as to plagiarism are academic judgements.

One of the main benefits to the use of text-matching software is the improved detection of student-to-student copying, an issue otherwise difficult to identify in large classes and across years.

TEXT MATCHING SOFTWARE IS MANDATED FOR ALL STUDENTS IN THE FOLLOWING UNITS OF STUDY:

Text matching software is mandated for all coursework units of study within the Business School.

DATA ON CASES OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY IS COLLECTED AND STORED AS FOLLOWS:

- All cases of academic dishonesty or plagiarism are logged into a secure spreadsheet. Detailed records are kept securely and separately from any other areas with restricted access to the current and archived spreadsheets.
- An individual private file for each student is created which contains all correspondence, the assessment, any evidence of plagiarism and academic dishonesty and all other relevant materials. This file is either paper based or electronic. In either case the file is separately stored with restricted access to only those authorised.
- At the end of the appeal period (6 months after the last action within the file), the file is digitised or collated into one file and moved into secure archives. A copy is also placed into TRIM.
- Copies of all letters sent to students are sent to the Student Affairs Unit as required under policy. This is undertaken at the end of each semester.

FURTHER COMMENTS

The processes and practices used by the Business School have been trialled and tested since 2009. The Business School now has some longer term data.

- Units that have followed the process show very sharply decreasing incidence of academic dishonesty or plagiarism.
- The rate of repeated detections of plagiarism or academic dishonesty is less than 1%. The combination of effective education and known deterrence through mandatory checking of all assignments has reduced the incidence of academic dishonesty or plagiarism

The Nominated Academics for the Business School in 2015 were Brett Bondfield and Pearl Rozenberg.

- Brett Bondfield served as primary Nominated Academic and handled close to all cases.
- Pearl Rozenberg served as back up Nominated Academic and handled cases Brett Bondfield could not handle (eg students from within a unit he taught) or when Brett was on leave.

Responsibility for Academic Honesty and all process within the Business School - in 2015 - lies with the SubDean, Pearl Rozenberg.
My Masters ghost writing decisions that the Business School is aware of. SAU holds the complete list and should provide it to ensure complete reporting across the university. (When SAU conducts these investigations in future, faculties must be notified of what is happening and should not be guessing on the basis of decisions sent out.)

Note: the Business School is still waiting to be informed about decisions on some of these cases.

- WORK5003 Management and Organizations, Semester 2, 2014 | Assignment 2
- WORK1003 Foundations of Work and Employment, Semester 2, 2014 | Assignment
- CLAW1001 Foundations of Business Law, Semester 2, Midsemester problem assignment
- ACCT3011 Financial Accounting, Semester 2, 2014
- IBUS6002 Cross-Cultural Management, Semester 1, 2014 | group assignment
- WORK1003 Foundations of Work and Employment, Semester 2, 2014 | assignment
- BUSS1001 Understanding Business, Semester 2, 2014 | Cultural Dimensions Essay
- BUSS5000 | assessment 5
- TPTM6210 | individual assignment
- BUSS1040 Economics for Business Decision Making, Semester 1, 2013;
- BUSS1001 Understanding Business, Semester 1, 2013;
- BUSS1002 The Business Environment, Semester 2, 2013;
- BUSS1002 The Business Environment, Semester 1, 2014;

Report completed by: Pearl Rozenberg and Jen Chambers

Position: Pearl Rozenberg – Sub Dean University of Sydney Business School, Director
Academic Appeals and Nominated Academic under the Academic Honesty and Plagiarism policy.
Position: Jen Chambers – Policy & Administration Officer, University of Sydney Business School.

Date: 25 June 2016
IN 2015, THE FACULTY RECEIVED THE FOLLOWING NUMBER OF ALLEGATIONS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course level</th>
<th># allegations</th>
<th># allegations upheld</th>
<th># referred to the Registrar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>02 01</td>
<td>01 00 01</td>
<td>00 00 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTGRADUATE</td>
<td>00 04</td>
<td>00 00 03</td>
<td>00 00 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTGRADUATE COURSEWORK/RESEARCH</td>
<td>01 00 01 00</td>
<td>00 00 00 04</td>
<td>00 00 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>03 05 02 00 04</td>
<td>00 00 01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P=plagiarism  *AD=academic dishonesty  *NP=negligent plagiarism  *DP=dishonest plagiarism

The above figures represent:

1.83 % of enrolled undergraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
0.92 % of enrolled undergraduate students having allegations upheld;
1.17 % of enrolled postgraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
0.87 % of enrolled postgraduate students having allegations upheld.
0.85 % of enrolled postgraduate coursework/research students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
0.85 % of enrolled postgraduate coursework/research students having allegations upheld.

Where allegations of academic dishonesty/plagiarism were upheld, the following penalties were applied:
List here the distribution of penalties applied. For example, the number of cases where students were required to redo work; number of cases where a mark penalty was applied; number of cases resulting in a fail grade being awarded for a Unit of Study. Please also include the outcomes of any cases referred to the Registrar.

For the purpose of this report, Faculty of Dentistry programs fall into three categories – 1 Undergraduate and two Postgraduate:

UNDERGRADUATE: BACHELOR OF ORAL HEALTH; and BACHELOR OF DENTISTRY
POSTGRADUATE: DOCTOR OF DENTAL MEDICINE, and
DOCTOR OF CLINICAL DENTISTRY (specialist Postgraduate coursework) and
HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH students

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM (BACHELOR OF ORAL HEALTH):
- 1 case of Plagiarism was upheld and the following penalty issued:
ACADEMIC STANDARDS & POLICY COMMITTEE

Resubmission of assignment;  
500-word essay; plus  
2 Clinical & Academic Professional (CAP) demerit points issued;  

- 1 case of Academic Dishonesty was upheld and the following penalty issued:  
  ‘Incomplete’ awarded for Semester 1, 2015 Units of Study and fail for Semester 1, 2015

POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM (DOCTOR OF DENTAL MEDICINE):  

- 3 cases of Academic Dishonesty were upheld and the following penalties issued:  
  - 1 case was referred to the Registrar who issued the following penalty:  
    ‘Reprimand’ and suspension for 1 semester to be suspended pending any further misconduct under Chapter 8 of the By-Law  
  - 2 cases received the following penalties:  
    1. 1000-word essay;  
    2. 2000-word essay; + 2 Clinical & Academic Professional (CAP) demerit points issued

SPECIALIST POSTGRADUATE COURSEWORK PROGRAM (DOCTOR OF CLINICAL DENTISTRY):  

- 1 case of Plagiarism was upheld and a penalty issued:  
  Student is to repeat Semester 3 in 2017;  
  Undertake Continuing Education development, ie, CE hours;  
  Present a log of read journal articles

THE FACULTY HANDLED THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER  
Responses should focus on procedures, not details of students or staff involved.  
Outline the faculty procedures followed for dealing with allegations of academic dishonesty.  
What detection methods does the faculty use to identify academic dishonesty?  
Does the faculty use text matching software? If so, has any mandatory use been reported to Academic Board previously?  

Faculty procedures: In each case of alleged student impropriety (Plagiarism, Dishonesty), Faculty followed and documented due process as required by University of Sydney Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 and Academic Honesty in Coursework Procedures 2012, ie, the student (and support) was invited to attend a meeting with the relevant Head and Year Academic Coordinator, accompanied by the Student Affairs Manager, to discuss, and be provided with all evidence of the allegation.  

The recorded notes are provided to, firstly the student, as well as the Faculty’s Curriculum & Assessment Strategy Group for consultation and recommendation to the Dean.  

Matching Software: Turnitin matching software is used for all assignments in every unit of study in all Faculty of Dentistry programs.  

Detection: in the instance of:  

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM - BACHELOR OF ORAL HEALTH:  

- Plagiarism was detected through Turnitin  
- Academic Dishonesty Irregularity, falsification and tampering of dates on medical certificate was detected. Investigation ensued.
POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM - DOCTOR OF DENTAL MEDICINE:

- 3 cases of Academic Dishonesty:
  
  - The case referred to the Registrar was brought to the attention of the Academic Year Coordinator by a student who had seen it on social media. It was investigated according to University guidelines. As it compromised the integrity of the examination it was brought to the Registrar's attention for consideration of Misconduct.
  
  - The other two alleged cases of Dishonesty related to falsification and tampering of medical certificates detected by Faculty staff. Investigation ensued.

SPECIALIST POSTGRADUATE COURSEWORK PROGRAM ( DOCTOR OF CLINICAL DENTISTRY):

- 1 case of Plagiarism was detected through Turnitin

THE FOLLOWING STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN BY THE FACULTY TO PROMOTE COMPLIANCE WITH THE EDUCATION STRATEGIES TO FOSTER ACADEMIC HONESTY IN THE ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM POLICY

For example, clearly documenting what is expected of students in the academic writing and referencing conventions of their discipline, and supporting students in learning the value and importance of academic honesty.

In 2015 a working group of the Assessment and Evaluation Committee developed protocols for ensuring academic honesty in all forms of assessment (written exams, practical assessments and assignments). These protocols were presented for comment by members of the student representative committee (SUDA) and communicated to the faculty via the Learning & Teaching Committee. The protocols were also posted on Blackboard for students who were reminded of the importance of familiarising themselves with the protocols prior to all assessments. Additionally, Unit of Study Coordinators, those academics who write examination topics and questions, were asked not to re-use questions and encouraged to think and write questions more creatively so that they were less able to be plagiarised.

TEXT MATCHING SOFTWARE IS MANDATED FOR ALL STUDENTS IN THE FOLLOWING UNITS OF STUDY:

List all units of study, or groups of units of study, in which text matching software is routinely used. If the Faculty is intending to use TMS for some units in the near future these should also be listed along with anticipated commencement date.

The protocols for ensuring academic honesty have mandated the use of text matching software for all assignments in every unit of study in all Faculty of Dentistry programs.

FURTHER COMMENTS

Any further comments are to be listed here

No further comments

Completed by: Denise Fischer
Position: Student Affairs Manager
Date: 15 June 2016
IN 2015, THE FACULTY RECEIVED THE FOLLOWING NUMBER OF ALLEGATIONS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course level</th>
<th>#allegations</th>
<th>#allegations upheld</th>
<th># referred to the Registrar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*P  *AD</td>
<td>*NP  *DP  AD</td>
<td>NP  DP  AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>18  1</td>
<td>13  5  1</td>
<td>0  0  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTGRADUATE</td>
<td>1  0</td>
<td>0  1  0</td>
<td>0  0  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0  0</td>
<td>0  0  0</td>
<td>0  0  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19  1</td>
<td>13  5  1</td>
<td>0  0  1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P=plagiarism  *AD=academic dishonesty  *NP=negligent plagiarism  *DP=dishonest plagiarism

The above figures represent:

XX % of enrolled undergraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,

XX % of enrolled undergraduate students having allegations upheld;

XX % of enrolled postgraduate students having allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,

XX % of enrolled postgraduate students having allegations upheld.

Where allegations of academic dishonesty/plagiarism were upheld, the following penalties were applied:

UG - 4 students were required to resubmit work; a mark penalty was applied to 14 cases; 6 students were required to attend an academic referencing course. One student's case of academic dishonesty was referred to the Registrar and subsequently the student was excluded for one semester.

PG – The student resubmitted the work (with only a pass mark being possible).

THE FACULTY HANDLED THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER

UG - The majority of plagiarism cases were identified via the use of Turnitin software. Prior to the introduction of an Academic Integrity Officer, all cases were interviewed by the Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching and the relevant unit of study co-ordinator. Admin staff took detailed notes which were then used to formulate letters to the student/s detailing the outcome of their interview/s.

PG – Unit of study coordinator detected plagiarism and confirmed through internet search (no matching text software was used in this case). The Unit of Study coordinator reported to the Course Convenor who met with the student.

THE FOLLOWING STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN BY THE FACULTY TO PROMOTE COMPLIANCE WITH THE EDUCATION STRATEGIES TO FOSTER ACADEMIC HONESTY IN THE ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM POLICY

UG - ALL students are directed to the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism Policy in the Faculty’s Little Blue Book which also includes examples of appropriate APA referencing. The use of Turnitin is clearly stated on all unit outlines.
PG – The core units in the special and inclusive education designation include dissemination about academic integrity. All units dedicate time to discuss the relevant policy and expectations.

TEXT MATCHING SOFTWARE IS MANDATED FOR ALL STUDENTS IN THE FOLLOWING UNITS OF STUDY:
UG - All units of study involving written assessment tasks are required to use Turnitin and staff have attended workshops on its use.
PG – not applicable for 2015 but applicable in all Special and Inclusive Education units of study from 2016, semester 1.

FURTHER COMMENTS

Completed by: Shona Smith
Position: Faculty Manager
Date: 20 June 2016
IN 2015, THE FACULTY RECEIVED THE FOLLOWING NUMBER OF ALLEGATIONS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course level</th>
<th>#allegations</th>
<th>#allegations upheld</th>
<th># referred to the Registrar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>P</em></td>
<td><em>AD</em></td>
<td><em>NP</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTGRADUATE</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P=plagiarism  *AD=academic dishonesty  *NP=negligent plagiarism  *DP=dishonest plagiarism
# One student was involved in both dishonest plagiarism and academic dishonesty (breached the code of conduct)

The above figures represent:
1.9% of enrolled undergraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
1.5% of enrolled undergraduate students having allegations upheld;
2.3% of enrolled postgraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
2% of enrolled postgraduate students having allegations upheld.

Where allegations of academic dishonesty/plagiarism were upheld, the following penalties were applied:

- Re-education and resubmission with grade penalty. Penalties ranged from 15% to 50% of available grade for the assessment based on the amount of plagiarism identified in the paper. For very minor negligent plagiarism students were told to engage in specified re-education strategies and resubmit their assignment. They were then marked down in the grading criteria for the initial plagiarism but no other penalty given.
- Grade penalty: 14 students received 0 for an exam or assignment.
- Other students received other types of penalties relating to the type of assessment where they had been involved in plagiarism or dishonesty. For example five students wrote essays on professionalism and the student code of conduct with regards to practical placements.
- One student was given a fail grade for an entire unit. This was due to forgery of documentation on placement. In at least one other case students failed the unit because they received a 0 grade for their assignment due to dishonest plagiarism.

THE FACULTY HANDLED THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER

- Unit of Study coordinators refer instances of plagiarism to the Director of Student Affairs who handles allegations of plagiarism on behalf of the Faculty.
- The Director of Student Affairs wrote a letter to the student presenting them with the facts of the plagiarism and an assessment of whether they considered it to be negligent or dishonest plagiarism. The student was asked to respond within a week. Once the student had responded then the Director of Student Affairs would discuss the response with the unit of
study coordinator and an appropriate penalty would be devised. This would be relayed to the student in a decision letter which was also placed on the student's record.

- At the start of 2015 the Faculty used Turnitin where requested by unit of study coordinators. Some disciplines use Turnitin more than others and in those disciplines there is a much higher rate of plagiarism detection.
- During 2015 the Faculty resolved to make Turnitin mandatory and this was gradually brought in during 2015.

THE FOLLOWING STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN BY THE FACULTY TO PROMOTE COMPLIANCE WITH THE EDUCATION STRATEGIES TO FOSTER ACADEMIC HONESTY IN THE ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM POLICY

- In 2015 the Faculty made Turnitin mandatory for all units where written assignments are submitted and submission is compatible with Turnitin.
- Turnitin training was offered for Faculty staff members.
- In units where plagiarism is thought to be high but Turnitin cannot be used because assignments are submitted via non-Turnitin-compliant software (Excel), the Unit coordinator has worked with our Educational Designer to develop a matrix to identify submissions more likely to contain plagiarism or collusion. This is being trialled in one unit in Semester 1 2016.
- The Faculty has identified and worked with units where online exams are taking place to limit opportunities for collusion and plagiarism.
- The Faculty developed a working party to address problems of possible collusion and plagiarism in online examinations for distance learning units. Examity is being trialled in Semester 1 in 2016.
- The Faculty produces guidelines for Unit of Study Coordinators which reflect on good academic practice for avoiding plagiarism.
- The Faculty Director of Student Affairs has met with all Disciplines across the Faculty to discuss plagiarism and answer questions.

TEXT MATCHING SOFTWARE IS MANDATED FOR ALL STUDENTS IN THE FOLLOWING UNITS OF STUDY:
The Faculty of Health Sciences mandates the use of Turnitin in all units of study where written assignments are submitted.

FURTHER COMMENTS
No further comments.

Completed by: Dr Jennifer Smith-Merry
Position: Academic Integrity Coordinator, Faculty Director of Student Affairs
Date: 1st June 2016
FACULTY OF LAW
ANNUAL REPORT ON CASES OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY
2015

*PLEASE NOTE, NO STUDENT DETAILS, OR INFORMATION WHICH COULD BE USED TO IDENTIFY INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS, ARE TO BE INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT

IN 2015, THE FACULTY RECEIVED THE FOLLOWING NUMBER OF ALLEGATIONS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course level</th>
<th>#allegations</th>
<th>#allegations upheld</th>
<th># referred to the Registrar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTGRADUATE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 10 1 7 0 1 0 0 0

*P=plagiarism  *AD=academic dishonesty  *NP=negligent plagiarism  *DP=dishonest plagiarism

The above figures represent:

0.13% of 1567 enrolled undergraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,

0.06% of 1567 enrolled undergraduate students having allegations upheld;

0.48% of 2050 enrolled postgraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,

0.34% of 2050 enrolled postgraduate students having allegations upheld.

Where allegations of academic dishonesty/plagiarism were upheld, the following penalties were applied:

- Mark of zero for unit of study
- Revise and resubmit, maximum mark of 50 for unit
- Revise and resubmit, maximum mark of 50 for assessment.
- Rewrite and resubmit, maximum mark of 64 for assessment.
- Rewrite and resubmit, no penalty
- No penalty

THE FACULTY HANDLED THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER

No change from the previously-reported process.

1. Identification of potential breach

Academic staff member ("Lecturer") identifies potential plagiarism or breach of academic honesty. This allegation is brought to the Nominated Academic for academic honesty matters, or the Executive Officer.

Potential breaches are identified using academic judgement. Some units of study use electronic text-matching (TurnItIn) to assist initial identification or to identify possible original sources of matched...
text. The Lecturer may, but need not, view a report produced by the TurnItIn software. Where the Lecturer does consult the report, the report will be only one of the factors to be considered in determining whether a student may have engaged in plagiarism. Ultimately, the identification of plagiarism remains a matter for the relevant academic exercising his/her own professional judgment.

2. Commence official proceedings

The Nominated Academic makes preliminary assessment. If this preliminary assessment is that a breach of the policy has occurred, formal proceedings are commenced.

3. Initial letter to student

Letter sent to student on behalf of the Nominated Academic.

The letter will:

a) inform the student that a question has been raised about academic honesty in their assessment (e.g. words and ideas used without appropriate attribution);

b) specify the details of the allegation, for example by identifying the work alleged to have been copied from; and

c) invite them to a formal meeting to discuss the matter with the Nominated Academic and relevant lecturer; and

d) inform them of their rights under the policy, the availability of support and advice from SRC or SUPRA, and provide a link to the policy register.

Copies of the relevant documents will be provided to the student. Relevant documents may include:

- a copy of the student’s work marked-up to identify alleged plagiarised material, and the source of that material
- a copy of the Turnitin report for the student’s work
- copies of the source material it is alleged the student copied from without attribution, often highlighted to identify the relevant sections.

4. Meeting and assessment of student response

The Nominated Academic (and lecturer, where possible) will meet with the student to discuss the concerns. The Nominated Academic assesses the response of the student and the evidence available to make a determination as to the outcome.

Finding 1: No impropriety

The Nominated Academic sends a letter to the student thanking them for their explanation and reporting that the matter has been dismissed.

Finding 2: Negligent plagiarism; dishonest plagiarism or academic dishonesty

The Nominated Academic sends a letter to the student informing them of the finding of negligent / dishonest plagiarism / academic dishonesty and the outcome. The letter will:

a) inform the student of the outcome

b) ask them to sign and return a written warning (if one was not completed at the meeting), or provide them with a copy if one has been completed;

c) other necessary elements, included in the letter template, such as rights to appeal, location of policy, and consequences of subsequent breach.

5. Return of written warning and record-keeping

The Executive Officer maintains the official records, including copies of all correspondence and relevant documentation.
When the student returns the written warning it will be added to the official records. A copy of the signed written warning and outcome letter will be added to the student's general file (maintained by the University Records Service) and a copy sent to the Registrar.

Text-matching software
Since the University obtained an institutional licence for Turnitin it has been available for use across all units of study in the Law School. Students are informed that any work they submit may be subject to submission to Turnitin.
As of 2014, all work submitted via the LMS is submitted to Turnitin.

THE FOLLOWING STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN BY THE FACULTY TO PROMOTE COMPLIANCE WITH THE EDUCATION STRATEGIES TO FOSTER ACADEMIC HONESTY IN THE ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM POLICY

The Faculty spends much time and effort trying to educate students about acceptable academic honesty practice. Information is included in all unit of study outlines (extracted below from 2013 unit of study outline template), and a checklist and link to policy on all assessment cover sheets (including eLearning Management System).

Students are informed in the foundation units of study about academic honesty expectations and appropriate referencing. Lecturers in all classes often dedicate large sections of classes to discussing expectations regarding academic honesty and referencing, especially in the foundation compulsory units of study Foundations of Law and Legal Reasoning and the Common Law System. The Induction and Orientation programs for new students and international students stress the importance of understanding the policy and adhering to appropriate legal writing and referencing guidelines. It is noted that this is especially important in law, where an adverse finding can affect a graduate’s ability to enter professional practice.

In July 2014 a new website on "Learning and Teaching" was launched. This site contains a dedicated tab for academic dishonesty and plagiarism, an extensive guide to legal writing, as well as guides and examples of the three main forms of assessment in Law: essays, legal problem questions and case studies.

TEXT MATCHING SOFTWARE IS MANDATED FOR ALL STUDENTS IN THE FOLLOWING UNITS OF STUDY:
All units of study

FURTHER COMMENTS
Any further comments are to be listed here

Completed by: Peter Lead
Position: Executive Officer
Date: 25 May 2016
FACULTY OF MEDICINE Report 1 relating to IPM issue only
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REDACTED

REDACTED
ACADEMIC STANDARDS & POLICY COMMITTEE
**FACULTY OF MEDICINE - Report 2**

**ANNUAL REPORT ON CASES OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY**

**2015**

*PLEASE NOTE, NO STUDENT DETAILS, OR INFORMATION WHICH COULD BE USED TO IDENTIFY INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS, ARE TO BE INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT*

---

**IN 2015, THE FACULTY RECEIVED THE FOLLOWING NUMBER OF ALLEGATIONS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course level</th>
<th># allegations</th>
<th># allegations upheld</th>
<th># referred to the Registrar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>P</em></td>
<td><em>AD</em></td>
<td><em>NP</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDERGRADUATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBBS (other than IPM)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POSTGRADUATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P=plagiarism  *AD=academic dishonesty  *NP=negligent plagiarism  *DP=dishonest plagiarism

The above figures represent:

- 0.13 % of enrolled **undergraduate Science** students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
- 0.13 % of enrolled **undergraduate Science** students having allegations upheld;

- 0.35% of enrolled **undergraduate MBBS** students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them, (see separate report re IPM issue)
- 0.35% of enrolled **undergraduate MBBS** students having had allegations of upheld; (see separate report re IPM issue)

- 0.7 % of enrolled **postgraduate coursework** students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
- 0.7 % of enrolled **postgraduate coursework** students having allegations upheld.

**Where allegations of academic dishonesty/plagiarism were upheld, the following penalties were applied:**

**Undergraduate Science**

The outcomes were: Mark adjustment (two students), fail grade awarded (one), required to rewrite essay (eight), sent for remedial training (three, including one student required to rewrite essay).

**MBBS (other than IPM)**

There was one case of negligent plagiarism within the MBBS Research Project GDMP4110 unit of study. This student was permitted to re-submit the work in their own words after counselling and direction to the appropriate guidelines and policy. The student's supervisor also worked with the student to develop the student's knowledge of appropriate referencing in academic writing.

The student would have been eligible for award of Honours if the report had not been determined to be in breach of the academic standards. Once the student resubmitted the report and no further detection of plagiarism was made, the student was granted a pass in the unit of study. The student was not eligible for the award of Honours.
Postgraduate Coursework (School of Public Health)
Eight cases of negligent plagiarism (two Health Policy, two Clinical Epidemiology, four International Public Health. Students were asked to re-submit assessment and undergo a program of training in academic honesty.

Five cases of dishonest plagiarism (one Master of Surgery, one Clinical Epidemiology, one Public Health, and two International Public Health. Students were asked to re-submit assessment and undergo a program of training in academic honesty. Students were reported to Student Affairs.

Two cases of academic dishonesty, not serious enough to constitute student misconduct (two Clinical Epidemiology). Students were asked to re-submit the assessment and reported to Student Affairs.

THE FACULTY HANDLED THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER

Undergraduate Science
Students alleged to have committed negligent plagiarism were interviewed by the unit of study coordinator who decided the matter on the basis of their views on its merits.

MBBS
Since 2013 all final submissions for GDMP4110 Research Project have been submitted via plagiarism detecting software, Turnitin. References, bibliographies and small word counts are omitted from the text-matching search. All submitted reports produce a similarity score that is manually checked to confirm whether or not there is evidence of plagiarism. After the student's research report was found to have a high similarity match, it was reviewed by both Honours Sub-Deans. The Sub-Deans determined that the student appeared to have engaged in plagiarism. The Sub-Deans met with the student and their supervisor to discuss the similarity index and the student's work. The student and supervisor both asserted that it was negligent plagiarism. The Sub-Deans reviewed all evidence and determined that the student engaged in negligent plagiarism.

Postgraduate Coursework (School of Public Health)
The School's Office for Teaching & Learning sends all unit coordinators information and links to policy regarding academic dishonesty. See attached document.

THE FOLLOWING STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN BY THE FACULTY TO PROMOTE COMPLIANCE WITH THE EDUCATION STRATEGIES TO FOSTER ACADEMIC HONESTY IN THE ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM POLICY

Sydney Medical Program
The Sydney Medical Program has specific policies governing professionalism and appropriate conduct for medical students - the SMP Statement of Expectations Local Provisions (2013). The Statement of Expectations includes specific provisions requiring medical students (MBBS and MD) to be familiar and comply with the University of Sydney Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism Policy.

Students are asked to adhere to academic honesty in barrier assessments such as MCQs through the undertaking at the start of each question paper: 
Reproduction of any part of this Examination in any form is expressly forbidden. Failure to comply with this direction will be dealt with under the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy 2012 and the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 of the University of Sydney.

Sydney Medical School is currently establishing a Professionalism and Performance Committee for the Sydney Medical Program that will review students in difficulty and recommend/require support or remediation measures to improve their knowledge or behaviours.
Students involved in research are given specific instruction about the requirements for academic writing, with all medical students completing concurrent research higher degrees required to complete a mandatory unit on research ethics, taught by the School of Public Health.

All written work for the Sydney Medical Program including MD project reports are subject to text matching software on submission for assessment.

From 2016 all students in Years 1 and 2 are required to complete the Academic Honesty online module, and it is strongly recommended for those currently in Year 3. This will lead, from 2018, to all medical students having completed the module.

Postgraduate Coursework Programs
Managing and promoting compliance in all programs is managed in similar ways across Sydney Medical School, including:

- Students being required to acknowledge an "Acceptance of Compliance" before submitting any assessment via Blackboard;
- Students being enrolled in an academic honesty module on commencement of their course and each time they submit a written assignment they must make a declaration which confirms they have indeed completed that module;
- All students must complete the interactive tutorial about Plagiarism and Academic Dishonesty available through the University Library page. This provides a Certificate of Completion which must be submitted as part of their first assessment task;
- Students have to either attend in person or watch online the Academic Writing and Plagiarism tutorial designed and delivered by staff before submitting their first assignment;
- Customised online tutorial about academic honesty which all students have to complete before being allowed to submit any assignments;
- The definition of academic honesty is explained in early lectures and on release of assignments;
- Students are provided with a link to the relevant University policies.

TEXT MATCHING SOFTWARE IS MANDATED FOR ALL STUDENTS IN THE FOLLOWING UNITS OF STUDY:

Undergraduate Science
All units of study requiring written submission are using tendon software in compliance with University policy.

Medicine Coursework Programs
Turnitin is compulsory for all 'standard' written assignments across all courses.

Postgraduate Coursework (School of Public Health)
It is standard practice to use Turnitin for ‘standard’ written assignment across all courses.

Completed by: Ria Deamer
Position: Operations and Project Manager
Date: 15 June 2016
Dear Unit Coordinators,

‘What do I do if my student’s assignment shows text matching in Turnitin and/or I suspect my student has plagiarised or has been academically dishonest?’

- FIRST – be aware that all SPH coursework students are well informed about the academic dishonesty and plagiarism through: Orientation, OTL student emails each semester, compulsory completion of the SPH Academic Honesty Module in their first Semester of coursework (located on BlackBoard) and the assessment submission process (all students are required to complete a declaration which includes awareness of Policy and Procedures).

- NEXT – consider the type and degree of matching on the Turnitin report (see the ‘SPH Turnitin Guidelines’ on the SPH Resources Teaching Hub site under Assessment and Academic Dishonesty/Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism to help you interpret Turnitin reports), if necessary talk to your course coordinator, then categorise the incident as either:

  1. Poor Academic Practice for improvement (Academic dishonesty or plagiarism unlikely)

     OR

  2. Academic Dishonesty and/or Plagiarism (Negligent or Dishonest) likely.

1. Poor Academic Practice

These incidents are less than ‘borderline’ and are not serious enough to make an allegation of Academic Dishonesty or Plagiarism. As an academic, however, you may have concern that the student is at risk of inadvertently committing plagiarism or academic dishonesty in the future and feel that the student would benefit from some education about good academic writing practice, reminding about Academic Dishonesty or Plagiarism, and having the incident recorded as ‘Poor Academic Practice’ on the SPH Academic Dishonesty register. The record of this incident can then be used to monitor the student and inform other unit coordinators in case of future similar incidents that may warrant further intervention.

Mark penalties for these types of incidents should not be imposed UNLESS you have pre-specified X% of marks for a certain standard of academic writing practice or similar in your assessment marking criteria (see the SPH Teaching Hub/Assessment and Academic Dishonesty/ ‘Assignment marking guide template’ for some ideas about how to do this). If you think a penalty should be imposed, but do not have a mechanism to do this through your assessment marking criteria, then perhaps the incident should be reconsidered as the more
serious category of Academic Dishonesty and/or Plagiarism (Negligent or Dishonest) likely. A ‘Poor Academic Practice’ letter template that can be used to send to a student is available on the SPH Teaching Hub.

2. Academic Dishonesty and/or Plagiarism (Negligent or Dishonest) likely

These incidents are where a “preliminary view” is formed “that the alleged conduct, if proved, would constitute negligent plagiarism, dishonest plagiarism or some other form of academic misconduct”. If the incident is likely to fall into this category then discuss this with the unit coordinator or program course coordinator. If the ‘nominated academic’ (usually the unit and/or course coordinator) form the “preliminary view” above then they must follow University Policy and Procedures concerning Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism see:


The documents can also be found by searching for ‘Academic Dishonesty’ in the University Policy register.

NOTE: The University Procedure above provides a very helpful checklist to guide the management of Academic Dishonesty and/or Plagiarism allegations.

Letter templates to support your communication with students around alleged incidents of Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism can be found on the SPH Teaching Hub.

In sequence we recommend you use:

1. Standard Academic Dishonesty/Plagiarism - First contact letter - to arrange a meeting with the student to investigate the allegation (then follow up with 2nd and 3rd contact letters if the student doesn’t respond)

2. ‘Warning’ letter - after the student meeting use this template to summarise the incident and the meeting, state the determination (i.e. negligent plagiarism or dishonest plagiarism or some other form of academic dishonesty, or no impropriety) and action required. Where there is a determination of Academic Dishonesty or Plagiarism a copy of this letter will be sent to the University Student Affairs unit as part of SPH OTL reporting.

If you are unsure about the seriousness of an incident or, if it is a repeat incident and/or serious incident where referral to the Registrar is being considered, then please discuss with the Course Coordinator and the SPH Director of Teaching and Learning (Assessment and Evaluation).

The SPH context - some information to assist your implementation of the University Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism Policy and Procedures:

- The ‘nominated academic’: In the first instance the examiner will usually discuss their concerns with the Unit Coordinator. Then, if they both suspect plagiarism, or some other form of academic dishonesty, they will discuss this with the Course
plagiarism, or other academic dishonesty. Also copy the School OTL into your correspondence with the student so that copies can be kept at the SPH. The University procedure requires record-keeping at the Faculty level (managed at the SPH by the OTL) and if there is a determination of plagiarism or other form of academic dishonesty the University Student Affairs Unit will also need to be advised (this will be managed at the end of each semester by the School OTL in consultation with the relevant academic). When an incident is reported up to the University Student Affairs Unit a copy of the post-student meeting “Warning Letter” will also be sent to the Student Affairs Unit.

Other helpful Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism resources

SPH Resources Teaching Hub on BlackBoard – look under Assessment and Academic Dishonesty/Academic Honesty and Plagiarism.

SPH Academic Honesty Module on BlackBoard (all students are expected to complete this in their first semester).

Student SPH ‘Student Orientation Guide - Part 4: Assessment and Academic dishonesty’ on Blackboard and hard copies in OTL office.

University Student Affairs Unit:  http://sydney.edu.au/student_affairs/plagiarism/index.shtml


If you have any further questions please contact me or the SPH Office for Teaching and Learning.

Sharon Reid

Dr Sharon Reid
MBBS MPH FRACGP DRANZCOG DipPaed
SPH Director of Teaching and Learning (Assessment and Evaluation)
Senior Lecturer Clinical Epidemiology
School of Public Health
Room 325 Edward Ford Building (A27)
University of Sydney
NSW 2006
Tel: 61-2-9303-9126
Fax: 61-2-9351-5049
sharon.reid@sydney.edu.au
Coordinator to decide whether to take the matter further.

- **Past history of Plagiarism or Academic dishonesty:** Academics suspecting plagiarism or academic dishonesty should always check with the SPH Office for Teaching and Learning (OTL) and the SPH Academic Dishonesty database to see if there is a past history or concurrent issues known to the SPH. A database kept by the University Student Affairs Unit can also be checked if there are concerns about other University incidents outside the SPH.

- **If an interview with the student to discuss Plagiarism or Academic Dishonesty is considered appropriate** then follow the Policy and Procedure above but be aware that academic judgement will always be required. For example; to determine if a face-to-face interview is feasible. As noted in the University Procedure email correspondence, (or a teleconference, Skype, or other means of electronic communication) can replace a face to face interview if necessary.

- **Who should be at the interview?** Usually at least two academics including the examiner, unit coordinator and/or course coordinator. The student should be informed of the option of involving a support person, eg. SUPRA.

- **Communicating with the student:** Correspondence/Letter templates are available for your use on the SPH Teaching Hub (these will need to be adapted to your particular student situation). Students should be given the opportunity to consider the allegation and any supporting material. According to University Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy 2012, 5.2 Procedural Fairness (link above) the rights of students include to be “informed of the allegations against them in sufficient detail to enable them to understand the precise nature of the allegations and properly to respond to them;”. For example this might include the provision of a copy of the Turnitin report to the student if judged appropriate by the academic, accompanied by the SPH Turnitin Guidelines for students, also available on the SPH Teaching Hub site. Students should also be provided a copy of their Turnitin report upon their request.

- **Interview outcome:** In most ‘first offence’ incidents of alleged plagiarism or academic dishonesty at the SPH the outcome after meeting with the student is usually either ‘no impropriety’ or ‘negligent plagiarism’. However, if the matter seems more serious you should discuss with your Course Coordinator and the Director of Teaching and Learning (Assessment and Evaluation). These ‘first offence’ interviews are often seen as an opportunity to give strong feedback to the student and further educate them about plagiarism and academic honesty. Depending on the academic decision at the end of the interview the Unit Coordinator may or may not decide on a penalty e.g. re-do the assignment or another assignment, with max 50% mark. However, no penalty is to be imposed on the work for the alleged plagiarism/dishonesty unless the incident has been managed in accordance with the University Policy and Procedures.

- **Upon conclusion of this process:** Communicate with the student according to the Policy and Procedures (see the letter templates on the SPH Teaching Hub) and **please let the School OTL know the outcome, e.g. no impropriety, negligent or dishonest**
**ACADEMIC STANDARDS & POLICY COMMITTEE**

**SYDNEY NURSING SCHOOL**

**ANNUAL REPORT ON CASES OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY**

2015

*PLEASE NOTE, NO STUDENT DETAILS, OR INFORMATION WHICH COULD BE USED TO IDENTIFY INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS, ARE TO BE INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT*

---

**IN 2015, THE FACULTY RECEIVED THE FOLLOWING NUMBER OF ALLEGATIONS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course level</th>
<th># allegations</th>
<th># allegations upheld</th>
<th># referred to the Registrar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>P</em> <em>AD</em> NP <em>DP</em> AD</td>
<td>NP DP AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>12 1 12 0 1 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTGRADUATE</td>
<td>7 0 6 1 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>12 0 12 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31 1 30 1 1 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P=plagiarism  *AD=academic dishonesty  *NP=negligent plagiarism  *DP=dishonest plagiarism

The above figures represent:

- 2.25% of enrolled undergraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
- 2.25% of enrolled undergraduate students having allegations upheld;

- 0.8% of enrolled postgraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
- 0.8% of enrolled postgraduate students having allegations upheld.

- 6.1% of enrolled other/undergraduate (SIM) students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
- 6.1% of enrolled other/undergraduate (SIM) students having allegations upheld;

Where allegations of academic dishonesty/plagiarism were upheld, the following penalties were applied:

- 30 negligent plagiarism allegations were upheld for Sydney Nursing School for 2015.
- Of the 30 cases with an upheld decision of negligent plagiarism, students were required to complete an online library module focusing on referencing and resubmit their work for a maximum achievable mark of 50% of the overall total of the assessment item.
- 1 case of academic dishonesty was alleged and upheld. The student received a mark of zero (0) for the assessment item.
- 1 case of dishonest plagiarism was alleged and upheld, the student received a mark of zero (0) for the assessment item; consequently the student received a fail grade for the Unit of Study.
- No cases were referred to the Registrar.

THE FACULTY HANDLED THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER

Students were formally notified via email of the allegation; the email included a formal letter outlining details of the case including Unit of Study and Assessment item, a copy of the student's Turnitin
ACADEMIC STANDARDS & POLICY COMMITTEE

Report, highlighted sources matched from the similarity report and a copy of the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework 2012. Students were invited to attend an interview with the Delegated Academic (Dishonesty and Plagiarism). Sydney Nursing School utilised Turnitin software to detect potential plagiarism and Academic Dishonesty cases.

THE FOLLOWING STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN BY THE FACULTY TO PROMOTE COMPLIANCE WITH THE EDUCATION STRATEGIES TO FOSTER ACADEMIC HONESTY IN THE ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM POLICY

- All SNS Unit of Study Outlines included a link to the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy 2012 and a paragraph outlining the importance and expectations of Academic Integrity.
- Clearly outlining expectations to students to comply with the policy when commencing study: both in Lectures and at Orientation.
- All SNS Unit of Study Blackboard sites included a link to the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy 2012.
- Units of Study Blackboard sites included resources to links for the Write Site and a Library Module focusing on referencing sources.
- Some Units of Study included class sessions with Library staff highlighting the importance of properly referencing sources and applying the APA referencing style to writing.
- Academic Staff reiterate the importance of correct and accurate referencing in all Units of Study.

TEXT MATCHING SOFTWARE IS MANDATED FOR ALL STUDENTS IN THE FOLLOWING UNITS OF STUDY:

Text matching software (Turnitin) was mandated for NURS1002 – Health Assessment in Semester 1 2015. The following Units of Study used text matching software (Turnitin) for suspected plagiarism cases:

NURS5071 – Contemporary Health Leadership (S2 2015)
NURS2002 – Child and Adolescent Health and Care
NURS6004 – Nursing and Politics of Health Care
NURS5078 – Capstone (work-based project)
NURS6026 – Professional Practice (Paediatrics)
NURS1005 – Interruptions to Normal Physoplogy
SNCP3004 – Clinical Practice Project
SNCP3005 – Nursing Management and Clinical Governance
SNCP3010 – Law and Ethics in Health Care

As of Semester 1 2016, all Sydney Nursing School Units of Study mandated use of text matching software (Turnitin) for written assessment items.

FURTHER COMMENTS

“OTHER” category represents the Bachelor of Nursing (Post-Registration), taught in Singapore as part of SIM Global Education.

Completed by: Tamara Kyd
Position: Learning and Teaching Support Officer
Date: 30/06/2016
In 2015, the Faculty received the following number of allegations of academic dishonesty and plagiarism:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course level</th>
<th># allegations</th>
<th># allegations upheld</th>
<th># referred to the Registrar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P  AD NP DP AD</td>
<td>NP DP AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>14 1 5 1 1</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTGRADUATE</td>
<td>10 0 3 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24 1 8 1 1</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P=plagiarism *AD=academic dishonesty *NP=negligent plagiarism *DP=dishonest plagiarism

The above figures represent:
1.5% of enrolled undergraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
0.7% of enrolled undergraduate students having allegations upheld;
7.1% of enrolled postgraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
2.1% of enrolled postgraduate students having allegations upheld.

Where allegations of academic dishonesty/plagiarism were upheld, the following penalties were applied:

All students (N=10) received zero for the plagiarised work
All students (N=10) were required to redo work
Two students received a Fail grade.

The outcome of the student case referred to the Registrar was that it was upheld - the student was excluded from university for one semester and received a fail grade.

The Faculty handled the allegations in the following manner:

Students were contacted via email containing a letter from the Associate Dean Learning and Teaching requesting they attend for an interview. In all cases except for one, allegations were made for group work assignments. All group members were interviewed separately. Those not found to have taken part in plagiarism were not penalised. Those that were received the penalties outlined above. The faculty uses Turnitin text matching software and academic markers’ vigilance.

The following steps have been taken by the Faculty to promote compliance with the education strategies to foster academic honesty in the academic dishonesty and plagiarism policy.
In 2015, all Bachelor of Pharmacy and Master of Pharmacy students were required to undertake the University Library’s online plagiarism module, and provide evidence of completion to a unit of study co-ordinator. All marking criteria for assessment tasks include criteria on correct referencing and citations. All Unit of Study outlines contain a section on academic honesty. In 2016, in line with University policy, all commencing students will be required to undertake the new online academic honesty module.

TEXT MATCHING SOFTWARE IS MANDATED FOR ALL STUDENTS IN THE FOLLOWING UNITS OF STUDY:

PHAR1811, PHAR1812, PHAR 1821, 3rd Yr drug profile, PHAR2821, PHAR4814, PHAR4815, PHAR4824, PHAR4825, PHAR4826, PHAR4830, PHAR4832, PHAR4831 and PHAR5505, PHAR5512, and PHAR5513.

For 2016, all units of study in the Bachelor of Pharmacy and Master of Pharmacy which contain written assignments, including lab reports will be using Turnitin.

FURTHER COMMENTS

Completed by: Associate Professor Lorraine Smith
Position: Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching, Faculty of Pharmacy
Date: 22nd June, 2016
IN 2015, THE FACULTY RECEIVED THE FOLLOWING NUMBER OF ALLEGATIONS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course level</th>
<th># allegations</th>
<th># allegations upheld</th>
<th># referred to the Registrar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*P</td>
<td>*AD</td>
<td>*NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTGRADUATE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>123</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P=plagiarism  *AD=academic dishonesty  *NP=negligent plagiarism  *DP=dishonest plagiarism

The above figures represent:
1.250 % of enrolled undergraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
1.042 % of enrolled undergraduate students having allegations upheld;

1.183 % of enrolled postgraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
1.183 % of enrolled postgraduate students having allegations upheld.

[Total number of enrolled undergraduate students in Science units of study (unique SIDs) = 12,481]
*Includes UG Medicine units of study administered by the Faculty of Science, e.g. ANAT2008, PHSI3005.
*Includes TSP units of study administered by the Faculty of Science
*Includes students from other Faculties enrolled in Science units of study.

[Total number of enrolled postgraduate students in Science units of study (unique SIDs) = 761]
*Includes students from other Faculties enrolled in Science units of study.

The above figures also represent:
0.314 % of undergraduate enrolment instances having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
0.262 % of undergraduate enrolment instances having allegations upheld;

0.396 % of postgraduate enrolment instances having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
0.396 % of postgraduate enrolment instances having allegations upheld.

[Total number of undergraduate enrolment instances in Science units of study = 49,646]
*Includes UG Medicine units of study administered by the Faculty of Science, e.g. ANAT2008, PHSI3005.
*Includes TSP units of study administered by the Faculty of Science
*Includes students from other Faculties enrolled in Science units of study.

[Total number of postgraduate enrolment instances in Science units of study = 2,275]
*Includes students from other Faculties enrolled in Science units of study.
Where allegations of academic dishonesty/plagiarism were upheld, the following penalties were applied:

Of the 134 cases not referred to the Registrar:
- 6 – Fail grade applied to the unit of study
- 21 – Fail mark applied to assessment
- 89 – Mark penalty applied to the assessment
- 8 – Resubmission or alternative assessment
- 9 – Warning only (no penalty applied)
- 1 – Remark

Of the 6 cases referred to the Registrar:
- 1 – Investigations ongoing (no outcome yet)
- 1 – Referred back to the faculty
- 4 – Suspension AND Fail grades
- 0 – Expulsion AND Fail grades

THE FACULTY HANDLED THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER

PROCESS SUMMARY

1. When plagiarism is suspected by a marker or examiner, the matter is raised with the designated Nominated Academic within each School or Discipline.
2. In consultation with the marker or examiner, the Nominated Academic determines the specific allegations made against the student and comes to a preliminary finding.
3. The student is informed by letter and email of the allegations made against them and of the preliminary finding by the Nominated Academic. The student is invited to attend an interview to discuss the allegations. The student is informed of the right to invite a support person to the meeting. The student is also permitted to make a written submission to the Nominated Academic in addition to attending the interview.
4. An interview between the student, the student’s support person, the Nominated Academic and an additional academic member of staff is conducted. During the interview, the student is given the opportunity to explain his or her actions, respond to the allegations and ask further questions. The student is informed that a final determination will be made by the Nominated Academic after full consideration of the allegations and response made by the student in writing or orally during the interview.
5. When a final determination is made by the Nominated Academic, the student is informed by letter and email of the outcome, the consequential penalties and the remedial steps to be taken. The student is also counselled. The student is apprised of their appeal rights and avenues.
6. In cases of dishonest plagiarism or academic dishonesty, the student is issued with a written warning signed and dated by the academic. The student is requested to sign the written warning to acknowledge receipt. A copy of the written warning is forwarded to the Faculty and the Registrar.
7. Where a student has engaged in conduct that the Nominated Academic considers being potential student misconduct, the matter is referred directly to the Registrar. The student’s result for relevant the unit of study is changed to RI (Long Term Incomplete), pending outcome of the Registrar’s investigations.
8. A record of all these processes and correspondence is kept at the School or Discipline Office.

DETECTION METHODS

- Text matching software, including Turnitin, WCpyfind and Google Search
- Manual detection and checking of assessments and coursework by academic staff
- Manual detection and checking of documents submitted to the Faculty by academic and professional staff
- Exam invigilators
DATA ON CASES OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY IS COLLECTED AND STORED AS FOLLOWS:

- The Nominated Academic in each School/Discipline is responsible for maintaining records of all plagiarism and dishonesty cases. The School/Discipline retains original or copies of assignments in which plagiarism or dishonesty is suspected, letters issued to students setting out allegations and inviting them for interview, scribed notes from the interview, letters issued to students setting out the Nominated Academic’s finding and decision (“outcome letters”), and any email correspondence between the School/Discipline and the student on the matter. These records are held both electronically and physically.

- The Nominated Academic in each School/Discipline will forward outcome letters to a staff member in the Faculty of Science Administration Office as well as to the Student Affairs Unit (SAU). The Faculty will log the outcome in the Faculty’s spreadsheet of recorded incidences. The SAU will log the outcome in the central register of recorded incidences.

- Upon request from with the Faculty or the SAU, the School/Discipline is able to produce full records of plagiarism and dishonesty cases. This typically occurs when a student submits a formal Faculty-level or SAB-level academic appeal against the Nominated Academic’s finding and decision.

- When a student submits a formal Faculty-level or SAB-level academic appeal against the Nominated Academic’s finding and decision, the Faculty creates a physical and electronic file through Records Online / TRIM on which all documents are stored and accessible to Faculty and SAU staff involved in administering the appeal matter.

THE FOLLOWING STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN BY THE FACULTY TO PROMOTE COMPLIANCE WITH THE EDUCATION STRATEGIES TO FOSTER ACADEMIC HONESTY IN THE ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM POLICY FOR STUDENTS:

- Discussions about plagiarism occur in lectures, tutorials, practical classes and labs. Lecturers highlight to students the consequences of plagiarism in introductory lectures. Tutors and demonstrators also do this in tutorials and labs. Students are warned against engaging in plagiarism in all forms of work, including written reports and essays. Students are also warned against engaging in academic dishonesty, especially in take-home assessments.

- Web links to the University’s policy on plagiarism and academic dishonesty are included in unit of study outlines, guidebooks and lab manuals, distributed to students at the commencement of the semester. Information about plagiarism and referencing guidelines are posted on Blackboard and e-Learning / LMS websites.

- Students in some units of study are required to complete an additional eLearning module on plagiarism and referencing (e.g. all students in PSYC1001).

- Students are required to complete a Library learning module on plagiarism.

- Students are asked to sign a coversheet for each submitted assignment, acknowledging their compliance with and awareness of the University’s policy on plagiarism. The coversheet also contains an attestation by the student that they have completed the Library learning module.

- Warnings against plagiarism are included in assessment marking criteria.

- In some Schools and Disciplines, students receive an automated email upon assignment submission which provides a link to the University’s policy on plagiarism.
FOR STAFF:

- A web-based intranet for Faculty academic and professional staff provides access to the University policy on academic plagiarism and dishonesty, information on the procedures for dealing with plagiarism and various other resources developed by the Faculty (e.g. flowcharts, letter templates, checklists, etc).
- Academic plagiarism and dishonesty policy and procedures are discussed regularly in Faculty and School Learning and Teaching Committee meetings.
- Administrative staff from each of the Faculty’s various Schools and Disciplines are trained on the policy and procedures for dealing with academic plagiarism and dishonesty.
- New Faculty teaching academic staff members are required to read through and be aware of the University’s policy and procedures for dealing with academic plagiarism and dishonesty.
- Annual emails are sent to all Faculty academic and progression staff informing them of the policy on academic plagiarism and dishonesty.
- A member of staff in the Faculty Administrative Office is available to advise academic and administrative staff on policy and compliance matters.

TEXT MATCHING SOFTWARE IS MANDATED FOR ALL STUDENTS IN THE FOLLOWING UNITS OF STUDY:

ATHK1001 Analytical Thinking
BIOL1001 Concepts in Biology
BIOL1911 Concepts in Biology (Advanced)
BIOL1991 Concepts in Biology (Special Studies)
BIOL1003 Human Biology
BIOL1903 Human Biology (Advanced)
BIOL1993 Human Biology (Special Studies)
BIOL1002 Living Systems
BIOL1902 Living Systems (Advanced)
BIOL2016 Cell Biology
BIOL2916 Cell Biology (Advanced)
BIOL2024Ecology &Conservation
BIOL2924 Ecology &Conservation (Advanced)
BIOL3010 Tropical Wildlife Biol & Management
BIOL3910 Tropical Wildlife Biol & Management (Advanced)
BIOL3013 Marine Biology
BIOL3913 Marine Biology (Advanced)
BIOL3018 Gene Technology and Genomics
BIOL3918 Gene Technology and Genomics (Advanced)
BIOL3045 Animal Ecological Physiology
BIOL3945 Animal Ecological Physiology (Advanced)
BIOL3046 Animal Behaviour
BIOL3946 Animal Behaviour (Advanced)
ENVI5705 Ecology Principles for Environ Scientists
ENVI5904 Methods in Applied Ecology
NEUR3001 Neuroscience: Special Senses
NEUR3901 Neuroscience: Special Senses (Advanced)
NEUR3002 Neuroscience: Motor Systems & Behaviour
NEUR3902 Neuroscience: Motor Systems & Behav. Adv
PHSI2005 Integrated Physiology A
PHSI2905 Integrated Physiology A (Advanced)
PHSI2006 Integrated Physiology B
PHSI2906 Integrated Physiology B (Advanced)
PHYS3040 Electromagnetism / Lab
PHYS3940 Electromagnetism / Lab (Adv)
PHYS3941 Electromagnetism (Adv) / Special Project
PHYS3042 Quantum Physics / Astrophysics / Plasma Physics
PHYS3942 Quantum Physics / Astrophysics / Plasma Physics (Adv)
PHYS3043 Quantum Physics / Astrophysics / Computational Physics
PHYS3943 Quantum Physics / Astrophysics / Computational Physics (Adv)
PHYS3044 Quantum Physics / Plasma Physics / Computational Physics
PHYS3944 Quantum Physics / Plasma Physics / Computational Physics (Adv)
PHYS3015 Topics in Senior Physics A
PHYS3915 Topics in Senior Physics A (Adv)
PHYS3039 Quantum Physics / Computational Physics / Lab
PHYS3939 Quantum Physics / Computational Physics / Lab (Adv)
PHYS3090 Statistical Mechanics / Lab
PHYS3990 Statistical Mechanics / Lab (Adv)
PHYS3991 Statistical Mechanics (Adv) / Special Project
PHYS3068 Condensed Matter Physics / Optics / Lab
PHYS3968 Condensed Matter Physics / Optics / Lab (Adv)
PHYS3069 High Energy Physics / Optics / Lab
PHYS3969 High Energy Physics / Optics / Lab (Adv)
PHYS3074 Condensed Matter Physics / High Energy Physics / Lab
PHYS3974 Condensed Matter Physics / High Energy Physics / Lab (Adv)
PHYS3080 Condensed Matter Physics / High Energy Physics / Optics
PHYS3980 Condensed Matter Physics / High Energy Physics / Optics (Adv)
PHYS3025 Topics in Senior Physics B
PHYS3925 Topics in Senior Physics B (Adv)
PSYC1001 Psychology 1001
PSYC1002 Psychology 1002
PSYC2011 Brain and Behaviour
PSYC2911 Brain and Behaviour (Advanced)
PSYC2012 Statistics & Research Methods for Psych
PSYC2013 Cognitive and Social Psychology
PSYC2014 Personality and Intelligence 1
PSYC3010 Advanced Statistics for Psychology
PSYC3011 Learning and Behaviour
PSYC3012 Cognition, Language and Thought
PSYC3013 Perceptual Systems
PSYC3014 Behavioural and Cognitive Neuroscience
PSYC3914 Behavioural and Cognitive Neuroscience (Advanced)
PSYC3015 Personality and Intelligence 2
PSYC3016 Developmental Psychology
PSYC3017 Social Psychology
PSYC3018 Abnormal Psychology
PSYC3020 Applications of Psychological Science
PSYC4011 Psychology Honours A
PSYC4012 Psychology Honours B
Faculty is in the process of implementing Turnitin for all units with written work from commencement of Semester 1, 2016 as required under the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015.

FURTHER COMMENTS
No further comments.

Completed by: Jessie Alchin
Position: Quality Assurance Officer
Date: 30/6/2016
In 2015, the faculty received the following number of allegations of academic dishonesty and plagiarism:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course level</th>
<th># allegations</th>
<th># allegations upheld</th>
<th># referred to the Registrar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*P</td>
<td>*AD</td>
<td>*NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTGRADUATE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P=plagiarism  *AD=academic dishonesty  *NP=negligent plagiarism  *DP=dishonest plagiarism

The above figures represent:
- <1% of enrolled undergraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
- <1% of enrolled undergraduate students having allegations upheld;
- 0% of enrolled postgraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
- 0% of enrolled postgraduate students having allegations upheld.

Where allegations of academic dishonesty/plagiarism were upheld, the following penalties were applied:

With the exception of the single student with the allegation dismissed, each student was permitted to resubmit the work. Two students were permitted to resubmit work without further penalty if they attended an academic referencing course, three students were permitted to resubmit on a pass/fail basis only. All students subsequently passed the unit of study. The Registrar was informed of one instance of Academic Dishonesty, but no further action was required.

The Faculty handled the allegations in the following manner:

All students are required to meet with the Associate Dean (L&T) to respond to the allegation. ADL&T counsels student on appropriate methodology to prevent further occurrences, e.g. correct academic referencing, awareness that the recycling of essays is a breach of academic honesty policy, etc. If further education is required, students are directed to attend remedial course (Learning Centre) Instances of academic dishonesty are reported to Registrar and students warned of possible sanctions should a similar breach occur in the future. All students required to comply with action directed by senior academic staff and to co-sign a record of the meeting with ADL&T.

Text matching software is the principal identification tool employed to identify academic dishonesty, combined with staff experience and familiarity with a broad range of reference and research material. Academic Board has been previously advised of Faculty use of Turnitin and the use of text matching software is acknowledged in unit of study outlines.
THE FOLLOWING STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN BY THE FACULTY TO PROMOTE COMPLIANCE WITH THE EDUCATION STRATEGIES TO FOSTER ACADEMIC HONESTY IN THE ACADEMIC
DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM POLICY

Clear guidelines are communicated to all students from Orientation presentations to the provision of links to appropriate websites on unit of study outlines and student bulletins prior to assessment due dates. First year critical thinking units of study were expanded to incorporate specific instruction on referencing requirements and academic honesty policy. Students are encouraged to attend Learning Centre workshops or to engage with online tutorials provided by the Learning Centre. Faculty-specific writing and referencing workshops conducted for Honours candidates.

TEXT MATCHING SOFTWARE IS MANDATED FOR ALL STUDENTS IN THE FOLLOWING UNITS OF STUDY:
All Critical Thinking units of study, including CATE1001; CATE1002; CATE2007; CATE2014; CATE2016; CATE2017; CATE2021; CATE2022; CATE2024; CATE2025; CATE2026; CACA5001; CACA5002; CACA5003; CAHO4001; CAHO4002; CAHO4003; CAHO4004; CAMI5005

Completed by: KERRY STERN
Position: SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER
Date: 28 April, 2016.
Sydney Conservatorium of Music
ANNUAL REPORT ON CASES OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY 2015

*PLEASE NOTE, NO STUDENT DETAILS, OR INFORMATION WHICH COULD BE USED TO IDENTIFY INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS, ARE TO BE INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT

IN 2015, THE FACULTY RECEIVED THE FOLLOWING NUMBER OF ALLEGATIONS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course level</th>
<th># allegations</th>
<th># allegations upheld</th>
<th># referred to the Registrar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P  AD NP DP AD</td>
<td>NP DP AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>23 2 19 4 2</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTGRADUATE</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23 2 19 4 2</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P=plagiarism  *AD=academic dishonesty  *NP=negligent plagiarism  *DP=dishonest plagiarism

The above figures represent:
.03 % of enrolled undergraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them, .03 % of enrolled undergraduate students having allegations upheld;

0 % of enrolled postgraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them, 0 % of enrolled postgraduate students having allegations upheld.

Where allegations of academic dishonesty/plagiarism were upheld, the following penalties were applied:
Almost all cases of Negligent Plagiarism received a mark penalty proportional to the amount and type of plagiarism. Almost all cases of Dishonest Plagiarism received zero for the assignment. One Academic Honesty case resulted in a mark of zero for the exam in question, and the other a mark penalty for the assignment.

THE FACULTY HANDLED THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER
All cases reported to the Nominated Academic were dealt with according to the Policy and Procedures. Cases were mostly detected with similarity detection software although some were detected by examiners on reading assignments. Only some UoS used similarity detecting software in 2015 since it was at the discretion of UoS coordinators.

THE FOLLOWING STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN BY THE FACULTY TO PROMOTE COMPLIANCE WITH THE EDUCATION STRATEGIES TO FOSTER ACADEMIC HONESTY IN THE ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM POLICY
Students are taught referencing in some large Musicology and Arts Music subjects, and Honours and Research preparation and skills classes. Students in some classes are given exercises in identifying when paraphrasing is successful and when it is plagiarism. Referencing style guides are distributed in large Musicology and Arts Music classes.

TEXT MATCHING SOFTWARE IS MANDATED FOR ALL STUDENTS IN THE FOLLOWING UNITS OF STUDY:
In 2016, as per the recommendations provided to us, all text-based assignments are subject to text matching software.

FURTHER COMMENTS

Completed by: Rachel Campbell  
Position: Nominated Academic for Academic Honesty and Plagiarism  
Date: 27 June 2016
IN 2015, THE FACULTY RECEIVED THE FOLLOWING NUMBER OF ALLEGATIONS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course level</th>
<th># allegations</th>
<th># allegations upheld</th>
<th># referred to the Registrar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*P  *AD  *NP  *DP  AD</td>
<td>NP  DP  AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>6 0 5 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTGRADUATE</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7 0 5 2 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P=plagiarism  *AD=academic dishonesty  *NP=negligent plagiarism  *DP=dishonest plagiarism

The above figures represent:
0.57% of enrolled undergraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
0.57% of enrolled undergraduate students having allegations upheld;

0.61% of enrolled postgraduate students having had allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them,
0.61% of enrolled postgraduate students having allegations upheld.

Where allegations of academic dishonesty/plagiarism were upheld, the following penalties were applied:
- VETS3242: 5 x negligent plagiarism – depending on the level of plagiarism detected by the text matching software, students lost half or all of the mark they obtained.
- VETS4135: 1 x plagiarism – student copied another student’s assignment. 42% content was found to be matching. Student’s mark was reduced by 42%.
- VETS9003: 1 x plagiarism – student’s work matched the literature 50%. He was asked to rewrite the topic and submit.

THE FACULTY HANDLED THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER

Methods of detection:
- Text matching software, including Turnitin and Google Search
- Manual detection and checking by academic staff
- Exam invigilators

Process:
- Following detection, the marker or examiner informs the Unit of Study Coordinator, the Associate Dean of Students, the Sub Dean of Students, and the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Programs or the Associate Dean of Postgraduate Programs.
- In consultation with the marker or examiner, a nominated academic determines the specific allegations made against the student and comes to a preliminary finding.
- The student is notified of the allegation in writing, and a meeting is arranged. The student is also informed of the right to invite a support person to the meeting and to make a written response to the allegation.
- The nominated academic and another academic member of staff meet with the student and their support person. The student is given an opportunity to explain their actions, respond to the allegation and ask further questions. The student is informed that a final determination will be made after full consideration of the allegation and the student's responses. The student is also offered counselling.
- A final determination is made by the nominated academic. If the allegation is upheld, the nominated academic consults with the Unit of Study Coordinator regarding the penalties and remedial steps to be taken.
- The student is informed in writing of the outcome, and the penalties and remedial steps to be taken. The student is also issued with a written warning that they are requested to sign and acknowledge receipt of. A copy of the written warning is kept on record by the Faculty.
- If the nominated academic considers that the student’s conduct constitutes potential student misconduct, the matter is referred to the Registrar.
- If the student has received a prior warning, the matter is referred to the Registrar.

THE FOLLOWING STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN BY THE FACULTY TO PROMOTE COMPLIANCE WITH THE EDUCATION STRATEGIES TO FOSTER ACADEMIC HONESTY IN THE ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM POLICY

For students:
- Students are advised at orientation and degree information sessions that they need to be conversant with the University's policy on Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism.
- Web links to the University’s policy on Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism are included in unit of study outlines, guidebooks and lab manuals, distributed to students at the commencement of the semester. Information about plagiarism and referencing guidelines are posted on Blackboard and e-Learning / LMS websites.
- Students are required to sign a coversheet for each submitted assignment, acknowledging their compliance with and awareness of the University's policy on Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism.

For staff:
- Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism policy and procedures are discussed regularly in Faculty Learning and Teaching Committee meetings and teaching workshops.
- New Faculty teaching staff members are required to be conversant with the University's policy on Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism.

TEXT MATCHING SOFTWARE IS MANDATED FOR ALL STUDENTS IN THE FOLLOWING UNITS OF STUDY:
- ANSC2005
- ANSC3101
- ANSC3105
- ANSC3106
- AVBS3002
- AVBS4013
- AVBS4014
- AVBS4015
- AVBS4016
- AVBS4017
- AVBS4018
- VETS6108

FURTHER COMMENTS
While members of teaching staff are required to be conversant with the University’s policy, the process for handling allegations of academic plagiarism and dishonesty has not always been consistently followed across all programs in the Faculty. Introduction of the new University system to
record plagiarism and academic dishonesty cases will assist in improving the process and achieve consistency across the Faculty. Faculty academics are constantly being reminded to use the new online system to report any suspected cases.

Completed by: Richa Kamrah
Position: Academic Support Manager
Date: 15 June 2016