
ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY COMMITTEE

2:00PM – 4:00PM, TUESDAY 30 MAY 2017

Chair: Professor Jane Hanrahan

Committee Officer: Dr Matthew Charet

T 9114 1356

University Secretariat | Office of the Vice-Chancellor

E matthew.charet@sydney.edu.au

Quadrangle (A14)

sydney.edu.au/secretariat/academic-board-committees/standards-policy-committee

NOTICE OF MEETING

Meeting 4/2017 of the **Academic Standards and Policy Committee** will be held from **2:00pm – 4:00pm** on **Tuesday 30 May 2017** in the Senate Room, Quadrangle. The Agenda for the meeting is below.

Dr Matthew Charet

Executive Officer to Academic Board

AGENDA

	Presenter	Paper
1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES		
Apologies have been received from Associate Professor Alex Chaves and Professor Pip Pattison.		
2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS		
2.1 Minutes of the Previous Meeting	Chair	<i>attached</i>
2.2 Business Arising	Chair	<i>verbal</i>
3 STANDING ITEMS		
3.1 Report of the Chair	Chair	<i>verbal</i>
3.2 Report of Academic Board	Tony Masters	<i>attached</i>
4 ITEMS FOR ACTION		
4.1 University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017	Chair	<i>attached</i>
5 ITEMS FOR NOTING		
5.1 Identifying, embedding and reporting graduate qualities for the Sydney PhD	Ross Coleman	<i>attached</i>
5.2 Providing Extra Advice to Associate Deans (RE) with Respect to Theses containing Potential Issues of Academic Dishonesty	Ross Coleman	<i>attached</i>
6 OTHER BUSINESS		
6.1 Any Other Business		

Next meeting: 2:00pm – 4:00pm, **Tuesday 11 July 2017**
Senate Room, Quadrangle

Remaining meeting dates for 2017:

Tuesday 11 July

Tuesday 8 August

Tuesday 26 September

Tuesday 14 November

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 co-ordinate 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 University Executive, 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 University Executive 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 University Executive 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.



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	18 April 2017
Item No	2.1

Non-Confidential

Author	Dr Matthew Charet, Executive Officer to Academic Board
Reviewer/Approver	Professor Jane Hanrahan, Chair
Paper title	Minutes of the Previous Meeting
Purpose	To seek approval of the minutes of the previous meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolve that the minutes of meeting 3/2017, held on 18 April 2017, be confirmed as a true record.

MINUTES

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY COMMITTEE

2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 18 April 2017

Senate Room, Quadrangle (A14)

Members Present: Professor Jane Hanrahan (Chair); Helen Agus (Science); Dr Vasiliki Betihavas (Nursing); Isabella Brook (President, SRC); Karen Cochrane (Nominee of the President, SUPRA); Dr Frances Di Lauro (Arts & Social Sciences); Associate Professor Geoff Frost (Business); Professor Manuel Graeber (Medicine); Kerrie Henderson (Office of General Counsel); Associate Professor Glen Hill (Architecture, Design & Planning); Georgia Mantle (Student, Arts & Social Sciences); Associate Professor Mark Melatos (Arts & Social Sciences); Associate Professor Maurice Peat (Business); Dr Debra Shirley (Health Sciences); Professor Anne Twomey (Law).

Attendees: Dr Matthew Charet (Secretary); Associate Professor Ross Coleman (Director, Graduate Research) (for Items 5.1 and 5.2); Dr Glenys Eddy (Committee Officer, Secretariat); Tristan Enright (Manager, Educational Integrity) (for Item 4.1).

Apologies: Associate Professor Tim Allender (Education & Social Work); Professor Adam Bridgeman (Director, Educational Innovation); Associate Professor Alex Chaves (Veterinary Science); Associate Professor Tania Gerzina (Dentistry); Associate Professor Peter Gibbens (Engineering & IT); Associate Professor Robyn Gibson (Education & Social Work); Associate Professor Veysel Kayser (Pharmacy); Dr Peter Knight (Medicine); Associate Professor Tony Masters (Chair of the Academic Board); Professor Pip Pattison (Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)); Associate Professor Jennifer Rowley (Conservatorium); Amy Wenham (Student, Nursing).

3/2017

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

Apologies were noted as recorded above.

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

2.1 Minutes of Meeting 2/2017 on 14 March 2017

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as a true record.



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	18 April 2017
Item No	2.1

Non-Confidential

Resolution ASPC17/3-1

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolve that the minutes of meeting 2/2017, held on 14 March 2017, be confirmed as a true record.

2.2 Business Arising

There was no business arising.

3 STANDING ITEMS

3.1 Report of the Chair

The Chair advised that she had nothing to report.

Resolution ASPC17/3-2

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the report of the Chair.

3.2 Report of Academic Board

The Chair drew the attention of members to the written report circulated with the agenda. She highlighted the Academic Board's approval of the broad recommendations made in the Report of the Review of Academic Board, and advised that the future structure of the Board, as agreed by a working party, was presented to and approved at the meeting. The Office of General Counsel is currently drafting a new *University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017*, to replace the existing *University of Sydney (Academic Governance) Rule 2003 (as amended)*, to be presented to Senate for approval.

The Chair also advised that the proposal to change semester duration and dates, as endorsed at the last meeting of the committee, was not supported by the Academic Board.

Resolution ASPC17/3-3

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 28 March 2017.

4 ITEMS FOR ACTION

4.1 Educational Integrity Reports 2016

Mr Enright spoke to this item and advised members that these are the first reports utilising the new pre-populated template. The Office of Educational Integrity has prepared an extensive summary report which provides the broader context for the reports of individual faculties. The reports indicate that faculties are overwhelmingly supportive of the new Educational Integrity policy and procedures, and the new reporting process has allowed faculties to focus on identifying gaps and address issues in implementation.

In discussion, the Chair sought clarification of the status of students who have not completed the online module. Members were informed that to date, 18,000 students have completed the module and that those who have yet to do so have been identified and advised to complete before the end of Semester 1 2017 or risk having their academic record suppressed.

Ms Brook sought an update of the University's trial of Cadmus, noting that a pilot had been conducted in the Business School. A meeting is scheduled with the Deputy Dean (Education) in the Business School to assess whether this tool will be adopted more widely, and if so a proposal to this effect will be circulated via the appropriate committees in due course. Ms Brook also suggested that induction of new academic staff should include training in Educational Integrity. Ms Mantle asked that future development of the module take into consideration opportunities to broaden accessibility, and Mr Enright advised that no negative feedback has been provided by Disability Services relating to the current module but that the program welcomes any further comments in this regard.

It was observed that the statistics provided demonstrate an imbalance in rates of reporting incidents across the University, with Business and Engineering reporting a significantly higher number of incidents than other faculties. The significance of this was discussed, with members being informed that Business was an early adopter of Turnitin and so staff have received more



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	18 April 2017
Item No	2.1

Non-Confidential

training and are more familiar with its use than staff who have recently adopted its use. Under-detection and under-reporting need to be identified at faculty level, and members were advised that faculty Educational Integrity Coordinator has access to unit of study-level data to enable this. Several members reported that colleagues have expressed reluctance to have incidents recorded on a student's academic record and so have potentially under-reported, not understanding that Educational Integrity reporting is held in a separate administrative file and is not included on a student's transcript. There are also possible gaps between the ability to detect incidents and the ability to report on them, suggesting that further training for unit of study coordinators may be desirable.

It was recognised that student communications and education are a key component in fostering academic honesty, and that some forms of assessment are more open to misuse than others. Adjusting the type of assessment was also raised as a possible means of reducing infringement. It is also important to ensure that staff establish a balance between the educational outcomes required for the unit of study with the need to ensure educational integrity, with acknowledgement that it is possible to achieve both objectives through skilful assessment.

The possibility was raised of including in the report the number of students enrolled as well as the number of incidents, with the observation made that this would enable clearer comparisons to be drawn between units of study with different levels of enrolment. Resourcing was identified as the main constraint to providing this level of detail, and that future reports will include the ability to track incidents by faculty of enrolment as well as unit of study.

The committee noted the report and agreed to recommend that the Academic Board constitute a working group to develop University-wide guidelines for the determination of outcomes and penalties.

Resolution ASPC17/3-4

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee:

- (1) *review the Educational Integrity Annual Report 2016, the faculty educational integrity reports and recommend steps to be taken by each faculty to further ensure the academic integrity of their courses;*
- (2) *recommend that the Academic Board constitute a working group comprised of faculty Educational Integrity Coordinators and supported by the Office of Educational Integrity to develop University-wide guidelines for the determination of outcomes and penalties; and*
- (3) *recommend that the Academic Board discuss the feasibility of constituting and resourcing a cross-faculty research group to conduct in-depth analysis of the incidence of plagiarism and academic dishonesty at the University.*

5 ITEMS FOR NOTING

5.1 Identifying the academic integrity and milestone actions within the *Progress and Planning for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015*

Associate Professor Coleman spoke to this paper, advising that the proposal emerged from the recommendations of the Educational Integrity Taskforce regarding HDR students. It is proposed to amend the *Progress and Planning for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015* to require the submission by HDR students of a substantial piece of written work at the end of the first year of candidature, which will then be checked using Turnitin. Any educational integrity issues that might be identified via this process can then be addressed by the supervisor in the early stages of candidature. Implementation will necessitate the development of a Turnitin site for all supervisors as well as training in how to use the tool, which has delayed implementation at the beginning of 2017. Training and support tools are currently in development and will be rolled out following the approval of this proposal.

In discussion, members were informed of student concern regarding the retention of draft material in Turnitin, and Associate Professor Coleman advised that material will be retained in Turnitin, but that supervisors can turn off checking against previous versions. The saved content is also not accessible to external users without the express permission of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), which will only be granted in exceptional circumstances. Compliance with the process will be reported as part of the Annual Progress Review, with no other data reported to the



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	18 April 2017
Item No	2.1

Non-Confidential

Educational Integrity or Research Offices.

The committee noted this proposal, which will be presented to the Academic Board for approval with the endorsement of the Graduate Studies Committee.

Resolution ASPC17/3-5

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the proposed amendment of the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015 for the purpose of implementing an integrity check as a component of the first year HDR milestone.

5.2 Accountability changes within the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013

Associate Professor Coleman spoke to this paper, advising that the maintenance of a University Supervisor Register was a key outcome of the University's last TEQSA review. The addition of staff to the Register is currently delegated to the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee and it is proposed to delegate this activity to faculty or University school Associate Deans, enabled by the amendment of the *Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013*. It is believed that as faculties have sufficient expertise to appoint academic staff, they will also be well-placed to assess the suitability of staff to act as supervisors or auxiliary supervisors.

The committee noted this proposal, which will be presented to the Academic Board for approval with the endorsement of the Graduate Studies Committee.

Resolution ASPC17/3-6

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the proposed amendments to the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013, as presented.

5.3 Simple Extension Data, Semester 2 2016

The Chair opened discussion of this item by advising that the paper incorrectly asserts that Pharmacy does not allow simple extensions; this is not the case and the information was provided in error. Members noted that many faculties had not provided data, and that of the faculties that had, there were many gaps in response. It was also unclear whether a response of zero indicated that no applications have been made and approved, whether data was not available, or whether unit of study coordinators had advised students that simple extensions were not available. Strategies for better communicating the collection of data to unit of study coordinators were discussed. It was also noted that simple extensions were intended to be a simple administrative process and that it was therefore important not to over-formalise it.

The committee noted this report.

Resolution ASPC17/3-7

That the Academic Standards & Policy Committee note the data provided by faculties on Simple Extensions for Semester 2, 2016.

6 OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 Any Other Business

Mrs Agus raised an issue regarding the transfer of students who are facing exclusion in one degree (but who have not yet been excluded due to their case awaiting final assessment by the Student Appeals Body) into a combined degree program which includes the original degree. The desirability of a strategy to close this loophole (which also applies to transfers administered by UAC) was discussed and the difficulty was identified with acting pre-emptively when a decision is still pending. It was also observed that it is impossible to know whether an external applicant is in a similar situation and so there are also equity concerns with penalising a Sydney University student over an external applicant. The related issue of the current practice of resetting progression to Stage 0 when a student transfers to a new degree was also raised, and it was agreed that these concerns might benefit from further discussion. Ms Henderson sought advice regarding the volume of such incidents, noting that policy is not generally written to focus on exceptions to the norm.

There being no other business, the meeting concluded at 3:29pm.



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	18 April 2017
Item No	2.1

Non-Confidential

Next meeting: 2:00pm – 4:00pm, **Tuesday 30 May 2017**
Senate Room, Quadrangle

A full copy of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee papers is available at:
sydney.edu.au/secretariat/pdfs/academic-board-committees/academic-standards/2017/20170418-ASPC-Agenda-Pack.pdf.

DRAFT



Non-Confidential

Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	30 May 2017
Item No	3.2

Author	Matthew Charet, Executive Officer to Academic Board
Reviewer/Approver	Associate Professor Tony Masters, Chair of the Academic Board
Paper title	Report of the Academic Board meeting
Purpose.	To advise the Academic Standards and Policy Committee of the outcomes of the Academic Board meeting held on 2 May 2017

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 2 May 2017.

REPORT OF ACADEMIC BOARD MEETING

Items related to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee

The Academic Board noted the report of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee meeting held on 18 April 2017; and

- agreed to constitute a working group comprised of faculty Educational Integrity Coordinators and supported by the Office of Educational Integrity to develop University-wide guidelines for the determination of Educational Integrity outcomes and penalties.

Other matters

The Academic Board also:

- approved the Academic Board Annual Report 2016 for presentation to Senate;
- discussed the draft *University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017*;
- noted the verbal report of the Chair;
- noted the verbal report of the student members of the Academic Board;
- noted the verbal report from the Vice-Chancellor and Principal, including matters considered by Senate at its 24 March 2017 meeting;
- noted the Preparing More Indigenous Teachers at the University of Sydney (PMITUS) Taskforce 2016 Report;
- approved the introduction of a 3 credit point unit of study in the Faculty of Dentistry; and
- noted the membership of the Central Promotions Committees 2017 for Level D and Level E appointments.

Noted the report from the meeting of the Admissions Committee held on 18 April 2017; and

- approved the proposal from Sydney Medical School to amend the Doctor of Medicine and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from the proposal, as amended, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Noted that the meeting of the Undergraduate Studies Committee scheduled for 11 April 2017 was cancelled.

Noted the report of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on 11 April 2017 and:

- approved the delayed implementation until Semester 2 2017 of scholarship allocations based on strategic alignment, as approved by the Academic Board at its meeting of 2 November 2016;
- approved the proposal from Sydney Law School to amend the Juris Doctor and approved the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal, with immediate effect;
- approved the change in INTM5008 Basic Cardiology from a 3 credit point unit of study to a 6 credit point unit of study and approved changes to the table of units of study arising from this proposal, with effect from Semester 2, 2017;
- approved the proposal from Sydney Medical School to amend the Master of Medicine/Master of Science in Medicine to change of name of the current Master of Medicine/Master of Science in Medicine stream in 'HIV, STIs and Sexual Health' to 'Sexual and Reproductive Health'; approved the reconfigured Pathway structure within this Stream, including a new Reproductive Health and Fertility Pathway; approved the



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	30 May 2017
Item No	3.2

Non-Confidential

deletion of the stream 'Maternal, Fetal & Reproductive Medicine' from the Master of Medicine and Master of Science in Medicine; agreed to 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 Sydney Medical School; and approved changes to Course Resolutions and Unit of Study Tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;

- approved the proposal from the Sydney Medical School to amend the Master of Surgery and approved the amendment of the unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect for Semester 2, 2017;
- approved the amendment of the *Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015*, with effect from 16 May 2017; and
- approved the amendment of the *Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013*, with effect from 16 May 2017.



Non-Confidential

Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	30 May 2017
Item No	4.1

Author	Matthew Charet, Executive Officer to Academic Board
Reviewer/Approver	Associate Professor Tony Masters, Chair of Academic Board
Paper title	<i>University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017</i>
Purpose	To request endorsement by the Committee of the amended <i>University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017</i>

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board endorse the adoption of the University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017, as presented.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Structural changes to the University and the recommendations arising from the external review of the Academic Board have necessitated the development of a revised model for the composition of the future Academic Board. A model was presented to and approved at the 28 March 2017 meeting of the Academic Board and as agreed at that meeting, the University Policy Manager has drafted the *University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017*, which, in combination with associated Procedures, is intended to replace the current *University of Sydney (Academic Governance) Rule 2003 (as amended)* (created in 2002). The attached draft has been amended following feedback provided at the 2 May meeting of the Academic Board.

The principal governance functions of the Academic Board have been retained, with some changes to reflect the concerns of and UE response to the external Review of the Academic Board, which returned its findings in early 2017. Administrative aspects of the current *Academic Governance Rule* (such as electoral procedures) have been removed and will be more appropriately located in procedures. These are currently in development and will be presented with the finalised version of the Academic Board Rule to the Academic Board for consideration at a future meeting, prior to the conduct of elections in Semester 2.

The amended *Academic Board Rule* is presented to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee for endorsement to the Academic Board, to be presented to Senate for approval.



UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY (ACADEMIC BOARD) RULE 2017

The Senate of the University of Sydney, as the governing authority of the University of Sydney, by resolution adopts the following Rule under subsection 37 (1) of the *University of Sydney Act 1989* for the purposes of the *University of Sydney By-law 1999*.

Adopted on:

Amended on:

Amendment effective from:

CONTENTS

Contents	1
Part 1 Preliminary	2
1.1 Name of Rule	2
1.2 Commencement.....	2
1.3 Purpose of Rule	2
1.4 Interpretation.....	2
Part 2 Purpose and functions of the Academic Board	4
2.1 Principal responsibilities	4
2.2. Specific roles and powers.....	4
2.3 Reporting	5
Part 3 Membership	5
3.1 Membership of Academic Board.....	5
3.2 <i>Ex officio</i> members	5
3.3 Elected staff members	6
3.4 Student members	7
3.5 Appointed or co-opted members	7
3.6 Terms of office	8
3.7 Re-election or re-nomination in the same category.....	8
3.8 Cessation of membership.....	8
Part 4 Office bearers	9
4.1 Chair	9
4.2 Deputy Chair	10
4.3 Committee Chairs	11
Part 5 Elections	12
Part 6 Committees and working parties	12
Part 7 Meetings	13
7.1 Meetings of the Academic Board.....	13
7.2 Meetings of Committees	15
Part 8 Administrative matters	15
8.1 Procedures.....	15
8.2 Rescissions and replacements	15
Notes	15
Amendment history	16
Schedule 1 - Categorisation of faculties and University schools	17



PART 1 PRELIMINARY

1.1 Name of Rule

This is the University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017.

1.2 Commencement

This Rule commences on [date].

1.3 Purpose of Rule

The purpose of this Rule is to provide for the constitution, functions and operations of the Academic Board.

1.4 Interpretation

(1) In this Rule:

Academic Board means the Academic Board established by section 15 of the *University of Sydney Act 1989 (NSW)* [INSERT HYPERLINK]

Act means the *University of Sydney Act 1989 (NSW)* as amended from time to time

academic staff member has the meaning given in section 50(1) of ~~*University of Sydney By-Law 1999 (NSW)*~~ the *By-Law*, [INSERT HYPERLINK] which at the date of this Rule is:

a person who is employed as a member (other than a casual member) of the academic staff of the University.

By – Law means the *University of Sydney By-Law 1999 (NSW)* [insert hyperlink] as amended from time to time

Category A means a faculty or University school which employs 5% or less of the University's full-time equivalent academic staff, as specified in Schedule 1.

Category B means a faculty or University school which employs more than 5% and up to (and including) 15% of the University's full-time equivalent academic staff, as specified in Schedule 1.

Category C means a faculty or University school which employs more than 15% and up ~~to~~ (and including) 25% of the University's full-time equivalent academic staff, as specified in Schedule 1.



Category D	means a faculty or University school which employs more than 25% of the University's full-time equivalent academic staff, as specified in Schedule 1.
centre	has the meaning set out in the <i>Centres and Collaborative Networks Policy 2017</i> [INSERT HYPERLINK] which, at the date of this Rule, is: an academic grouping or collaborative network established by the University to add value to research or education activities, enhance collaboration and increase knowledge transfer.
enrolled student	has the meaning given in section 50(1) of University of Sydney By-Law 1999 (NSW), the By-Law [INSERT HYPERLINK] which at the date of this Rule is: means a person (other than a person who is an academic staff member) who is enrolled as a student in an award course at the University
faculty	means, as appropriate, a faculty or a University school.
Faculty General Managers Committee	means University Executive subcommittee of that name.
Heads of School Committee	means University Executive subcommittee of that name.
procedures	means any procedures associated with this Rule, as provided in section 8.1.
Secretary to the Academic Board	means the Secretary to Senate or their nominee.
University Executive	means the senior management committee comprised of the Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellors, Deans of Faculties, Vice-Principals and Chair of the Academic Board.

- (2) A heading to a Part or Schedule is a provision of this Rule. Other headings are not provisions of this Rule, but the number of a section or subsection is a provision of this Rule even if it is in a heading.
- (3) A note, marginal note, footnote or endnote is not a provision of this Rule.



PART 2 PURPOSE AND FUNCTIONS OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

2.1 Principal responsibilities

- (1) Subject to the Act, the By-law, the governing authority of the Senate and to the powers of the Vice-Chancellor, the Academic Board has the functions, powers and responsibilities set out in this part.
- (2) The Academic Board has principal responsibility for:
 - (a) assuring the highest standards in teaching, scholarship and research and, in so doing, safeguarding the academic freedom of the University;
 - (b) overseeing and monitoring the development of academic activities of the University;
 - (c) communicating with the academic community, particularly through academic organisational units such as faculties, University schools, boards of studies and centres; and
 - (d) providing a forum for debate and information flow within the University in relation to academic matters.

2.2. Specific roles and powers

- (1) Subject to any inconsistent provision in the Act, By- Law or any Rule, the Academic Board will determine standards and, after consultation with the University Executive, determine policy in relation to~~The Academic Board will determine standards and consult with the University Executive on policy in relation to:~~
 - (a) admission requirements;
 - (b) programs of study, including requirements for the award of any qualification ;
 - (c) progression requirements;
 - (d) examinations and assessment;
 - (e) student recognition awards, including scholarships, subsidies or prizes; and
 - (f) such other matters as Senate may delegate to it.

Note: See the *University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016* [\[insert hyperlink\]](#) for details of the Board's delegated powers.
- (2) The Academic Board will consider and, if appropriate, approve new academic award courses and amendments to existing courses, provided that the approved new or amended course:
 - (a) is tabled and considered at the next appropriate Senate meeting; and
 - (b) may not commence until after it has been endorsed by Senate.
- (3) The Academic Board will provide advice to Senate, the Vice-Chancellor and the University Executive about academic matters, including but not limited to:
 - (a) teaching, research and educational programs;



- (b) academic priorities;
 - (c) academic aspects of current and proposed University strategic plans;
 - (d) academic aspects of policies and procedures, including but not limited to those relating to the appointment, promotion and conditions of employment of academic staff;
 - (e) establishing and maintaining academic standards; and
 - (f) any academic matter it considers to be of strategic importance.
- (4) Jointly with the University Executive, the Academic Board will initiate and oversee a formal program of reviews of the academic activities of the University and its academic organisational units.
- (5) The Academic Board may receive, and may direct provision of, reports from faculties and other organisational units in relation to academic matters.

2.3 Reporting

- (1) The Academic Board must report to Senate:
- (a) after each meeting of the Board, on the Board's activities; and
 - (b) annually, on the Board's activities and its assessment of its own performance.
- (2) The Academic Board will consider, and report on, all matters referred to it by the Senate or the Vice-Chancellor.

PART 3 MEMBERSHIP

3.1 Membership of Academic Board

The Academic Board will consist of:

- (a) the Chair;
- (b) the Vice-Chancellor;
- (c) the *ex officio* members;
- (d) the elected staff members;
- (e) the student members; and
- (f) appointed or co-opted members.

3.2 *Ex officio* members

The *ex-officio* members will be:

- (a) the Vice-Chancellor;
- (b) the Deputy Vice-Chancellor;



- (c) the Pro Vice-Chancellors;
- (d) the Deans;
- (e) the Heads of School and Deans of University schools;
- (f) the Director, University Libraries;
- (g) the Director, Student Administrative Services;
- (h) two representatives nominated by the Heads of School Committee;
- (i) two representatives nominated by the Faculty General Managers Committee;
- (j) the President of the Students' Representative Council;
- (k) two other undergraduate students nominated by the executive of the Students' Representative Council;
- (l) the President of the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association;
- (m) two other postgraduate students nominated by the executive of the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association; and
- (n) appointed or co-opted members, as provided in section 3.5.

3.3 Elected staff members

- (1) The elected staff members must be academic staff members who do not already hold office in another capacity, elected or appointed consistently with this Rule.
- (2) Faculties and University schools will be entitled to elect staff members of the Academic Board on the following basis:
 - (a) Sydney College of the Arts – three members;
 - (b) Category A – four members each;
 - (c) Category B – eight members each;
 - (d) Category C – 12 members each;
 - (e) Category D – 16 members each.

(3) For each group of elected staff members referred to in **subsection 3.3(2)**:

(a) ~~at least one-25%~~ must be ~~appointed at from~~ Levels A-C; ~~E~~ and

~~(f)~~(b) at least 25% must be from Levels D and E, with at least one from Level E. at least one at Level A-D.

~~(3)~~(4) If there are insufficient nominees to fill available places:

- (a) the nominees will be declared elected unopposed; and
- (b) the Faculty Board may nominate staff members to fill the vacant positions.

(5) If there are no nominees in one of the categories required by subsection 3.3(3), the Dean will appoint an individual at the relevant level to meet the requirement, and the number of places filled by elected members will be correspondingly reduced.



- ~~(4)~~(6) When nominating staff members to fill vacant positions, the Faculty Board must take into account the need to achieve an appropriate and equitable representation of the faculty's diversity.

3.4 Student members

- (1) The student members must be enrolled students who do not already hold office in another capacity.
- (2) The boards of faculties and University schools will be entitled to nominate student members of the Academic Board from among the student members of the faculty or University school elected as provided for in the *University of Sydney (Governance of Faculties and University Schools) Rule 2017* **[INSERT HYPERLINK]**
- (3) Faculties and University school boards will be entitled to nominate student members on the following basis:
 - (a) Sydney College of the Arts – two members;
 - (b) Category A – two members each;
 - (c) Category B – two members each;
 - (d) Category C – four members each;
 - (e) Category D – four members each.

(4) When nominating student members:

(a) at least one must be an undergraduate student and one a postgraduate student; and

~~(f)~~(b) the faculty or University school board must take into account the need to achieve an appropriate and equitable representation of the faculty's diversity.

3.5 Appointed or co-opted members

- (1) The Academic Board may appoint up to four members who do not already hold office in another capacity:
 - (a) on the recommendation of the Chair; and
 - (b) by resolution at an ordinary meeting.
- (2) Co-opted members are intended to be short term appointees appointed to assist the Academic Board with a particular issue or project.

(3) Co-opted members must be appointed:

(a) by resolution at an ordinary meeting; and

~~(a)~~(b) for a specified term of office which reflects the time span of the relevant issue or project.



3.6 Terms of office

- (1) Elected staff members hold office for a term of two years commencing on 1 January in the year following their election.
- (2) *Ex officio* members hold office during the period in which they hold the position on which their membership depends.
- (3) Student members hold office for a term of one year commencing on 1 January in the year following their nomination.
- (4) Appointed and co-opted members hold office for the term, and on the conditions, specified in the resolution by which ~~they are appointed~~[their membership is approved](#).
- (5) A person filling a casual vacancy holds office from the time that person is elected or appointed to do so, until the expiry of the term of the person's predecessor.

3.7 Re-election or re-nomination in the same category

- (1) Elected members of the Academic Board are eligible to be re-elected in the same category provided that:
 - (a) they meet the eligibility criteria for that category at the time of their nomination; and
 - (b) they may not serve more than three, full, consecutive terms in the same category.
- (2) Student members of the Academic Board are eligible to be re-nominated in the same category provided that:
 - (a) they meet the eligibility criteria for that category at the time of their nomination; and
 - (b) they may not serve more than three, full consecutive terms in the same category.

3.8 Cessation of membership

A person will cease to be a member of the Academic Board if they:

- (a) resign from the Academic Board;
- (b) cease to hold the position on which their *ex officio* membership depends;
- (c) as appropriate, cease to be an academic staff member or an enrolled student; or
- (d) die.



PART 4 OFFICE BEARERS

4.1 Chair

- (1) The Chair of the Academic Board is responsible for:
 - (a) managing and supervising the functions and business of the Academic Board;
 - (b) facilitating communications between the academic community of the University, the University Executive and Senate;
 - (c) subject to delegations of authority by Senate and resolutions of the Board, apportioning authority for carrying out the Academic Board's functions to other members of the Board;
 - (d) reporting to Senate on behalf of the Academic Board, as required by this Rule or any request of Senate.
- (2) The Chair must be an academic staff member appointed at Level D or Level E.
- (3) Elections for the position of Chair must be held and finalised before the final meeting of the Academic Board for the year preceding the commencement of a new Chair's term of office.
- (4) The electorate for election of the Chair will consist of:
 - (a) all incoming elected staff members;
 - (b) all incoming student members;
 - (c) all *ex officio* members representing the Students' Representative Council; and
 - (d) all *ex officio* members representing the University of Sydney Postgraduate Students Representative Association.
- (5) The term of office for the Chair is:
 - (a) if elected immediately after elections for staff members of the Academic Board, two years from 1 January immediately following the election; or
 - (b) if elected at any other time, from the date of their election until 31 December immediately following the next elections for staff members of the Academic Board.
- (6) A Chair is eligible for re-election, provided that no person may serve as Chair for more than three, full consecutive terms.
- (7) A person may not serve as Chair while they are:
 - (a) the Vice-Chancellor;

Note: The Vice-Chancellor may preside at any Academic Board meeting: see section 47(3)(b) of the *University of Sydney By-Law 1999 (as amended)*. **[INSERT HYPERLINK]**

 - (b) a Deputy Vice-Chancellor;
 - (c) a Pro Vice-Chancellor;
 - (d) a Dean; or



- (e) a Head of School and Dean of a University School.
- (8) The office of Chair will become vacant if the occupant:
 - (a) resigns, either as Chair or from the University;
 - (b) assumes any of the positions referred to in **subsection 4.1(6)**; or
 - (c) dies.
- (9) If the office of Chair becomes vacant on or after the last six months of the Chair's term, the vacancy must be filled by the Deputy Chair.
- (10) If the office of Chair becomes vacant before the last six months of the Chair's term, a new Chair must be elected as soon as possible, as provided in **subsection 4.1(4)**.

4.2 Deputy Chair

- (1) The Deputy Chair of the Academic Board is responsible for:
 - (a) assisting the Chair in the performance of their functions, as determined by the Chair from time to time;
 - (b) acting as Chair when:
 - (i) the Chair is on leave;
 - (ii) the Chair is otherwise unavailable to attend meetings; or
 - (iii) the office of Chair is vacant.
- (2) The Deputy Chair must be an academic staff member.
- (3) The Deputy Chair must be appointed by the Academic Board:
 - (a) from among the Committee Chairs;
 - (b) by ordinary resolution;
 - (c) at, or as soon as possible after, the first meeting after the completion of elections for staff members of the Academic Board.
- (4) The term of office of the Deputy Chair is:
 - (a) if appointed immediately after elections for staff members of the Academic Board, two years from 1 January immediately following the election; or
 - (b) if appointed at any other time, from the date of their appointment until 31 December immediately following the next elections for staff members of the Academic Board.
- (5) A Deputy Chair is eligible for re-election, provided that no person may serve as Deputy Chair for more than three, full, consecutive terms.
- (6) A person may not serve as Deputy Chair while they are:
 - (a) the Vice-Chancellor;
 - (b) a Deputy Vice-Chancellor;
 - (c) a Pro Vice-Chancellor;
 - (d) a Dean; or
 - (e) a Head of School and Dean of a University school.



- (7) The office of Deputy Chair will become vacant if the occupant:
- (a) resigns, either as Deputy Chair or from the University;
 - (b) assumes any of the positions referred to in **subsection 4.2 (6)**; or
 - (c) dies.
- (8) If the office of Deputy Chair becomes vacant the Academic Board must elect a new Deputy Chair, as provided in **subsection 4.2(3)**.
- (a) A person elected under this subsection will hold office for the remainder of their predecessor's term of office.

4.3 Committee Chairs

- ~~(1)~~ (1) Committee Chairs ~~must will~~ be appointed by the Chair of the Academic Board:
- ~~(a) — as soon as possible after :~~
 - ~~(b) — on the nomination of the Chair;~~
 - ~~(c) — by ordinary resolution;~~
 - ~~(a) — at the first meeting after t~~ the completion of elections for staff members of the Academic Board; or
 - ~~(d)(b) as soon as possible after~~ establishment of the committee.
- ~~(9)~~ (2) The term of office of a Committee Chair is:
- (a) if appointed ~~immediately~~ after elections for staff members of the Academic Board, two years from 1 January immediately following the election; or
 - (b) if appointed at any other time, from the date of their appointment until 31 December immediately following the next elections for staff members of the Academic Board.
- ~~(10)~~ (3) ~~—~~ A Committee Chair is eligible for re-appointment, provided that no person may serve as Chair of the same committee for more than three, full consecutive terms.
- ~~(11)~~ (4) A person may not serve as a Committee Chair while they are:
- (a) the Vice-Chancellor;
 - (b) a Deputy Vice-Chancellor;
 - (c) a Pro Vice-Chancellor;
 - (d) a Dean; or
 - (e) a Head of School and Dean of a University School.
- ~~(12)~~ (5) The office of Committee Chair will become vacant if the occupant:
- (a) resigns, either as Committee Chair or from the University;
 - (b) assumes any of the positions referred to in **subsection 4.3 (4)**; or
 - (c) dies.
- ~~(13)~~ (6) If the office of Committee Chair becomes vacant the Academic Board must appoint a new Committee Chair, as provided in **subsection 4.3(1)**.



- (a) A person appointed under this subclause will hold office for the remainder of their predecessor's term of office.

PART 5 ELECTIONS

- (1) Elections for staff members of the Academic Board will be held:
 - (a) in the second semester of every alternate year, commencing in the second semester of 2017; and
 - (b) in the manner specified in the procedures.
- (2) The University Secretariat will conduct the elections.
- (3) The Secretary to the Academic Board will act as the returning officer for elections.
- (4) The returning officer's decision in relation to any matter affecting the conduct of an election will be final including, but not limited to, eligibility of candidates or results of elections.

PART 6 COMMITTEES AND WORKING PARTIES

- (1) The Academic Board will have such committees and sub- committees as it determines to be appropriate from time to time.
- (2) The Board may establish committees and sub-committees by ordinary resolution.
- (3) The Academic Board will:
 - (a) after consultation with the University Executive, determine the Terms of Reference; and
 - (b) appoint a Chair;for each Academic Board committee.
- (4) Committee membership must:
 - (a) provide appropriate discipline representation and expertise;
 - (b) as far as possible, reflect the diversity of the University community;
 - (c) include:
 - (i) academic staff members who are not members of the Academic Board;
 - (ii) non- academic staff members with relevant expertise or experience; and
 - (iii) at least one enrolled student, but preferably one undergraduate and one postgraduate enrolled student.
- (5) The Chair of each committee must report:
 - (a) to each meeting of the Academic Board, on the committee's activities; and
 - (b) annually, on the committee's activities and its assessment of its own performance.



- (6) The Academic Board, or the Chair of the Academic Board, may establish such working parties, with such terms of reference, as they consider necessary to assist or advise the Academic Board or the Chair in performance of their functions.

PART 7 MEETINGS

7.1 Meetings of the Academic Board

- (1) The Chair is responsible for convening meetings of the Academic Board, in the manner specified in the procedures.
- (a) The Chair must convene at least six meetings in each calendar year.
 - (b) The Chair may also convene a meeting at any time on their own motion.
 - (c) The Chair must convene a meeting if requested to do so by any of:
 - (i) Senate;
 - (ii) the Vice-Chancellor; or
 - (iii) at least 50% of all members.
- (2) A meeting held or a resolution passed at a meeting is not invalid because:
- (a) a person entitled to receive notice of the meeting does not receive it; or
 - (b) less than the prescribed time of notice was given.
- (3) A person who is acting in the position of an *ex officio* member may attend meetings and may exercise the voting rights of that position.
- (4) An *ex officio* member, elected staff member or student member may nominate a standing alternate to attend meetings on their behalf.
- (a) The member must inform the Secretary to the Academic Board in writing of the following at least two days before the next meeting:
 - (i) the fact of the appointment of the alternate;
 - (ii) the alternate's name;
 - (iii) the alternate's contact details; and
 - (iv) the alternate's position.
 - (b) The alternate must meet the membership criteria applicable to the member.
- ~~(5) An appointed standing alternate may attend any meeting in the same calendar year as their appointment, but must provide at least two days' written notice to the Secretary to the Academic Board before any meeting they attend.~~
- ~~(6)~~(5) Quorum for Academic Board meetings is 30 members.
- (a) If no quorum is present within 30 minutes of the notified starting time of a meeting, the meeting may consider only procedural matters and must not transact any other business.



- | ~~(7)~~(6) The Secretary to the Academic Board must arrange for minutes of each meeting to be taken and recorded.
- Note:** See [University Recordkeeping Policy](#) and [Recordkeeping Manual](#).
- (a) Minutes must record all motions put to a meeting, and their outcomes.
 - (b) Copies of draft minutes must be provided to each member no later than the date when notice of the next meeting is given.
 - (c) Minutes, once approved, must be signed by the Chair as a true and correct record.
- | ~~(8)~~(7) Any resolution which is to be put to a vote by members must be duly proposed and seconded.
- | ~~(9)~~(8) Each member present at a meeting has one deliberative vote.
- (a) Voting will be conducted by show of hands, unless a secret ballot is required.
 - (b) A secret ballot must be conducted if:
 - (i) demanded by any two members present at the meeting and entitled to vote; or
 - (ii) directed by the Chair.
- | ~~(10)~~(9) Except in relation to motions of dissent under **subsection 7.1(14)**, the Chair has one casting vote, in addition to a deliberative vote, if there is a tied vote.
- (a) No casting vote is available in relation to a motion of dissent under **subsection 7.1(14)**.
- | ~~(11)~~(10) Ordinary resolutions will be carried by a majority of those present at the meeting and eligible to vote.
- | ~~(12)~~(11) A special resolution will be carried by at least 75% of those present at the meeting and eligible to vote.
- (a) A special resolution is required to amend any Rule made by the Academic Board.
- | ~~(13)~~(12) Except for a motion of dissent in the Chair, only the Chair may put a motion without notice to a meeting of the Academic Board.
- | ~~(14)~~(13) A member of the Academic Board may move a motion of dissent from a ruling by the Chair without notice.
- (a) A motion of dissent will be carried by at least 75% of those present at the meeting and eligible to vote.
 - (b) A successful motion of dissent will:
 - (i) overrule the relevant ruling of the Chair; and
 - (ii) substitute a new ruling for that ruling.
 - (c) The Chair must not preside when a dissent motion is put and resolved. The Deputy Chair will preside in such circumstances, and if they are not present, the Academic Board must elect another member to preside.



7.2 Meetings of Committees

- (1) Committee Chairs are responsible for convening committee meetings, and will determine the schedule of meetings in consultation with the Chair of the Academic Board.
- (2) A member of a committee may nominate an alternate to attend a meeting on their behalf, by giving written notice to the relevant Chair at least two days before any meeting the alternate is to attend.
- (3) Meeting and quorum requirements for committees will be as specified in their Terms of Reference.
- (4) The Secretary to the Academic Board will arrange for minutes of each committee meeting to be taken and recorded.

Note: See [University Recordkeeping Policy](#) and [Recordkeeping Manual](#).

PART 8 ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

8.1 Procedures

- (1) The Chair of the Academic Board and the Vice-Chancellor may jointly determine procedures for the implementation of this Rule.
- (2) Any such procedures must be:
 - (a) determined in writing; and
 - (b) registered in the Policy Register.

8.2 Rescissions and replacements

This document replaces the *University of Sydney (Academic Governance) Rule 2009 (as amended)* which is rescinded as from the date of commencement of this Rule.

NOTES

University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017

Date adopted:

Date commenced:

Related documents: List here documents related to the rule, in the following order.

Commonwealth Statutes

State Statutes

Codes, protocols or similar, external to the University

University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017

Draft v52

19859/522637_1

Page 15 of 17



University Policies
University Procedures
University Guidelines

AMENDMENT HISTORY

Provision **Amendment**

Commencing



SCHEDULE 1 - CATEGORISATION OF FACULTIES AND UNIVERSITY SCHOOLS

Category A	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• University of Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning• Sydney University Law School• Sydney Conservatorium of Music
Category B	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• University of Sydney Business School• Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies• Faculty of Health Sciences• Faculty of Dentistry• Faculty of Pharmacy• Sydney Nursing School
Category C	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences• Faculty of Science;• Faculty of Medicine
Category D	nil

Note: [As at the date of commencement of this Rule, the University is undergoing a period of organisational redesign and transition. This schedule sets out the position as at the date of this Rule, and will be amended as the redesign process progresses.](#)



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	30 May 2017
Item No	5.1

Non-Confidential

Author	Associate Professor Ross Coleman, Director- Graduate Research
Reviewer/Approver	Professor Pip Pattison, DVC Education
Paper title	Identifying, embedding and reporting graduate qualities for the Sydney PhD
Purpose	The purpose of the paper is to seek endorsement of proposed draft graduate qualities for the University of Sydney PhD as the basis for consultation with the University community

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the proposed draft graduate qualities for the University of Sydney PhD set out in Section 3 of this paper for broader consultation with the University community; and note this preliminary report on the issues to be addressed and next steps to be taken in finalising, embedding and reporting on graduate qualities for the University of Sydney PhD.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Postgraduate research degrees are arguably undervalued by society and employers in industry. This may be due in part to the perception that the primary outcome of a PhD is deep knowledge about a very specialised domain rather than expertise coupled with a constellation of more broadly transferrable skills and qualities.

Articulating the explicit educational outcomes of the PhD at the University of Sydney will allow us to clarify learning outcomes for the student, the public and potential employers and also ensure that we are achieving these outcomes successfully. Identifying, embedding and reporting qualities will make the PhD at the University of Sydney more attractive and ensure it remains relevant for current and future labour markets.

A set of qualities is proposed here along with strategies for embedding their development. These qualities are informed by the University's Bachelor graduate and researcher qualities¹ and by contemporary discussions of the nature of PhD outcomes².

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

1. Why graduate qualities for the PhD?

For most students, committing to a 3-4 year program of study for a PhD occurs at a time when other major career, further study and life transitions are also being considered. It is important, therefore, to be able to provide a clear answer to the question, "Why do a PhD?". Often, the answers to that question are not that different from a related question asked by industry – "Why employ a PhD graduate?". Governments and research agencies may ask why they should fund a PhD. While the answer to the latter question generally refers to the development of human capital and the transition towards a knowledge-based economy³, answers to the first and second questions are more nuanced. Those considering a PhD education may be seeking diverse outcomes, such as meeting professional requirements, acquiring deep knowledge and understanding of a discipline, and developing personally and professionally. This paper is intended to prompt discussion of what a University of Sydney PhD education offers and how completing a PhD at the university prepares a graduate for a diversity of familiar and as yet unimagined career paths ahead.

¹ See <http://sydney.edu.au/dam/intranet/documents/strategy-and-planning/strategic-plan-2016-20.pdf>.

² See, for example, the Australian Qualifications Framework <http://www.aqf.edu.au/aqf/in-detail/aqf-qualifications/> and Vitae (<https://www.vitae.ac.uk/>).

³ <http://acola.org.au/wp/saf13-rts-review/>



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	30 May 2017
Item No	5.1

Non-Confidential

2. The Purpose of the PhD at Sydney

The PhD is the primary degree for developing research capability and contributing to the research ecosystem within the University of Sydney as well as broader national and international systems for research and innovation. A thriving PhD cohort ensures a successful research system within the University and the broader systems of which it is a part.

The University is pursuing three strategies to ensure excellence in PhD outcomes. The first is to ensure recruitment of those students most likely to succeed; actions put in place with respect to the Strategic Plan 2016-2020 aim 2.2⁴ have addressed this, as will continued engagement with faculties and the central recruitment team. The second approach is to ensure that PhD students work in an exciting, intellectually demanding and enriching environment. The third is to ensure that PhD outcomes are fit for the purposes for which the degree prepares students, including careers in universities, the broader research and innovation sector, and industry, community and government more generally. The University's Strategic Plan 2016-2020 makes these latter two work streams a key priority for 2017-18. This paper takes the first step towards clarifying the purpose of the PhD and ensuring that the PhD experience is designed to deliver on that purpose for students, the University and external stakeholders, including future employers.

The function of the PhD as an educational offering has changed markedly over the last decade or so. The primary function of the degree of PhD was, until very recently, seen to be preparing students for an academic research role and, implicitly therefore, for a teaching and research role. The PhD was reviewed by the Graduate Studies Committee Academic Board in 2005⁵; this review noted 7 key attributes of a PhD graduate from the University of Sydney - (i) *the acquisition of research skills*; (ii) *an appreciation and understanding of the research environment*; (iii) *an understanding of the management of research* (iv) *enhanced personal effectiveness*; (v) *a range of effective communication skills*; (vi) *team working and leadership skills*; (vii) *planning, career development skills, introspection*. The Group of 8 Research Intensive Universities also reviewed the changing nature of the PhD⁶, and this review also argued convincingly for a development plan to embed transferable/generic skills within the PhD experience and to make the relevance of the PhD explicit for both the student and society at large.

More recently, the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Training commissioned the Australian Council of Learned Academies (ACOLA) to produce a comprehensive review of higher degree by research (HDR) training. The ensuing report was accepted in its entirety by the current Minister on 4th November 2016, although it should be noted that none of the recommendations have yet been acted on. The review, known as the ACOLA review or SAF13⁷, had as its top two priorities (1) to ensure that Australia's HDR training models are comparable with the best in the world and (2) to ensure that research graduates are equipped for and achieve employment outcomes in a range of sectors, including academic teaching, research and industry. It is not the function of this paper to recycle the detailed analysis given in the ACOLA report, which distils the results of extensive consultation and consideration of the key issues. The relevant key findings (KF) of the ACOLA review were as follows (with emphases added):

KF 1: Universities have a duty of care to communicate the likely outcomes of HDR training prior to candidates commencing their training. *The information currently available to aspiring candidates is inadequate*. Candidates need to be provided with information on the career outcomes of past HDR graduates, as well as comparative information on the quality, performance and components of HDR training provided by each university. The Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching website provides a potential opportunity to communicate this information to candidates in a clear and effective way.

KF4: Broader transferable skills development is a necessary aspect of HDR training. Although many universities have made significant investments in this area, transferable skills development is not as strongly embedded in our research training system as it is in some other comparable research training systems around the world. *Skills development must be flexible and candidate-directed, and*

⁴ See <http://sydney.edu.au/dam/intranet/documents/strategy-and-planning/strategic-plan-2016-20.pdf>

⁵ Minutes of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on Monday, 22 August 2005

⁶ https://go8.edu.au/sites/default/files/docs/the-changing-phd_final.pdf

⁷ <http://acola.org.au/wp/saf13-rts-review/>



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	30 May 2017
Item No	5.1

Non-Confidential

take into account the diverse backgrounds and experience of candidates. The UK Vitae Researcher Development Framework is an established and comprehensive approach that provides a useful model that could be adapted for use in Australia.

KF 9: The current examination system ensures Australia's HDR outputs are of high quality, *but a statement of the skills and knowledge gained by the candidate is also needed.* The Australian Higher Education Graduation Statement (AHEGS) provides a potential vehicle for such information, *the evidence base for which can be built through HDR milestones (confirmation of candidature, mid-candidature, and final), preparation of a skills portfolio, seminar presentations, industry and international placements, and oral examinations.*

By explicitly identifying the key features and benefits of a PhD from the University of Sydney, we will be better able to articulate a value proposition for a PhD at the University of Sydney. This coupled with our increasing excellence in research will help make us a first choice for aspiring PhD candidates.

A number of possible qualities for PhD graduates were identified in the discussion papers leading up to the Strategic Plan⁸; in addition, the qualities of University of Sydney Bachelor graduates and University of Sydney researchers articulated in the 2016-2020 Strategic Plan provide anchors between which the qualities of PhD graduates might be articulated.

In the next section, therefore, we propose a constellation of broader learning outcomes of a PhD education and seek to link these outcomes to an ecosystem of possible skill and professional development activities. Attention must be given to processes for ensuring that appropriate opportunities are provided to maximise the potential of individual candidates. In particular, we need to identify the means by which we can provide support for the development of the required capabilities and how we can best add intellectual depth and breadth to the PhD experience. For example, should we, as articulated in the 2016 strategy discussion papers, encourage participation in additional seminars, workshops, discussions, hackathons and innovation opportunities not just within the field of enquiry but also in areas of contemporary interest and concern, including in interdisciplinary domains? And should these also include, for example, a range of methodological skills, communication skills, fundamentals of project management, fundamentals of commercialisation, entrepreneurship, research integrity, effective teamwork, mentoring skills and leadership development?

The University also needs to have an understanding of how we might capture, measure, record and report the successes and benefits to a candidate's professional development from doing a PhD at Sydney. This will help graduates better understand and articulate how their PhD education has prepared them for the next stages of their life.

Ensuring that successful completion of HDR units in the Open Learning Environment can be included on the academic transcript will meet this requirement, in part, but we will need to determine what other activities are also to be recorded. Importantly, the University has not committed at this point to the production of an AHEGS, so the question of alternative means of reflecting broader developments and milestones is especially pertinent in our case.

Full time employment levels of HDR graduates may be improved if there is a greater appreciation in industry for HDR graduate qualities and a greater emphasis on transferable skills development during candidature.

The Australian postgraduate destination survey for 2015 indicated that out of those that were available, 72.7% of doctorate holders were in full-time employment four months post-graduation compared to 85.6% in 2010. The percentage of University of Sydney HDR graduates in full time work four months post-graduation has also declined consistently for the last 4 years, from 77% in 2012 to 69% in 2015 (GDS trend report 2012-2015). This reflects an 8% decline for domestic students and a 10% decline for international students (GDS trend report 2012-2015).

⁸ See *Developing a Culture of Research Excellence*, at <https://intranet.sydney.edu.au/content/dam/intranet/documents/news-initiatives/strategy/Strategy-Discussion-Paper-Research-2.pdf>



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	30 May 2017
Item No	5.1

Non-Confidential

Given the increasing flows of PhD graduates into non-academic careers, there is likely also more we can do to prepare students to make productive transitions post-completion of the PhD or post-doctoral fellowship. For example, as proposed in the strategy discussion papers, can we support students to spend more time in relevant industry or community settings, and hence provide opportunities to develop and build skills for alternative career pathways? Can we also develop more systematic support for international mobility experiences for PhD students (for example, international visits, short courses, conference attendance) to accelerate connection to international expertise and networks in students' fields of study?

3. PhD Graduate Qualities

Background

The degree of PhD is an Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) level 10 award. The AQF defines the PhD with respect to a prescribed set of skills; viz -

Graduates of a Doctoral Degree will have:

- cognitive skills to demonstrate expert understanding of theoretical knowledge and to reflect critically on that theory and practice
- cognitive skills and use of intellectual independence to think critically, evaluate existing knowledge and ideas, undertake systemic investigation and reflect on theory and practice to generate original knowledge
- expert technical and creative skills applicable to the field of work or learning
- communication skills to explain and critique theoretical propositions, methodologies and conclusions
- communication skills to present cogently a complex investigation of originality or original research for external examination against international standards and to communicate results to peers and the community
- expert skills to design, implement, analyse, theorise and communicate research that makes a significant and original contribution to knowledge and/or professional practice

In the 2016-2020 University of Sydney Strategic Plan, the term 'graduate qualities' is used to describe broad degree-level learning outcomes and this term is adopted here too to reflect the broader and often less tangible aspects of a successful PhD experience such as cultural and ethical awareness.

In Australia and the University of Sydney, the only part of HDR candidature that is currently assessed is the thesis. Annual progress reviews are conducted to evaluate major milestones on the path to submitting a thesis. There are certain activities that are considered an important part of HDR training – presenting at a conference, giving talks to the department, group discussions, workshops etc. – but these are not formally assessed nor necessarily required. Currently students are assumed to develop broader skills and capabilities through development of the thesis and associated activities, but we do not have a way of ensuring the opportunity exists for these qualities to be developed in students consistently across the University. By seeking to develop an explicit set of PhD qualities in all students, we can ensure that these qualities are characteristic outcomes of the PhD at the University of Sydney.

As described above, it is clear that transferable skills training is needed in order to keep HDR degrees attractive and relevant to the modern work force. The University of Sydney 2011-2015 Strategic Plan recognized that a 4 year PhD would afford the capacity for broader development, but this idea was rejected on the basis of funding constraints. Customised research training for PhD students was then identified as a viable short term alternative to a 4 year PhD program (University of Sydney, August 2015). The Roberts review of research education⁹ in the UK suggested that PhD students should have at least two weeks of transferable skills training per year. Our 2016-2020 Strategic Plan has proposed a research-track coursework masters pathway to the PhD to broaden opportunities for development.

Research training needs analysis for HDR candidates is already being implemented at the University of Sydney. From January 2016, some online modules are now compulsory for commencing HDR students in order to satisfy the requirements for their degree. I.e. *Work, Health and Safety – Induction; Responsible Research Practice; Human Ethics*. There are also compulsory and optional courses offered for students in

⁹ http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/d/robertsreview_introch1.pdf



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	30 May 2017
Item No	5.1

Non-Confidential

different faculties. However, questions remain regarding how to resource and organise research training in order to embed the development of graduate qualities.

While there are opportunities to take advantage of existing programs and systems, including:

- Counselling and Psychological Services (CAPS) e.g. *presentation skills, procrastination, postgraduate research success*;
- Learning centre e.g. *Working with your thesis supervisor, procrastination and managing time*; and
- The Open Learning Environment units targeted towards PhD and other HDR students;

there is likely also a need for a more systematic suite of development opportunities for PhD students that ensure we can support all students to acquire the graduate qualities on which the University agrees.

A proposed set of qualities for the PhD

What qualities should a PhD graduate have developed? Arguably, a PhD graduate should have developed the University of Sydney Bachelor graduate qualities to a higher level and also have begun to develop some of the agreed qualities of a University of Sydney researcher. A suggested initial list of qualities is proposed in Table 1, drawing on the University of Sydney Bachelor graduate qualities, the University of Sydney researcher qualities and the UK Vitae project. A number of these capabilities were proposed in the 2015 University of Sydney Strategy Discussion Papers, including *Towards a Distinctive Sydney Education* and *A Culture of Research Excellence*.

Specifically, the proposed qualities for a University of Sydney PhD graduate are as follows.

Deep expertise: To possess expert, world standard, knowledge of a specific field of enquiry, a mastery of relevant research methods, and the capability to contribute to scholarship and knowledge discovery.

This quality is an important outcome of sustained enquiry in the field of the PhD and demonstrates a capacity to develop and execute a systematic research plan.

Broader skills: To have developed broader, high level and widely applicable skills, including:

- critical thinking and problem solving;
- oral and written communication;
- information and digital literacy; and
- inventiveness.

These broader skills are developed to a high standard in the PhD because of the novel and challenging nature of the research undertaken and the need to create novel insights in the area of study. Through the research process, advanced skills are developed as students develop an accurate and globally informed understanding of the state of current relevant knowledge, employ contemporary and effective methods for summarising and analysing evidence, and communicate research findings to a variety of different audiences.

As a consequence, PhD graduates have the capability to solve problems that we may not yet know exist, as well as the many wicked and pernicious challenges that beset industry and society. The capacity to identify fruitful questions and develop feasible pathways to solution is a key manifestation of this quality.

PhD graduates are also aware of the needs of different audiences for communication and they must have the skills to pitch their ideas and findings in ways that are both accurate and impactful. They must also have expertise in accessing digital information resources and in utilising and keeping abreast of tools and technologies that support advancement in their broader field.

Innovative solutions often require boldness and courage. PhD graduates must therefore have the confidence to experiment with new approaches in ways that are informed by evidence, take intellectual risks and challenge current paradigms.

Cultural competence: To display high levels of cultural competence and embody best practice with regard to cultural competence in research.



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	30 May 2017
Item No	5.1

Non-Confidential

PhD graduates must develop the capabilities to work in global scholarly networks, and understand the cultural context of their work and its impact in different cultural settings. Given the university's commitment to cultural competence, these capabilities should be global in scope but also well-developed in relation to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island cultures.

Interdisciplinary effectiveness: To work effectively in interdisciplinary settings and to develop broader perspective, innovative vision and a capacity to work within national and international research and innovation systems.

To contribute to a broad range of industry and community problems, PhD graduates need the capability to work effectively with those possessing other forms of expertise so that they can together develop solutions that are unlikely to emerge from a single expert alone. They also need a sophisticated understanding of national and international research and innovation systems, including relevant legal and business frameworks.

Integrated professional, personal and ethical identity: To exercise integrity, confidence and resilience.

The University of Sydney aims for the highest standards of ethical behaviour. PhD graduates need not only work ethically, but also bring out ethical behaviours in others. This will come from developing each student's ethical self and from making the ethical and responsible basis of research explicit.

Influence: To be professionally and socially responsible and make a positive contribution to society.

Whether a research activity solves a societal/economic problem or adds to knowledge, PhD graduates must understand and contribute to the production of new knowledge as a positive change for society. This entails a capacity to exercise intellectual leadership.

These qualities are summarised in Table 1 alongside the qualities of the University's Bachelor graduates and researchers, and the UK Vitae project.

Comparative information from other universities is presented in Appendix 1. Relevant University of Sydney policies are listed in Appendix 2.

4. Embedding graduate qualities

A combination of methods for embedding the development of graduate qualities in the PhD experience is recommended. While some qualities are developed primarily through the research undertaken by the student, others can be supported by the Open Learning Environment (through a mix of online resources and courses and associated workshops and masterclasses) or by enrichment activities such as Hackathons, 3-minute thesis or other competitions, innovation and entrepreneurship challenges, industry and community placements and projects, conference presentations, international experiences, external training opportunities, mentoring programs and student-led seminars and activities.

Ideally, some means of documenting the development and achievement of the PhD graduate qualities will be available, perhaps through use of the HDR progression software and/or an ePortfolio solution. This should enable the development of a report that includes experience and training relevant to the attainment of each quality. Table 2 provides an illustrative list of activities that might support the development of each quality.

The development of a set of PhD graduate qualities will provide a clear value proposition for a PhD at the University of Sydney and will inform the establishment of an ecosystem of development activities, using a mixture of formal units of study, open learning units, international mobility activities and entrepreneurial/engagement opportunities.



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	30 May 2017
Item No	5.1

Non-Confidential

Table 1: Proposed graduate qualities for the University of Sydney PhD

University of Sydney Bachelor graduate	University of Sydney researcher	Vitae	Proposed University of Sydney PhD graduate qualities
<i>Depth of disciplinary expertise</i> - To excel at applying and continuing to develop disciplinary expertise	-creation and application of new knowledge and understanding	-Subject knowledge	<i>Deep expertise</i> – To possess expert, world standard knowledge in an area of specialisation, a mastery of relevant research methods and the capability to contribute to scholarship and knowledge discovery
<i>Broader skills</i> - critical thinking/problem solving	-asking important and difficult questions, challenging existing paradigms and dogma	- Analysing - Synthesising - Critical thinking - Evaluating - Problem solving	<i>Broader skills</i> – To display high level capabilities in critical thinking and problem solving and a commitment to lifelong learning and discovery
<i>Broader skills</i> -communication (oral and written)	-share research findings -continually learn -engage with the relevant stakeholders and end-users	-Academic literacy and numeracy - Communication methods - Communication media - Publication	<i>Broader skills</i> – To have excellent oral and written communication skills relevant to specialist and general audiences
<i>Broader skills</i> - information/digital literacy		-Information seeking - Information literacy and management	<i>Broader skills</i> – To evaluate and utilise contemporary digital tools, resources and technologies
<i>Broader skills</i> –inventiveness		-Inquiring mind -Intellectual insight -Innovation -Argument construction -Intellectual risk	<i>Broader skills</i> – To be innovative and creative in response to novel problems, and to be willing to take risks
<i>Cultural competence</i> – To work productively, collaboratively and openly in diverse groups and across cultural boundaries	-display high levels of cultural competence -embody best practice with regard to cultural competence in their research activities -professional and collegial manner	- Equality and diversity - Society and culture - Global citizenship - Collegiality - Team working	<i>Cultural competence</i> – To display high levels of cultural competence and embody best practice with regard to cultural competence in research
<i>Interdisciplinary effectiveness</i> – To work effectively in interdisciplinary settings and to build broader perspective, innovative vision and more contextualised and systemic forms of understanding	-a positive and dynamic research and workplace culture -inspire collaboration	- Collaboration	<i>Interdisciplinary effectiveness</i> – To work effectively in interdisciplinary settings, to develop broader perspective, innovative vision and the capacity to work effectively within national and international research and innovation systems
<i>Professional, ethical, personal identity</i> – To build integrity, confidence and personal resilience, and the capacities to manage challenge and uncertainty	-Code of Conduct and research policies, -ethics and integrity policies -responsible research practice -managing research data and managing conflicts of interest	- Appropriate practice - Enthusiasm - Perseverance - Integrity - Self-confidence - Self-reflection - Professional responsibility	<i>Professional, ethical, personal identity</i> – To exercise integrity, confidence and resilience
<i>Influence</i> – To be effective in exercising professional and social responsibility and making a positive contribution to society	-where appropriate, engaging constructively in public debate on matters related to their research expertise to help inform public discourse and policymaking.	-Teaching - Public engagement - Influence and leadership - People management - Mentoring - Social responsibility - Positive contribution to society	<i>Influence</i> – To be professionally and socially responsible and make a positive contribution to society



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	30 May 2017
Item No	5.1

Non-Confidential

Table 2: Some illustrative activities for embedding the development of PhD Graduate Qualities

Proposed PhD qualities	Embed/provide evidence/report
<i>Deep expertise</i> – To possess expert, world standard knowledge in an area of specialisation, a mastery of relevant research methods and the capability to contribute to scholarship and knowledge discovery	Thesis, research publications, oral examination, seminars, conference presentations, OLE units
<i>Broader skills</i> – To display high level capabilities in critical thinking and problem solving and a commitment to lifelong learning and discovery	Thesis, research publications, oral examination, seminars, seminar participation, seminar organisation, conference presentation, conference organisation, additional coursework, participation in hackathons and innovation challenges
<i>Broader skills</i> – To have excellent oral and written communication skills relevant to specialist and general audiences	Thesis, research publications, seminars, conference presentations, three-minute thesis competition, higher education teaching and learning development, higher education teaching experience, public engagement, other outreach activities
<i>Broader skills</i> – To evaluate and utilise contemporary digital tools, resources and technologies	Thesis, research publications, OLE units
<i>Broader skills</i> – To be innovative and creative in response to novel problems, and to be willing to take risks	Thesis, research publications, participation in hackathons and innovation challenges, entrepreneurship experiences
<i>Cultural competence</i> – To display high levels of cultural competence and embody best practice with regard to cultural competence in research	OLE units, staff development activities, thesis, fieldwork experience, research publications, mobility experience, international internship, dual degree completion
<i>Interdisciplinary effectiveness</i> – To work effectively in interdisciplinary settings, to develop broader perspective, innovative vision and the capacity to work effectively within national and international research and innovation systems	Interfaculty seminars, hackathons and innovation challenges, internships, public engagement, other outreach activities, OLE units, participation in scholarship, fellowship and research grant applications
<i>Professional, ethical, personal identity</i> – To exercise integrity, confidence and resilience	Thesis, research publications, online training modules, OLE units, staff development activities
<i>Influence</i> – To be professionally and socially responsible and make a positive contribution to society	Thesis, research publications, public engagement, other outreach activities, internships, contribution to academic, professional & learned societies

5. Measurement, Recording and Reporting of Graduate Qualities

The ACOLA report suggested that the reporting of a PhD student’s graduate skills and attributes could be delivered by text on the Australian Higher Education Graduation Statement (AHEGS). This would require production of an AHEGS by the University of Sydney, a capability that is not yet available for our systems and one that is not formally required by the Higher Education Standards Framework.

The problem of how to capture, record and report graduate qualities for a given student is not unique to PhD candidature. Whilst academic achievement can be recorded via performance in a unit of study and curriculum mapping can relate unit of study content to graduate attributes, the less tangible aspects of a Sydney graduate’s successes are less easy to pin down.

For PhD students, we currently only record the success of the thesis and any mandatory compliance and/or safety training. Australia is possibly the only country that examines the thesis only. At the annual meeting of the Council of Deans and Directors of Graduate Studies Australia (DDOGS) 2016, concerns were raised that Australian research PhDs may be regarded less favourably in some other countries due to our examination methods. As noted by the ACOLA review, the current system is possibly out-dated and only measures the thesis, not the student and their abilities. Introducing an oral examination is one way this could be addressed in part, although this idea has often been met with resistance. An oral examination allows examiners to probe the extent to which the candidate has wider knowledge of the discipline, how (s)he can frame an argument verbally, respond to questions and critically review other aspects of candidature not reported in the thesis (teamwork, authorship and intellectual ownership, cultural implications, relevance for end-users, transferability of core approaches etc). The current thesis examination policy permits oral examinations, including the possibility that they be supported via internet media.



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	30 May 2017
Item No	5.1

Non-Confidential

Once the University has adopted a set of Graduate Qualities for the PhD, these can then inform a wider discussion on developing and reporting graduate qualities for all PhD students from the University. The value of utilising supporting technological solutions, such as ePortfolio tools for students to record the development of graduate qualities, should also be considered. A record of graduate qualities would give students an advantage when preparing their CV or job application, making their value to potential employers clear. It would also promote the value of a HDR degree from the University of Sydney.

6. Conclusion

As of the 4th of November 2016 the federal government has accepted the six recommendations of the ACOLA review. This will require action from the University to implement changes that are geared towards higher engagement with industry and better preparation of PhD candidates for the workforce. Establishing and embedding postgraduate research qualities will be a major step in incorporating these changes. In addition to developing the undergraduate qualities to a higher level, we have suggested the addition of qualities specific to the investigative skills unique to PhD graduates. The PhD qualities can be embedded with a variety of methods as outlined above. Establishing and embedding postgraduate qualities will ensure that the PhD degree at the University of Sydney is attractive to high quality candidates, elicits high student satisfaction ratings and produces graduates who are prepared for the contemporary work force.

CONSULTATION

The original draft of this report was prepared by Dr Natalie Soars (DVC-Ed Portfolio). We consulted with the Universities listed in the Appendix. We also thank the Chair of Academic Board and the University Secretariat for the re-finding of the 'Magnificent Seven' paper.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Financial considerations are yet to be developed. Once the architecture for managing, reporting and delivering on PhD graduate qualities has been determined, then a more detailed financial review will be presented.

RISKS / BENEFITS

The risks arise from inaction. First, we suffer a reputational risk if our PhD programs and graduates are seen as less relevant to a modern society and economy, with corresponding falls in recruitment of top talent and employment of our PhD graduates. This will be exacerbated by our competitor institutions taking effective action. UQ has a graduate qualities working group, Melbourne has already articulated a graduate qualities framework and UNSW is developing a graduate qualities framework via its graduate school. Next, we are at financial risk through the research block grants. The RTP component is determined by research grant income (25%), engagement metrics (25%) and HDR completions (50%). Completions are solely determined from those candidatures of ≤ 4 years FTE. A failure to address completion rates will affect block grant funding and via the UEM, faculty research allocations.

The benefits are simply the consequences of taking action. First, we will be better position to articulate why a PhD from Sydney is the best career option for a candidate wishing to develop deep level research and cognitive skills. The consequence of this is better recruitment. Second, the identification of graduate qualities will lead to interventions to ensure HDR candidates have the opportunity to undertake development actions to ensure they can achieve against those qualities. A study in the University of Newcastle (UK) demonstrated that if students engaged with skill development actions, both completion and publication rates improved¹⁰. The authors also report better graduate satisfaction, although the data underpinning this assertion are not

¹⁰ Humpheys et al (2013) Vitae International Researcher Development Conference.

<https://www.vitae.ac.uk/events/browse-event-presentations-reports-outcomes/2013-event-presentations/vitae-researcher-development-international-conference-2013-b7-impact-of-rd.pdf/@download/file/Vitae-Researcher-Development-International-Conference-2013-B7-Impact-of-RD.pdf>



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	30 May 2017
Item No	5.1

Non-Confidential

presented. Developing and articulating the graduate qualities for a PhD will facilitate the University and faculties to develop strategic inputs aimed at enhancing HDR candidate performance and satisfaction.

COMMUNICATION

The consultation forums on Graduate Qualities for the PhD will be advertised widely, including via yammer and Staff News with digests placed on the DVC-Ed Portfolio (Graduate Research) web pages. Communication of the outcomes of the consultation process will be communicated as part of the final proposal on PhD Graduate Qualities.



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	30 May 2017
Item No	5.1

Non-Confidential

APPENDIX 1. CURRENT PRACTICE WITH RESPECT TO GRADUATE QUALITIES AND TRANSFERABLE SKILL DEVELOPMENT FOR PHD STUDENTS IN THE UK AND AUSTRALIA

Below, we present an analysis of a few specific examples. Due to the close match of styles and academic progression for PhDs in the UK and Australia, we concentrated on these two jurisdictions. Although, there is much excellent work being done in the USA on enhancing the learning experiences for PhD students¹¹ (e.g. Bosque-Perez et al 2016), this is not necessarily transferrable to the Sydney experience owing to the dramatically different structure and duration of the two different degree systems.

HDR Graduate qualities and methods for developing, embedding and reporting them were collected from UK and Australian universities (Tables A1 and A2). These qualitative data were collected chiefly from Group of Eight universities and those that have similarities to the University of Sydney in term of size, structure, ranking and HDR degree structure. Universities that did not have published information on HDR graduate qualities or training programs were excluded. Not all universities had available information on how their qualities were developed and some did not provide comment when contacted.

Postgraduate qualities in the UK or Australia may have other labels such as *attributes*, *skills* or *capabilities* and can be roughly grouped into 7 categories:

- Deep knowledge of the study area
- Specific skills required to conduct research
- Personal and professional Integrity and ethics
- Critical thinking and problem solving
- Digital and information literacy
- Effective communication and collaboration skills
- Innovation and creativity

Typically, the list of qualities is developed by a working group, may involve a literature review and will be informed by undergraduate qualities and postgraduate qualities from other universities. Some universities, including many in the UK, do not have an explicit list of qualities and instead utilise the Researcher Development Framework by Vitae or its predecessor the Joint Skills Statement. The Vitae Researcher Development Framework (RDF) and Vitae Researcher Development Statement (RDS) were developed from an extensive consultation process using a phenomenographic approach. The result is system that can be utilized by researchers at any stage of their career to plan their skills training and reflect on the skills and qualities they already have.

The methods used to embed qualities can be summarized as:

- **Traditional methods** - APR, milestones, thesis production and assessment
- **Self-assessment** - Students reflect on a quality and record situations where they demonstrated that quality, this may be a hard copy form or online module
- **Personal Development Programs** – An action plan based on reflection and goal setting, such as the Vitae PDP
- **Workshops and Courses** - Providing access to existing courses or offering courses specifically aimed at qualities
- **Award or certificate** - Points are accrued for certain activities such as work placement, volunteer work, courses, workshops

In the UK there is already an emphasis on transferrable skills training for HDR students in response to the changing demands of the job market. UK Postgraduate Research Experience Survey results from 2015 indicate that 77% of students received research skills training, 46.5% received transferable skills training and

¹¹ National Science Foundation Graduate Education programs <https://www.nsf.gov/div/index.jsp?div=DGE>; Bosque-Pérez, N. A., P. Z. Klos, J. E. Force, L. P. Waits, K. Cleary, P. Rhoades, S. M. Galbraith, A. L. B. Brymer, M. O'Rourke, S. D. Eigenbrode, B. Finegan, J. D. Wulfhorst, N. Sibelet, and J. D. Holbrook. 2016. A pedagogical model for team-based, problem-focused interdisciplinary doctoral education. *Bioscience* 66:477-488.



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	30 May 2017
Item No	5.1

Non-Confidential

45.5 % had a personal training or development plan (UK PRES 2015). Some Group of Eight universities have also established programs for research and transferable skills training (Table A2).

Table A1. PhD Graduate Qualities for a sample of International Universities

UK University	What are their qualities?	How did they develop them?	How do they embed/capture/report?
U of Edinburgh	Short version of Vitae	Short version of Vitae	Self-assessment
U of Manchester	Vitae RDF	Vitae	Workshops, courses, Vitae PDP
Imperial College	21 Attributes for ALL degree programs	-	Courses (not strictly enforced)
U of Strathclyde Glasgow	Vitae RDF	2012 working group, Vitae RDF	Researcher Development Program and the compulsory Postgraduate Certificate in Researcher Professional Development (60 credit pts)
Oxford Brookes U	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic literacy Research literacy Critical self-awareness and personal literacy Digital and information literacy Active citizenship 	Lit. review, working Group, extension of 3 of the 5 undergraduate attributes	Training needs analysis, Vitae RDF, courses, 70 h per year, planner used as a report
U of E Anglia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic excellence Research capabilities Critical self-awareness and personal attributes Digital Literacy 	Based on UK Doctorate Guide and Vitae RDF	Training needs assessment, courses mapped to the vitae RDS
Cambridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transferable skills instead 	Joint Skills Statement	PDP, courses



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	30 May 2017
Item No	5.1

Non-Confidential

Table A2. PhD Graduate Qualities for a sample of Australian Universities

Australian University	What are their qualities?	How did they develop them?	How do they embed/report?
U of Melbourne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • conduct and report original research • international context • evaluate and synthesize literature • disciplinary and multi-disciplinary norms • problem-solving •analyse critically • oral and written communication • cooperate and respect • intellectual integrity, ethics • Digital literacy • national and international relevance • intellectual property, commercialisation • Write applications 	-	Online self-assessment, ePortfolio used as a report
U of Queensland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and skills in the field of study • Effective communication • Critical judgment and research skills • Independence, creativity and learning • Ethical and social understanding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General/ discipline • diversity of disciplines • international benchmarks 	milestones, thesis, APR, research seminars, ethical and research integrity guidelines, skills training
U of Adelaide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The capability to conduct research independently • A deep knowledge of the field of study • The ability to communicate research significance 	-	Thesis, customised Career and Research Skills Training (CaRST), based on Vitae RDF
U of WA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16 for undertaking research • 8 for professional attributes 	-	Courses, pebblepad online CV for reporting
ANU	Not stated, but training is based on Vitae RDF	Vitae RDF	Research Skills and training program, Vitae RDF
Griffith U	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A deep knowledge of their field, • Intellectual capabilities • Communication and collaboration skills • Research skills • Professionalism and integrity in the conduct of research 	-	Completion, Milestones Workshops
JCU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and skills in the field of study • Effective communication • Critical judgement and research skills • Independence, creativity and learning • Ethical and social understanding 	Past attributes JCU and UQ	PDP, typical PG student activities e.g. conference, teaching
U of Canberra	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Innovation and creativity • Critical judgement and reflection • Communication • Management of research • Professionalism and social responsibility 	-	PDP, APR, Canberra Award (points system)

APPENDIX 2. RELEVANT POLICIES

<http://sydney.edu.au/policies/>

Essential Resources For Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2016

Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	30 May 2017
Item No	5.1

Non-Confidential

Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Procedures 2015

University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (as amended)

Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013

Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Policy 2015

Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Procedures 2015



Non-Confidential

Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	30 May 2017
Item No	5.2

Author	Assoc. Prof. Ross Coleman; Director, Graduate Research
Reviewer/Approver	Assoc. Prof. Ross Coleman; Director, Graduate Research
Paper title	Providing Extra Advice to Associate Deans (RE) with Respect to Theses containing Potential Issues of Academic Dishonesty
Purpose	This paper describes an addition advice step for Associate Deans (RE) when considering an HDR thesis that has been flagged as having potential issues around academic honesty. It will ensure consistency of procedural fairness and also will facilitate timely-decision making.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the changes in the process of considering theses with potential academic honesty issues.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

We now examine every HDR thesis for academic honesty issues prior to them being sent to examiners. If a thesis is found to contain text which raises the suspicion of dishonesty, the associate dean (Research Education) has to decide whether to send the thesis out to examination or not. Each course of action has serious consequences if the thesis is found to contain plagiarised material. The proposal here is to introduce an extra level of additional advice in the first administrative screening. The intent is to provide associate deans (RE) with a risk evaluation for each option to facilitate better and timely decision-making.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

The University response to the report of the Senate Taskforce on Academic Honesty was to commission changes to how we check for, and manage, academic honesty issues in our educational provision. For higher degree by research candidatures, a key change was to mandate that all theses were checked through similarity-detection software post-submission and before being sent to examiners. Theses with obvious academic dishonesty would be referred directly to the Research Integrity Office, and theses presenting no evidence of academic dishonesty would be sent directly to examiners. The initial screening at this stage is done by the Higher Degree by Research Administration Centre (HDRAC) leading to the documentation of a suspicion of inappropriate academic practice (Academic Honesty Procedures 2016, section 16). The associate dean Research Education (RE) and faculty are then required to form a view as to how to handle the thesis. This step is necessary because it is actually a faculty-level decision whether a thesis should be sent up examination or not. It is at the faculty level that issues have been identified. Such issues have been noted as below (in no particular order):

1. A lack of consistency. Many associate deans will see fewer than five theses with identified problems and so ensuring a consistent approach within and among faculties will be a challenge.
2. Giving a faculty a problem thesis with no supporting advice may place an associate dean (RE) in a difficult position of having to choose between sending the thesis out (with a note) or asking the student to revise resubmit/commencing 'show cause' procedures. This significant decision should not be made without as much information as possible.
3. Given the serious nature of the decision to be made, the consideration of a course of action with insufficient advice may cause the examination process to be longer than needed, leading to unnecessary stress for all concerned.



Submission To	Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date	30 May 2017
Item No	5.2

Non-Confidential

The proposed solution is:

For theses that are identified as having some cause for concern with respect to potential academic dishonesty, the initial triage step completed by HDRAC is to be expanded to include a short review by an experienced academic. This review would lead to a risk-advice note being developed and added to the reporting workflow for the appropriate associate dean and his/her faculty committee to aid decision-making. The short review will not be, in any way, be considered equivalent to an initial enquiry as described in the Research Code of Conduct. The associate dean (RE) will then consider all of the evidence provided to the faculty when deciding what actions to take with respect to a given problematic thesis.

CONSULTATION

George Caryannopoulos (Manager, Higher Degree by Research Administration Centre)
Tristan Enright (Manager, Education Integrity)
Rebecca Griffin (Research Integrity Manager, RIO)
Dr Rebecca Halligan (Director, Research Integrity Office - RIO)
Assoc.Prof. Michael Kertesz (Chair, Graduate Studies Committee)
Assoc.Prof. Peter McCallum (Director, Educational Strategy)
Prof. Pip Pattison (DVC-Education)

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The academic advisor nominated to support the HDRAC team at the initial advice stage will be initially funded by the Research Integrity Office on the basis of a 5% loading.

RISKS / BENEFITS

Risks

Not implementing the action has two potential issues. The first is that associate deans (RE) will become much more risk-averse and will decline to examine all theses identified as having potential issues. Given such issues may arise because a student has failed to attribute authorship of his/her previously published work or there is a citation slip-up next to properly quoted text, then the examination process will be adversely affected and the student will be subject to unnecessary stress in addition to the RIO being overworked. Alternatively, theses that should not go to examination are identified by examiners as containing issues of academic dishonesty. This will lead to significant reputational damage to the University.

Benefits

The advice giving to associate deans (RE) and their faculties will both speed up decision-making and enhance the capacity of the faculty to make the correct decision for the university and the students.

IMPLEMENTATION

The Director, Graduate Research will nominate a suitable candidate who may receive extra training from the RIO. This person will be supported by the DVC-Education portfolio. The reporting workflow has already been adapted to take account of this small change.

At the end of the year, we will review the process and evaluate whether the additional advice provided added decision-making and/or speeded up the process.

COMMUNICATION

This plan primarily impacts associate deans RE. The Director, Graduate Research will communicate this change directly to them. A summary will also be provided to SUPRA for inclusion in their advice documents