NOTICE OF MEETING

Meeting 6/2017 of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee will be held from 2:00pm – 4:00pm on Tuesday 8 August 2017 in the Senate Room, Quadrangle. The Agenda for the meeting is below.

Dr Matthew Charet
Executive Officer to Academic Board

AGENDA

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

Associate Professor Vincent Gomes replaces Associate Professor Peter Gibbens representing Engineering & IT.

Andrew Barnes replaces Associate Professor Jennifer Rowley representing the Sydney Conservatorium of Music while Associate Professor Rowley is on SSP.

Apologies have been received from Associate Professor Mark Melatos and Professor Pip Pattison.

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

2.1 Minutes of Previous Meeting

Chair

2.2 Business Arising

Chair

3 STANDING ITEMS

3.1 Report of the Chair

Chair

3.2 Report of Academic Board

Tony Masters

4 ITEMS FOR ACTION

4.1 Election Candidates’ Conduct Procedures 2017

Tony Masters

4.2 Assessment Procedures 2011 – Amendments

Tony Masters

4.3 Higher Education Standards Framework and University Policy

Peter McCallum

4.4 Towards a University-wide Approach to Assessing the Graduate Qualities

Peter McCallum

4.5 Charter of Academic Freedom

Tony Masters
5 ITEMS FOR NOTING
5.1 2016 Consolidated Summary of the Student Experience and Graduate Outcomes

Pip Pattison attached

6 OTHER BUSINESS
6.1 Any Other Business

Next meeting: 2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 26 September 2017
Senate Room, Quadrangle

Remaining meeting dates for 2017:
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.
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolve that the minutes of meeting 5/2017, held on 11 July 2017, be confirmed as a true record.

MINUTES

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY COMMITTEE

2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 11 July 2017

Senate Room, Quadrangle (A14)

Members Present:

Professor Jane Hanrahan (Chair); Helen Agus (Science); Associate Professor Tim Allender (Education & Social Work); Isabella Brook (President, SRC); Associate Professor Geoff Frost (Business); Associate Professor Peter Gibbens (Engineering & IT); Kerrie Henderson (Office of General Counsel); Associate Professor Glen Hill (Architecture, Design & Planning); Associate Professor Veyssel Kayser (Pharmacy); Associate Professor Tony Masters (Chair of the Academic Board); Kiriti Morti (Nominee of the President, SUPRA) Professor Donna Waters (for Dr Vasiliki Betihavas, Nursing).

Attendees:

Dr Glenys Eddy (Acting Secretary).

Apologies:

Professor Adam Bridgeman (Director, Educational Innovation); Associate Professor Alex Chaves (Veterinary Science); Dr Frances Di Lauro (Arts & Social Sciences); Associate Professor Robyn Gibson (Education & Social Work); Professor Manuel Graeber (Medicine); Georgia Mantle (Student, Arts & Social Sciences); Associate Professor Mark Melatos (Arts and Social Sciences); Professor Pip Pattison (Deputy Vice-Chancellor Education); Dr Debra Shirley (Health Sciences); Professor Anne Twomey (Law); Professor Donna Waters (Nursing).

5/2017

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

1  WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, extended an especial welcome to Professor Tyrone Carlin, Professor Donna Waters attending for Dr Vasiliki Betihavas, and to Kiriti Morti, Nominee of the President, SUPRA. The Chair also noted the apologies as recorded above.
2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

2.1 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting held on the 30th of May 2017 were approved as a true record of that meeting.

Resolution ASPC17/5-1
That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolve that the minutes of meeting 4/2017, held on 30 May 2017, be confirmed as a true record.

2.2 Business Arising

There was no business arising from the previous meeting.

3 STANDING ITEMS

3.1 Report of the Chair

The Chair advised the meeting that she had nothing to report.

Resolution ASPC17/5-2
That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the report of the Chair.

3.2 Report of Academic Board

At its meeting on the 13th of June the Academic Board agreed to recommend that Senate adopt the University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017 as presented, and rescind the University of Sydney (Academic Governance) Rule 2003 (as amended), with effect from 19 July 2017. The Academic Board Rule 2017 states that ex officio members do not vote for the Academic Board Chair. Associate Professor Masters expressed concerned that no reason could be found for such a decision and there was no discussion in the Senate minutes from the time regarding this aspect of the change to the Governance Rule, the then-VC is no longer around to provide an explanation, and it is highly desirable for the University to be able to provide TEQSA with a rationale for the current position. Associate Professor Masters had therefore formed a working party to explore the reasons for the decision. Up until 2005 ex officio members did vote, but in 2005 no provisions were made in the Academic Governance Rule. The Working Party has produced reasons for ex officio members not voting in the election of the Academic Board Chair, which at this time are yet to be communicated to Associate Professor Masters.

Resolution ASPC17/5-3
That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 13 June 2017.

4 ITEMS FOR ACTION

4.1 Semester Dates 2019 and beyond

Professor Carlin spoke to the proposal, noting that whilst the ASPC had endorsed the previous version of the proposal by majority, the Academic Board expressed some concerns at its meeting of 13 June resulting in the paper not being approved. Consequently there are no semester dates for 2019 and beyond, and it is now imperative to establish a set of dates for 2019. The current paper circulated with the agenda made a further recommendation for semester dates, and Professor Carlin recommended, that pending approval by this meeting, the semester date pattern proposed be approved by the Academic Board for the foreseeable future.

Although the change from 13 to 12 weeks had been welcomed in some quarters of the University, 13 weeks had been preserved in the presented proposal. Changes to UAC’s dates with the main offer round, now 21 December, has resulted in the University making changes to its annual close-down dates, which now begin a week later. The University is also trying to create a six-week window in the Winter break to facilitate more time for Winter School. Appendix B of the proposal outlines some identified winter school programs at other universities that Sydney can partner with, and although this will require manual work-arounds and special permissions under our current
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semester dates, these identified winter schools will work with the proposed semester dates.

A concern was raised about the effect on professional experiential placement schedules which are tightly allied to the primary and secondary school semesters. The current difficulty of placing students, and the capacity of the proposed dates to shut down a window of opportunity for students to do placements during the school year, were both noted. Professor Carlin acknowledged that several faculties will be affected, and that faculties with placements at the end of the year face the problem of ensuring that exams are completed before this time.

Another concern was the decreasing flexibility faced by students enrolled in combined degrees, in terms of completing units and undertaking professional experience placements in a timely manner. A workaround being considered in some circumstances is for some cohorts to begin their semester earlier. Students enrolled in the combined Education and Arts or Science degree will begin their Education units earlier, and units in Arts or Science would begin on the dates set out in the Registrar's model. However, the earlier start of semester 1 would impact on the availability of combined-degree students to complete a block of placements in February.

A workaround being considered for admission to combined Medicine and Dentistry degrees is to make a conditional offer earlier, based on the candidate’s successful navigation through the interview, and the firm offer later. Professor Carlin observed that a large amount of work will be compressed into late November. In order to understand the effect of this on the grant writing window, he has sought feedback from seasoned ARC and NHMRC grant recipients, who maintain that this will not adversely affect the University's grant performance; NHMRC and some ARC deadlines already fall with the proposed semester periods and good planning and support from the Research Office will help.

Trimesters at UNSW, how will they play out in relation to us? Professor Carlin replied that we don’t know precisely, but they have adopted a strategy to get 3 billion dollars within the next three years, get more students, but need to spend on more buildings, so try to extend their pattern of utilization of their estate, maximize teaching time; heavily promoting Summer School, 36 weeks of utilization of buildings a year; science is where they might be aggressive, coheres to some of their core strengths; underweight in the natural sciences and humanities, expects that they will be aggressive in those areas; UAC will still further change their enrolment schedule; thinks that there will be an enrolment round in the 3rd semester/trimester; we have raised English requirements a level higher to counteract; they will pitch accelerated completion; his paper not predicated as a competitive response to UNSW, but the university is mindful of the issue. The UNSW landscape is changing predicated on a set of commercial objectives, so they need to grow.

Concern was expressed about the effect on due dates for return of results with Semester 2 being pushed back a week. Professor Carlin stated that both exams and results-release would occur a week later. He would make it explicit in the paper that it is the same interval between return of results and close-down, but all will occur a week later, with the release of results pushed back to 18th of December. The dates for results release and close-down will be added to the Semester Dates table.

Concern was also expressed for students who would undertake off-shore internships of up to 12 weeks’ duration, which would need to take place in the Summer break as the Winter break is not long enough to be competitive.

Professor Carlin confirmed that the Census date for student enrolments will remain at the end of week 4 of semester. He also thought that the change of dates should not affect the APA allotment process as this has been streamlined so that scholarships can be offered earlier, but would check this with Associate Professor Coleman nonetheless.

To the statement that the proposal had not been circulated early enough for the faculties to have had time to respond, Professor Hanrahan responded that she believed that the deans had received the proposal some time ago, but members should take it to their faculties for discussion, and email Professor Carlin directly about any concerns they feel have not been addressed.

With nine members for the proposal and one against, the Committee endorsed the proposal for presentation to the Academic Board for approval.
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Resolution ASPC17/5-4
That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board approve the semester date model recommended in this paper, as set out in Appendix A, noting the commentary on both risks and benefits associated with the change.

4.2 Election Procedures 2017
Kerrie Henderson outlined the design of these procedures as a single set of procedures to meet the requirements of both the GOFUS rule and the Academic Board rule. The paper circulated with the agenda discussed progress with the process: the electronic platform has been identified, and a code of conduct has been developed for candidates in these elections.

There are requirements for preserved positions, for instance, for a number of professors on the Academic Board and for a certain spread of academics: for a certain number of levels A to B and C to D. There will also be a number of allocated positions with at least one undergraduate and postgraduate representatives.

People will vote using optional preferential voting. The user will not be able to forward on the election email. Once voting has closed, the system will generate a ranked list and positions will be allocated. All allocated positions will be determined first, and if only one meets the criteria for the position then the candidate will be appointed. After this allocation will depend on the number of votes.

The committee endorsed this proposal for presentation to the Academic Board.

Resolution ASPC17/5-5
That the Academic Standards & Policy Committee discuss the Election Procedures 2017 and note that they will come into effect from 8 August 2017.

4.3 Dentistry: Amendment of Resolutions of Faculty
Several changes to the Faculty resolutions were proposed, one of which was to extend the time limit for the Doctor of Dental Medicine from five to seven years (which had not been marked up in the CMS pdf). Kerrie Henderson undertook to check the consistency of this with the Coursework Rule, and observed that although the other changes could be approved by Academic Board, the time-limit change would need Senate approval on the Academic Board’s recommendation.

In relation to the 10-year time limit for many degrees, Dentistry was concerned that students who suspend for too long a time might lose their already acquired skills. Seven years was considered an appropriate time-limit, being not too long, but being long enough not to disadvantage students who might need to suspend for periods, for instance, to take maternity leave.

The committee endorsed this proposal for presentation to the Academic Board for approval.

Resolution ASPC17/5-6
That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend the amendments for approval by the Academic Board.

5 ITEMS FOR NOTING

6 OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 Any Other Business
There being no other business, the meeting concluded at 3:12pm.

Next meeting: 2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 8 August 2017
Senate Room, Quadrangle

Recommender

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 25 July 2017.

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 11 July 2017; and

- noted a presentation, Respect Now, Always, by the Registrar;
- 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 5 July 2017 meeting;
- approved the semester date model as proposed, noting the commentary on both risks and benefits associated with the change;
- discussed the Election Procedures 2017 and noted that they will come into effect from 7 August 2017;
- approved the amendment of the Resolutions of the Faculty of Dentistry, as presented, with immediate effect.

The Academic Board noted the report of the Chair of the Academic Board; and

- resolved that *ex officio* staff members of the Academic Board be included in the electorate for the Chair of the Academic Board, noting that this would be reported to the next meeting of Senate.

The Academic Board noted the report of the Admissions Committee meeting held on 11 July 2017; and

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Economic Analysis and embedded courses, and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018.

The Academic Board noted the report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee meeting held on 4 July 2017 and:

- approved the proposal from the Deputy Vice Chancellor Education Portfolio, and approved the common degree table template for use by all faculties where streams, programs, majors and minors are represented in degree resolutions, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from the Deputy Vice Chancellor Education Portfolio to amend the Table S/Dalyell stream units, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from the Deputy Vice Chancellor Education Portfolio, and approved the Table O amendments arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Bachelor of Design Computing / Advanced Studies and Bachelor of Design Computing, and approved the amendment of the unit of study table arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
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• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Bachelor of Architecture and Environments, and approved the amendment of the course resolutions and the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Bachelor of Design in Architecture (Honours) / Master of Architecture, and approved the amendment of the course resolutions and the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Arts / Bachelor of Advanced Studies, and approved the amendment of the course resolutions and the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Education / Bachelor of Arts, and approved the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Economics / Bachelor of Advanced Studies, and approved the amendment of the course resolutions and the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Diploma of Arts, and approved the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Diploma of Language Studies, and approved the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Diploma of Social Sciences, and approved the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Business to amend the Bachelor of Commerce and Bachelor of Commerce/Bachelor of Advanced Studies, and approved the amendment of the course resolutions and the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Sydney College of the Arts to amend the Bachelor of Visual Arts and Bachelor of Visual Arts/Advanced Studies, and approved the amendment of the course resolutions and the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Advanced Computing, and approved the amendment of the course resolutions and the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Project Management, and approved the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours, and approved the amendment of the course resolutions and the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Aeronautical), and approved the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Biomedical), and approved the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Chemical), and approved the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Civil), and approved the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Electrical), and approved the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Mechanical), and approved the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Mechatronic), and approved the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Software), and approved the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Humanitarian), and approved the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (various majors), and approved the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Flexible First Year), and approved the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Applied Science (Speech Pathology), and approved the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Applied Science (Physiotherapy), and approved the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise and Sport)/MND, and approved the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery to amend the Bachelor of Arts/Master of Nursing, and approved the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery to amend the Bachelor of Science/Master of Nursing, and approved the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Pharmacy to amend the Bachelor of Pharmacy, Bachelor of Pharmacy (Honours), Bachelor of Pharmacy and Management, Bachelor of Pharmacy and Management (Honours), and approved the amendment of the course resolutions and the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science; Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Advanced Studies, and approved the amendment of the course resolutions and the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science; Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Advanced Studies/Bachelor of Science (Advanced Mathematics), and approved the amendment of the course resolutions and the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Laws, and approved the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science and Doctor of Dental Medicine, and approved the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science and Doctor of Medicine, and approved the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science in Agriculture, and approved the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science in Agriculture, Bachelor of Science in Agriculture (Honours), Bachelor of Food and Agribusiness, Bachelor of Food and Agribusiness (Honours), and approved the amendment of the course resolutions and the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;

• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Environmental Systems, and approved the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;

• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Animal Veterinary Bioscience, and approved the amendment of the course resolutions and the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;

• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Veterinary Science, and approved the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;

• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science (Veterinary) and Bachelor of Science (Veterinary) (Honours), and approved the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;

• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Medical Science/Bachelor of Medical Science (Honours), and approved the amendment of the course resolutions and the table of units of study arising from the proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018.

The Academic Board noted the report of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on 4 July 2017 and:

• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to introduce the Master of Crosscultural and Applied Linguistics, Graduate Diploma in Crosscultural and Applied Linguistics and Graduate Certificate of Crosscultural and Applied Linguistics, and recommended that Senate endorse the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal and approve amendments to the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, and approve the introduction of Course Resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;

• approved the proposal from Sydney Medical School to amend the Master of Medicine/Science in Medicine (Pain Management), and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;

• approved the proposal from the Sydney College of the Arts to delete the Master of Film and Digital Image (MFDI) and Master of Interactive and Digital Media (MIDM), recommended 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 College of the Arts, and approved the deletion of Course Resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

• approved the proposal from the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Graduate Certificate in Architectural Science, Graduate Diploma in Architectural Science and Master of Architectural Science, and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;

• approved the proposal from the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Bachelor of Design in Architecture (Honours)/Master of Architecture, and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;

• approved the proposal from the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts and related programs, and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;

• approved the proposal from the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Graduate Certificate in Urban Design, Graduate Diploma in Urban Design and Master of Urban Design, and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Master of Urbanism, and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Graduate Certificate in Urban and Regional Planning, Graduate Diploma in Urban and Regional Planning and Master of Urban and Regional Planning, and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Creative Writing and embedded courses, and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Human Rights and embedded courses, and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of International Relations, and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of International Security, and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of International Studies, and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Graduate Certificate in Political Economy, and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Public Policy, and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of US Studies, and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend the Master of Commerce, Graduate Diploma in Commerce and Graduate Certificate in Commerce, and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend the Master of International Business and Graduate Certificate in International Business, and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend the Master of Logistics and Supply Chain Management, Graduate Diploma in Logistics and Supply Chain Management and Graduate Certificate in Logistics and Supply Chain Management, and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend the Master of Management, Master of Management (CEMS) and Graduate Certificate in Management, and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend the Master of Professional Accounting, Graduate Diploma in Professional Accounting and Graduate Certificate in Professional Accounting, and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Graduate Diploma in Computing, and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Civil), (Fluids), (Geomechanical) and (Structural) programs, and
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approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Electrical), (Power) and (Telecommunications) programs, and approved the amendment to the tables of Units of Study arising from the proposal, with effect from Semester 1, 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Software), and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend core units in the Master of Information Technology, Master of Information Technology Management and Master of Information Technology/Master of Information Technology Management, and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from Sydney Medical School to amend the Doctor of Medicine, and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from Sydney Nursing School to amend the Master of Nursing, and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Pharmacy to amend the Master of Pharmacy, Graduate Certificate in Pharmacy Practice, and Graduate Certificate in Evidence-Based Complementary Medicines; approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, and approved the amendment of the Resolutions of the Faculty of Pharmacy for coursework awards, with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Dentistry to amend the Doctor of Dental Medicine, and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, as amended with effect from 1 January 2018;
• noted the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Complex Systems, and noted the amendment of the table of Units of Study arising from the proposal, with effect from Semester 1, 2018;
• noted the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Data Science, and noted the amendment of the table of Units of Study arising from the proposal, with effect from Semester 1, 2018;
• noted the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Engineering (Biomedical Engineering), and noted the amendment of the table of Units of Study arising from the proposal, with effect from Semester 1, 2018;
• noted the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Engineering (Chemical and Biomolecular), and noted the amendment of the table of Units of Study arising from the proposal, with effect from Semester 1, 2018;
• noted the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Engineering (Civil) (Fluids) (Geomechanical) (Structural), and noted the amendment of the table of Units of Study arising from the proposal, with effect from Semester 1, 2018;
• noted the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Engineering (Electrical) (Power) (Telecommunications), and noted the amendment of the table of Units of Study arising from the proposal, with effect from Semester 1, 2018;
• noted the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Engineering (Mechanical), and noted the amendment of the table of Units of Study arising from the proposal, with effect from Semester 1, 2018;
• noted the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Engineering (Software), and noted the amendment of the table of Units of Study arising from the proposal, with effect from Semester 1, 2018;
• noted the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Aerospace), and noted the amendment of the table of Units of Study arising from the proposal, with effect from Semester 1, 2018;
Non-Confidential

- noted the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Biomedical) and noted the amendment of the table of Units of Study arising from the proposal, with effect from Semester 1, 2018;
- noted the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Chemical and Biomolecular), and noted the amendment of the table of Units of Study arising from the proposal, with effect from Semester 1, 2018;
- noted the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Mechanical), and noted the amendment of the table of Units of Study arising from the proposal, with effect from Semester 1, 2018;
- noted the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Project Leadership and the Master of Project Management, and noted the amendment of the table of Units of Study arising from the proposal, with effect from Semester 1, 2018;
- noted the proposal from Sydney Medical School to amend the Master of Medicine/Science in Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology), Master of International Public Health, Master of Health Communication, Master of Health Policy, Master of Medicine/Science in Medicine (Metabolic Health), Master of Public Health, Master of Public Health (Professional Practice) and Master of Surgery (Surgical Sciences) and embedded courses, and noted the amendment of unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from Semester 1, 2018.
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| Purpose                       | To advise the Academic Standards and Policy Committee of the Election Candidates’ Conduct Procedures 2017, as presented.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee discuss the Election Candidates’ Conduct Procedures 2017, as presented.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At its meeting of 25 July 2017, the Academic Board discussed the introduction of the Election Procedures 2017, which will guide the conduct of staff and student elections required by the University of Sydney (Governance of Faculties and University Schools) Rule 2016 ("the GOFUS Rule") and the University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017 ("the Academic Board Rule").

The attached Election Candidates’ Conduct Procedures 2017, in conjunction with the Code of Conduct – Staff and Affiliates and Code of Conduct for Students, provide further guidance for the conduct of elections, including but not limited to campaigning, canvassing votes and voting.

These Procedures are provided for discussion.
1 Purpose and application

(1) These procedures are to give effect to the electoral provisions of the University of Sydney (Governance of Faculties and University Schools) Rule 2016 ("the GOFUS Rule") and the University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017 ("the Academic Board Rule").

(2) These procedures should be read in conjunction with the Election Procedures 2017.

(3) These procedures apply, in addition to the Code of Conduct – Staff and Affiliates and Code of Conduct for Students, to all staff and students involved in the conduct of:

(a) elections held under the GOFUS Rule or the Academic Board Rule; and
(b) election campaigns.

2 Commencement

These procedures commence on [date].

3 Interpretation

(1) Words and phrases used in these procedures and not otherwise defined in this document have the meanings they have in the GOFUS Rule, the Academic Board Rule, as appropriate, or the Election Procedures 2017.

Note: See section 1.4 of the GOFUS Rule, section 1.4 of the Academic Board Rule, and clause 3 of the Election Procedures 2017.
(2) In these procedures:

- **campaign materials** means all electronic and non-electronic materials used for the promotion of a candidate including web pages, emails, social media posts, brochures and flyers.

- **campaigning** means carrying out an activity that identifies a person as a candidate for an election.

- **candidate** means a person who has nominated for election, and whose nomination has been accepted.

- **supporter** means a person assisting a candidate in an election campaign.

4 Principles

(1) The relevant Returning Officer must provide a copy of these procedures and the *Election Procedures 2017* to all candidates as soon as possible after receipt of their nomination.

(2) Staff and students involved in campaigning for elections must not engage in dishonest or misleading practices during the course of the campaign.

(3) All information provided to the Returning Officer, orally or in writing, must be true, accurate and not misleading.

(4) Campaign materials must not contain images or languages, or promote behaviour, that:
   - breaches any legislative or regulatory requirement;
   - breaches any University Rule, policy or procedures; or
   - in the reasonable opinion of the Returning Officer, is offensive.

   **Note:** See [Code of Conduct – Staff and Affiliates](#), the [Code of Conduct for Students](#), and [Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Policy 2015](#).

(5) Each candidate is responsible for the actions of their supporters during the campaign.

4 Campaigning

(1) Each candidate must inform their supporters:
   - about the requirements of these procedures; and
   - the necessity to observe these requirements at all times.

(2) During the course of the election, candidates and their supporters must conduct themselves in a manner that:
   - does not compromise the fairness and integrity of the election process, including the conduct of a secret ballot; and
   - does not prejudice the good name of the University.
5  Canvassing votes

(1) Candidates and their supporters may approach potential voters to ask for their vote.

(2) Candidates and their supporters must not:
   (a) harass, intimidate or coerce potential voters to vote for or against a particular candidate; or
   (b) use any means, including bribery or threats, to induce a potential voter to vote for or against a particular candidate.

   Note: See Code of Conduct – Staff and Affiliates, the Code of Conduct for Students, and Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Policy 2015.

6  Voting

(1) No person may:
   (a) log in online with another person’s ID or password; or
   (b) use another person’s ID and password to vote online on an electronic device.

   Note: See Clause 5(q) of the Policy on the use of University Information and Communication Technology Resources (ICT Resources).

(2) No person may
   (a) provide another person with their passwords; or
   (b) allow another person to vote on their behalf.

   Note: See clause 11a of the Information Security Policy.

7  Breach of these procedures

Breaches of these procedures may constitute misconduct or serious misconduct, and the University may take disciplinary action against any person who does so.
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RECOMMENDATION

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

a) approve the amendment of the Assessment Procedures 2011, as presented; and

b) approve the adoption of the amended policy

with effect from 12 September 2017 (for Semester 2 examinations).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The proposed amendment of the Assessment Procedures 2011, as attached, includes changes from the following areas:

- Academic Board Working Group for replacement assessments (section 14, clause 13 sub-clause (a)). This was a student-led working group convened in 2016 to address the issue of the absence of a limit to the number of replacement assessments that could occur once a student misses an assessment during the formal exam period. Under existing provisions successful special consideration requests on subsequent replacement assessments could allow matters to continue for months (or, in some cases, years) before a grade or DC was awarded. The proposed amendment now offers students two opportunities for a replacement assessment.

- Disability Service Office for accessible examination and assessment arrangements (section 12). The office has changed their processes as a result of the changes to the recent centralisation of formal examinations.

- Administrative changes to Schedule 3 to ensure alignment with sections 13 and 14 of the procedures.
1 Purpose and application

(a) These procedures are to give effect to Part 14 of the Coursework Policy 2014 ("the policy").

(b) These procedures apply to:
   (i) all coursework programs offered by the University; and
   (ii) assessment tasks at unit and program or course level, including individual and group tasks.

2 Commencement

(1) These procedures commence on 1 January 2012 with full compliance with these procedures to be reached by 31 December 2013.

(2) Sub-clause 5(7) commences in 2017 on a date to be determined by the Registrar.

3 Interpretation

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

   Note: See clause 5 of the policy.

(2) In these procedures:

   academic unit means a faculty, University school, board of studies, school, department, centre or interdisciplinary committee of the University.

   assessment rubrics means marking guides that state the criteria against which an assessment will be marked.

   examination means the final examination of a unit of study, which is held during the formal examination period.
Examinations Office means the University administrative unit responsible for the management of all examinations held during the formal examination period.

formal examination period means weeks 15 and 16 of each semester.

late results means results that are not entered into the student management system by the date determined by the Registrar for that purpose.

peer assessment means students commenting upon and evaluating the work of a fellow student.

replacement examination period means week 18 of each semester, in which replacement examinations for the formal examination period take place.

retention period means the mandatory period for which records must be maintained, as mandated by the NSW State Records Authority under the State Records Act 1998 (NSW).

self assessment means students evaluating their own learning, both in relation to their process of learning and its outcomes.

standards-based assessment means awarding marks to students to reflect the level of performance (or standard) they have achieved. Students’ grades are therefore not determined in relation to the performance of others, nor to predetermined distributions.

Note: See clause 7

Student Identification Number means the unique identification number assigned to each student upon their first enrolment at the University.

test means any test not conducted consistently with clause 8 of these procedures.

4 Application of implementation statements to assessment principles

(1) These procedures set out the implementation statements designed to give effect to the assessment principles established by the policy.

(2) Schedule 1 to these procedures is a table correlating assessment principles to implementation statements.

5 Assessment standards, design and quality assurance - Principles 1 to 4

(1) Standards or levels of expected performance should be described for assessment tasks in sufficient detail that students can improve the quality of their work.
(2) Standards should typically be defined in the context of the discipline, course or level of the unit.

(3) Standards (including threshold or pass standards) should be benchmarked against comparable disciplinary and/or professional standards, within the University and beyond.

Note: See also the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015

(4) Peer review or moderation of assessment tasks should be used to ensure the appropriateness of the tasks set and their conformity with the policy.

(5) Program learning outcomes must be consistent with the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015, and assessed at appropriate points throughout the degree.

(6) Students should have the opportunity for formative practice or experience on each type of instrument that is used to determine grades.

(7) In examinations, test or other assessments consisting of written elements, students should be identified on scripts, essay books or answers sheets by Student Identification Number only. Names should not be used.

(8) Where possible, program-level coordination should aim to have assessments timetabled to take account of other academic demands on a student’s time, such as other assessments or the requirements of other units of study.

(9) Moderation of marking between markers should ensure that shared understandings of the expected standards are developed, along with consistent application of these standards.

(10) Feedback on student work should be sufficiently timely to allow improvement where necessary.

(11) Where possible, assessments should be designed to enable students to apply feedback provided for an earlier task to a later task. This is particularly relevant to first year units.

(12) Feedback on student work, either individually or in a group, should be sufficiently detailed to be a useful identification of strengths and areas for improvement, yet not so detailed as to discourage self-reliance in learning and assessment.

(13) Evaluative feedback from students in relation to assessment should be incorporated by teachers, where appropriate, into teaching and learning strategies and future assessments.

6 Informing students – Principles 1 and 2

(1) The scope and nature of the assessment for each unit of study should be explicitly stated in the unit of study outline and published no later than one week prior to the commencement of the semester or teaching period in which the unit is offered. This statement should include:

(a) details of all aspects of the assessment system, including the intended learning outcomes to be tested;

Note: The University’s requirements for assessments are set out in section 19 of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2016, section 10 of the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016 and section 60 of the Coursework Policy 2014.

(b) the standards against which performance will be measured;

(c) an assessment table, with:

(i) the weighting of items and of tasks or papers;
(ii) the due date for submission or testing;
(iii) the conditions under which examinations will be sat;
(d) the conditions for extensions of time (if any); and
(e) the penalties for lateness or violation of assessment specifications (e.g. length).

(2) All new units of study commencing from semester 1, 2018 should use the standard assessment table in Schedule 2.

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

(4) Unit of study outlines must comply with the requirements of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 of the Academic Board.

(5) Any necessary modifications to the scope or nature of any assessment task must be communicated in writing to all students enrolled in the unit before the halfway point of the unit, and must be applied so that no student is differentially disadvantaged by the modification.

(6) Students must be informed of the style of academic referencing required and given opportunities to practice and gain feedback on academic writing and relevant scholarly conventions in the course discipline, in accordance with the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015.

(7) Students must be informed of the faculty’s required method for applying for simple extensions.

Note: See clause 11A of these procedures, and clause 66A of the Coursework Policy 2014.

7 Marking and determination of grades – Principles 2 and 3

(1) Grades must be applied consistently in accordance with clause 66 and Schedule 1 of the policy, including the use of prescribed grade descriptors.

(2) Tasks must be marked according to the published criteria provided to students.

Note: See Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

(3) Assessment must be evaluated solely on the basis of students' achievement against criteria and standards specified to align with learning outcomes.

(4) In the interests of transparency of grading the University uses a standards-based approach to assessing the achievements of students.

(a) In this approach, grades are allocated using pre-determined standards. Students’ grades are not determined in relation to predetermined distributions.

(5) Faculties and departments should implement the following aspects of standards-based assessment.

(a) At unit of study level, where possible, examples of students’ work should be identified which are characteristic of achievement for at least two different merit grades (benchmarks).

(b) If samples involve examples of real students’ work, then a copy of the signed permission of the student author must be kept for as long as the example is used for this purpose.
(c) When it is not possible to provide samples of work, a suitable description of the task and expected standards associated with different levels of achievement should be provided.

(d) The differences between work at different achievement levels should be described in information given to students. These grade descriptors should be statements such as:

At HD level, a student demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the unit material, and exhibits initiative and self-reliance in critically evaluating and synthesizing ideas related to the unit.

(e) Assessments and examinations must be graded against the benchmarks and outcomes discussed among colleagues teaching within the unit and in similar units to refine the standards.

(6) Each faculty should have and publish a written statement on standards applying in that faculty and how they are being assured.

(7) All students within a unit of study will be assessed according to the same standards and using the same or comparable assessment instruments.

(8) Assessment related decisions which may impact on a student’s progression or graduation:

(a) must be based solely on the assessments specified for that purpose; and

(b) must not depend on judgements made by a single marker without review by colleagues for calibration or moderation.

(9) When marks from tasks are combined, the methods used should be statistically and educationally defensible.

(10) Due account must be taken of any special consideration granted under clause 67, and reasonable adjustment under clause 68, of the policy.

8 Conduct of examinations - Principles 1 to 4

(1) The principal examiner is responsible for:

(a) complying with and completing all administrative requirements for the examination by the specified deadline;

(b) providing the examination paper to the Examinations Office by the specified deadline;

(c) securing working papers developed in preparation for examinations; and

(d) accounting for all secure papers.

(2) Examiners are strongly encouraged to require no more than 30 minutes of final examination per credit point to a maximum of 3 hours. A shorter time is acceptable, especially when students are also assessed progressively.

(3) Examinations should typically be of a higher weight than tests or other assessments required in a unit of study.

(4) Examinations may consist of written elements, non-written elements or a combination of both.

(5) All examinations other than those which include non-written elements must be administered by the Examinations Office.

(6) In relation to all examinations, the Examinations Office is responsible for:
(a) managing examination venue bookings;
(b) security protocol and printing examination papers;
(c) retaining final examination papers in the University archives;
(d) scheduling examinations generally;
(e) scheduling examinations in postgraduate coursework units of study, as far as practicable, at times consistent with class times and
(f) recruiting and training examination invigilators

(7) All examinations must be of one of the following durations:
   (a) 1 hour;
   (b) 1.5 hours;
   (c) 2 hours;
   (d) 2.5 hours; or
   (e) 3 hours.

(8) All examinations, except for those in the University of Sydney Law School, must provide for ten minutes reading time in addition to the stated examination duration. Examinations in the University of Sydney Law School must provide 30 minutes reading time.

(9) All examinations must be invigilated by University trained invigilators.

(10) Any unit of study with a value of six or fewer credit points should be examined in no more than one examination, apart from exceptional cases approved by the relevant dean.

(11) Any unit of study with a value of more than six credit points should be examined in no more than two examinations sessions.

(12) No student may be required to sit for more than two examinations on the same day. Where a student has three examinations scheduled for the same day, the Examinations Office must provide for one to be taken at an alternative time.

(13) To avoid examination timetable clashes, end of semester take-home tests should have a scheduled due date on either the last day before the formal examination period, or the last day of the formal examination period.

(14) Tests may be held during classes provided that faculties ensure that the overall assessment practices in all units of study are reasonable and not structured in a way that may disrupt attendance at other classes.

(15) The week after the end of teaching in each semester will be a study break (Stu-Vac, week 14) with the formal examination period to commence the following week, week 15.

(16) Principal examiners seeking to directly administer written examinations without the involvement of the Examinations Office must obtain the Registrar's written permission to do so each year. Such requests must:
   (a) set out the reason why the examination cannot be administered by the Examinations Office; and
   (b) detail the arrangements for secure printing and storage of examination papers.

(17) In relation to written examinations administered other than by the Examinations Office, the principal examiner is responsible for:
(a) providing the Examinations Office with all necessary information to schedule the examination, within the timeframes specified by the Examinations Office;
(b) arranging the Examinations Office to book an appropriate examination venue;
(c) arranging secure printing and storage of examination papers;
(d) providing a copy of the final examination paper to the Examinations office for retention in the University archives; and
(e) arranging for invigilation of the examination by University trained invigilators.

9 Security of examination papers - Principles 1 to 4

(1) In the preparation of examination papers, it is essential to ensure the security of questions and papers, so that examinations are fair to all students and the opportunity for unfair advantage for any individual or group is precluded.

(2) Results must be kept secure while they are being entered and summed up, so that they cannot be fraudulently changed.

(3) When questions are re-used in subsequent examination papers, variation is encouraged as far as practicable, within the constraint that questions requiring selected responses (including multiple choice variants) need to be trialled adequately to ensure their validity and reliability.

(4) Students’ examination scripts should be retained by the department for the specified retention period, after which they should be destroyed.

Note: At the date of these procedures this is 6 months. See the Recordkeeping Manual.

(5) Students are entitled to access their own written scripts, provided the request is made during the script retention period.

(a) Written work which answers questions from examinations not secured for re-use may be copied by students.

(b) Written work which answers questions from secured or confidential examination papers may not be copied, and may only be viewed by appointment, either individually or in groups, under appropriate academic supervision.

(6) All possible breaches of security or incidences of misconduct during an examination must be reported to the principal examiner and, if appropriate, to the Registrar. All unusual events, breaches of security or difficulties encountered in the setting, transport, marking or entering of results should be reported to the head, if possible before the head determines the results of the examination.

(7) Any paper whose security may have been compromised should be re-set.

10 Emergency evacuations during examinations - Principles 1 to 4

(1) If an evacuation is required, presiding examination invigilators:

(a) should make a note of the time at which the examination is stopped;

(b) should adhere to the instructions of precinct officers or security staff;

(c) if time permits, should attempt to contact the Examinations Office to inform them of the evacuation.
(2) Precinct officers and or security staff will direct students and invigilators to an appropriate area, where they must await further information. Unless otherwise instructed by precinct officers or security staff, students must remain in the immediate vicinity.

(3) Examination invigilators should inform students that, until otherwise instructed, there must be no communication between them and that the use of mobile phones or other communication devices, is not permitted except in exceptional circumstances and under strict supervision.

(4) If, after 20 minutes have elapsed from the time of evacuation, a student’s circumstances require them to make electronic contact (for example, to telephone someone for whom they have carer’s responsibilities or to an employer so as to ensure their employment is not adversely affected), the student may make a communication which is:

(a) as brief as possible; and

(b) under the direction and supervision of an examination invigilator.

(5) When notified that an examination room has been evacuated, the Examinations Office must notify:

(a) the principal examiner

(b) the relevant dean;

(c) the director of the Student Centre; and

(d) the Registrar.

(6) The relevant dean will determine whether the examination is to be resumed at the earliest opportunity, or whether it must be re-sat by the affected students. If the dean is not available, the following persons will be consulted, in the order below, and the first available will make the determination.

(a) the appropriate associate or sub-dean;

(b) the head of the relevant school or department.

(7) In making a determination under subclause 10(6), the decision maker will consult with security staff and or precinct officers as appropriate to determine whether a continuing threat exists and, if not, whether the examination rooms were secured at all times.

(8) The examination will be deemed to have been abandoned if:

(a) none of the individuals referred to in subclause 10(6) of these procedures is available; or

(b) the emergency or evacuation has compromised the examination room itself.

(9) When a decision is taken to abandon an examination, the Examinations Office will notify the relevant presiding invigilators who will inform students that the University will contact them as soon as possible about alternative arrangements.

(10) If an examination is abandoned due to an evacuation, only the examination sessions in the affected room(s) are deemed to have been abandoned. Where the examination is also being held in other locations unaffected by the emergency, those sessions will continue as normal.

(11) When an examination is abandoned, students’ work (such as answer booklets or computer answer sheets) is deemed null and void for the purposes of marking.
(12) After an examination has been abandoned, the Examinations Office will consult with the examiners and departments concerned and make arrangements for the affected students to re-sit the examination(s) as soon as possible.

(13) Students affected by an abandoned examination are advised to remain in Sydney and not make any travel plans until the official end of the examination period.

(14) All University policies, including those relating to illness and misadventure, apply in the circumstances of the re-sitting of an abandoned examination as they would have to the original examination.

(15) Serious incidents affecting more than one examination location should be assessed immediately by the Registrar who should obtain the advice of the Campus Security Unit, the Examinations Office and the director of the Student Centre.

(a) The Registrar should determine as soon as possible whether some examinations may proceed or the entire examination session should be postponed.

(b) All relevant deans, heads of departments, examiners and students should be notified immediately.

(16) If an examination is re-commenced after an evacuation, the presiding invigilators must allow students the full time lost to the evacuation, along with an additional 5 minutes to compensate for the disruption involved.

11 Use of handheld computing devices in examinations - Principle 3

(1) Hand held computing devices, including computers, calculators and internet-capable devices, are not normally permitted in examinations.

(2) Departments may develop examinations and assessments in which such devices are permitted but in doing so must consider the equity, supervisory and logistical implications of their use.

(3) The University adopts the approved calculator list for 2 Unit Mathematics issued by the NSW Board of Studies from time to time as its list of non-programmable calculators acceptable for use in examinations at the University.

(a) A copy of this list must be provided to:

(i) students sitting examinations which permit use of non-programmable calculators;

(ii) principal examiners who specify that non-programmable calculators may be used by candidates for their papers; and

(iii) examination invigilators.

(b) Examination invigilators must report any use of an unauthorised device in an examination.

(4) Students who own a non-programmable calculator which they wish to use in an appropriate examination may take the unit to the Examinations Office for approval, where the unit will be marked indelibly if it is approved for use.
12 Accessible examination and assessment arrangements - Principle 3

(1) Students who have registered with the University’s Disability Services, and have satisfied the University’s requirements for supporting documentation, may be eligible for reasonable adjustments or accessible examination and assessment arrangements.

(2) University staff are generally required to implement the examination and assessment adjustments or arrangements approved and notified by Disability Services, with the exceptions described in the Disability Standards for Education (2005).

(3) Staff should familiarise themselves with the Disability Standards for Education (2005) and discuss any concerns about notified adjustments with Disability Services.

(4) Disability Services will contact eligible students prior to the formal examination period to confirm required examination adjustments or accessible arrangements.

(5) Disability Services in consultation with the relevant delegate will determine the adjustments and accessible examination arrangements which will apply to each registered student in relation to a given assessment or examination.

(6) Adjustments applicable to the formal examination period also apply to, and must be provided in, the replacement examination period.

(7) In-department examinations, tests, take-home tests, within-semester assessments, practical and oral assessments are managed by the faculty. Faculty responsibilities include:

(a) notifying students in a timely manner of:
   (i) the confirmed adjustments or arrangements; and
   (ii) the time and location of any adjusted examination;

(b) providing notified adjustments and accommodations, including supervision, scribes or equipment;

   Note: Disability Services provides assistance with specialist equipment, ergonomic furniture and access to assistive technology, and can also provide a list of trained scribes and invigilators.

(c) providing adjustments or arrangements applicable to the original examination or assessment for any replacement assessment unless the form of assessment has changed, in which case Disability Services must be notified.

(8) The provision of reasonable adjustments or accessible arrangements does not preclude a student from claiming special consideration due to illness or misadventure.

   Note: See also clause 14 of these procedures and clause 67 of the policy.

(a) All requests for special consideration and special arrangements are managed by the Student Administration Services (SAS) Professional Services Unit (PSU).

   Note: See schedule 3 of these procedures.
13 Special arrangements for assessment or examinations - Principle 3

(1) Except as otherwise provided in this clause, special arrangements for assessment or examination should follow the provisions for special consideration set out in clause 67 of the policy and clause 14 of these procedures.

(2) In cases of extended absence, faculties should discuss with the affected student the option of withdrawal without failure. Unit of study and course co-ordinators are most likely to be best placed to determine when a student’s absence is such as to make it improbable or impossible for that student to meet the requirements, even with special arrangements.

(3) A student seeking special arrangements for assessment or examination should make a request:

(a) in the case of religious commitments that might have an impact on the types of assessment or examination they can undertake, at the date of commencement of semester; and

(b) in the case of other types of commitment, as soon as the student becomes aware of a requirement to be absent from the University.

(4) Faculties must advise students of any cut-off dates for requests for special arrangements for assessments or tests.

(5) Late requests for special arrangements for assessment or examination will be considered only where the student provides a reasonable explanation for the delay.

(6) Requests for special arrangements for examinations must be lodged, with all necessary forms and supporting documentation, no later than the close of business 14 days after the publication of the examination timetable.

(7) A request for special arrangements must be accompanied by sufficient and relevant supporting documentation, in English. This may include, but is not limited to:

(a) in the case of religious beliefs, a supporting letter from the student’s imam, pastor, rabbi or equivalent spiritual or community leader;

(b) in the case of compulsory absence, a copy of the summons, subpoena, court order or notice of selection for jury duty;

(c) in the case of sporting, cultural or political/union commitments, supporting documentation from the organising body;

(d) in the case of parental or adoption commitments, a certificate from a medical practitioner or midwife stating the expected date of birth or documentation from the relevant adoption agency stating the expected date of placement;

(e) in the case of defence force or emergency services commitments, supporting documentation from the student’s brigade or unit;

(f) in the case where continuing employment would be jeopardised, supporting documentation from the student’s employer;

(g) in the case of other situations, such documentation as is considered necessary by the University.

(8) Students requesting special arrangements must provide contact details for those individuals or organisations providing supporting documentation, so that further information or advice may be obtained.
14 Special consideration due to illness, injury or misadventure - Principle 3

(1) In this section, relevant delegate means:
   (a) an Associate Dean;
   (b) a Deputy Dean;
   (c) a Pro-Dean;
   (d) a Sub-Dean;
   (e) a Head of Department;
   (f) a Head of School;
   (g) a Program Coordinator; or
   (h) a Unit of Study Coordinator.

(2) All requests for special consideration will be considered in the same manner across the University, although the response may vary according to the circumstances.
   (a) Schedule 3 to these procedures prescribes the standard responses to the most common circumstances.

(3) Occasionally circumstances of a longer term nature may have a substantial impact on a student’s ability to study and undertake assessments. In such cases, affected students should discuss their circumstances with an advisor or counsellor within or outside their faculty before lodging a request for special consideration.

(4) Multiple and recurring requests for special consideration may be an indicator of a student at academic risk, and may be referred to the faculty for consideration under Part 15 of the policy.

(5) Requests for special consideration should be lodged no later than three working days after the assessment.
   (a) Where circumstances preclude this, a student may still request special consideration but must provide a reasonable explanation for the delay.
   (b) The University will not decline a request on the grounds of late lodgement where a reasonable explanation is provided.

(6) A request for special consideration must:
   (a) use the form specified for this purpose by the University;
   (b) clearly set out the basis for the request;
   (c) for illness or injury, provide an appropriate professional practitioner certificate completed by a registered health practitioner or counsellor operating within the scope of their practice and who is not a family member and which includes:
      (i) the practitioner’s name, contact details, provider number and signature;
      (ii) the date of consultation;
      (iii) an evaluation of the duration and degree of impact on the student’s ability to attend classes, learn or complete assessment requirements; and
      (iv) the date the certificate was written and issued; or
(d) where a professional practitioner certificate is not possible, include a statutory declaration:

(i) setting out the duration and degree of impact of the illness, injury or misadventure on the student’s ability to attend classes, learn or complete assessment requirements; and

(ii) attaching relevant supporting documents; and

(e) provide details of any group work which might be affected.

(7) The University may contact the author of a professional practitioner certificate or other supporting document to verify its authenticity.

(8) Students must retain the originals of any documents submitted in support of a special consideration request until their degree has been conferred, or their candidature is otherwise terminated.

Note: The University may require students to supply the originals of any documents submitted in support of a special consideration request at any time during their candidature.

(9) International students suffering illness, injury or misadventure should also contact the University for information about possible impacts on visa and other arrangements.

(10) A student may withdraw a request for special consideration made prior to, during or immediately after an assessment (usually an examination) at any time prior to the earlier of:

(a) release of results for that assessment; or

(b) completion of a replacement assessment.

A student may seek academic advice before doing so, but not from an academic associated with the assessment.

(11) The University will maintain detailed records of the process of determination, and outcome, of any special consideration request.

(12) The relevant delegate will determine the form of special consideration to be provided if a request is successful.

Note: Where appropriate, the University will apply standard determinations on the form of special consideration to be provided, based on precedents approved by the relevant delegate. Where a special consideration request falls outside the scope of an approved precedent, the University will refer the request to the relevant delegate for determination.

(13) The following forms of special consideration may be provided in relation to individual work.

(a) Replacement assessment.

(i) This may be made available where a request relates to an examination or test. All students who make a successful request for special consideration relating to an examination will receive a replacement assessment. Other forms of assessment, such as weekly quizzes, may be more appropriately accommodated by reweighting or averaging subject to sub-clause 13(a)(iv).

(ii) A replacement assessment should assess the same skills and knowledge, with appropriate preparation, as the original assessment.

(iii) Where a successful request for special consideration is made prior to, or during or immediately after an assessment, any replacement
assessment including replacement examinations will be treated as a first attempt and the original attempt at the assessment will be deemed not to have occurred.

(iv) The faculty is responsible for setting the date of the replacement assessment, except for replacement examinations which are held in the replacement examination period and managed by the Examinations Office.

(iv)(v) A student may lodge a further request for special consideration if they are unable to attend the first replacement assessment due to injury, illness or misadventure. If the request is successful, the faculty is responsible for arranging a second replacement assessment. The second replacement assessment will be held within three weeks of the date of the first replacement assessment.

(v)(vi) If the student is unable to attempt the second replacement assessment due to injury, illness or misadventure, or the faculty is unable to construct a valid form of replacement assessment, the faculty will determine alternative means of assessment if it is reasonably practicable to do so. If not, the faculty will award a grade of DC (discontinue not to count as failure).

(b) Extension.

(i) This may be made available in relation to a non-examination assessment task which is not an examination or test.

(ii) The relevant delegate will determine the length of any extension, and in doing so must consider the extent to which the student's ability to prepare was affected.

(iii) Extensions of up to 20 working days may be granted.

(iv) Extensions longer than 20 working days may only be granted if doing so would not advantage the student against the rest of the cohort. If unfair advantage would occur, an alternative assessment should be set.

(c) Reweighting or Averaging.

(i) This may be made available in relation to assessments that repeat on a regular basis. These are typically assessments that occur throughout the semester (such as weekly class tests, tutorial participation marks or laboratory work) where each assessment alone is not worth a high percentage of the total unit mark.

(ii) The non-completion of a minor component of assessment must not compromise the integrity of the assessment of the curriculum. Where re-weighting is inappropriate on academic grounds this should be declared in the description of assessment for the unit of study or curriculum. In these cases an alternative assessment should be provided.

(iii) Should a student miss more than 30% of the regular assessment components, the student will be required to submit an alternative assessment. The mark for this alternative assessment will replace the missing component of the regular assessment.

(14) The following provisions will apply where one or more members of a group involved in group work suffer an illness, injury or misadventure.

(a) Consideration must be given to the interests of:
(i) the member(s) suffering the illness injury or misadventure; and
(ii) the remaining group members whose ability to complete the task as originally assigned may be impacted, and may therefore also be considered to have suffered a form of misadventure. Ideally special consideration requests should be submitted by all affected parties.

(b) If the relevant delegate considers that the illness, injury or misadventure has no impact on the functioning of the group or its ability to complete the task as assigned, no special consideration will be provided.

(c) If the relevant delegate considers that the functioning of the group is not impaired but that its ability to complete the task as assigned is impaired, an extension of time or an alternative assessment will be provided as appropriate.

(d) If the relevant delegate considers that the group can no longer function, the assessment task will be redefined for the remaining active members, based on the contributions they were to make.
   (i) Assessment will then be based on the redefined task.
   (ii) The lecturer or teacher may also allow an extension of time.
   (iii) The group member(s) who suffered the illness, injury or misadventure will, if their request is accepted, be given an alternative assessment.

(e) If a group submits a request for special consideration on the basis of an absence of one or more members, and no matching request is submitted by the relevant member(s), the group request should be considered on its merits in accordance with this policy even if the relevant delegate has no knowledge of the absent member(s) suffering any illness, injury or misadventure.

(15) Aegrotat and posthumous awards may be made in circumstances involving serious illness or death. For the purposes of clause 92A of the Coursework Policy, a Dean will not recommend the conferral of an aegrotat or posthumous award unless the conditions for the award have been substantially met.

14A Simple extensions - Principle 3

(1) Students may apply for a simple extension, as provided in clause 66A of the Coursework Policy 2014.

(2) The faculty must determine the method for applying for simple extensions in that faculty, provided that the method must require written communication between the student and the relevant unit of study co-ordinator which records at least:
   (a) the student's name;
   (b) the student's student identification number; and
   (c) the unit of study code.

15 Processing and release of results - Principles 1 to 4

(1) The Registrar will determine in advance, and publish, dates for release of results to students. The Registrar may also determine, and publish the determination, that results for a specific unit of study be released on an earlier date than the originally determined date, if requested to do so by the relevant dean or associate dean.
(2) Principal examiners must:
(a) assemble all marks and records of assessment for the unit of study;
(b) ensure security of marks;
(c) arrange the collation of marks;
(d) verify the returned result from evidence such as mark sheets, annotated examination scripts, and minutes of departmental meetings in case an appeal process requires such evidence;
(e) submit the results to the relevant head of academic unit by the required date; and
(f) keep appropriate records to justify the final mark.

Note: See Recordkeeping Manual.

(3) The Dean and head of the relevant academic unit must ensure that:
(a) the results for all units of study comply with applicable policies, procedures and local provisions;
(b) appropriate information and training about processes for entering results is provided to those who require it; and
(c) final results are entered and agreed in the student management system by the date determined by the Registrar.

(4) Late results must be:
(a) approved by the head of the relevant academic unit;
(b) entered into the student management system as soon as they become available; and
(c) released as soon as possible after the release date determined by the Registrar.

(5) Changes to marks or grades after entry into the student management system must be:
(a) approved by the relevant dean, deputy dean, pro-dean, sub-dean or associate dean after consideration of an explanation for the change;
(b) submitted and entered in the manner specified by the Registrar; and
(c) released as soon as possible after the release date determined by the Registrar.

(6) If a grade of “incomplete” (IC) has been recorded for a unit of study and no other result has been received by the date determined by the Registrar for the date to convert all IC results to AF, the grade will be automatically converted either to “absent fail” (AF) or, if an incomplete mark has been entered with the IC grade, to the grade corresponding to that mark (note: an incomplete mark entered with an IC grade should be the maximum mark to which the student would be entitled if the assessment remains incomplete).

(7) The Registrar must ensure that results are released to students by the dates determined.
(a) Final results of students in completed units of study will be provided to students through the student management system.

(8) Departments must, on request, provide students with the numerical mark for each assessment task which comprises the final numerical mark reported on the student’s Examination Result Notice.
(a) Records of such marks must be retained for 12 months.

(9) To ensure confidentiality, students’ results must not be displayed in public places.

(10) The faculty must establish mechanisms for review of results, including those for students affected by illness or misadventure, in accordance with applicable University policies.

**Note:** See also clause 16 of these procedures and *University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006*.

(11) The faculty will determine the award of honours degrees and the levels at which they are awarded.

(12) After the expiry of the applicable retention period, examination scripts and marking sheets may be destroyed. The destruction must be authorised by the head of the unit and documented as required by the *Recordkeeping Manual*.

### 16 Appeals - Principles 1 to 4

(1) Students may appeal against the procedures used to arrive at an academic decision, as provided in the *University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006*.

(2) If an appeal is made:

   (a) all documentation relevant to that student’s assessment must be placed on the student’s appeal file;

   (b) all other annotated scripts must be retained together for each examination for the appeal period;

   (c) mark sheets must be retained for 12 months; and

   (d) minutes of departmental meetings must be centrally filed.

### 17 Professional development - Principles 2 and 4

(1) Staff with teaching responsibilities should be provided with professional development opportunities related to design, implementation, moderation and quality assurance of assessment.

(2) Faculties should provide opportunities for recognition and sharing of effective assessment practices. The University will also provide such opportunities on a University-wide basis.

(3) Professional development support will be provided by Educational Innovation in collaboration with faculties for assessment review as part of course quality improvement process to facilitate effective learning.

### 18 Effectiveness of assessment policies - Principle 4

(1) The Academic Board will ensure that the effectiveness of its policies is measured:

   (a) through a comparison of the University’s standards with those adopted elsewhere;

   (b) through information available from Academic Board faculty reviews; and
(c) through feedback from students on assessment (directly and via unit of study evaluations and related feedback tools).
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# SCHEDULE 1 – IMPLEMENTATION TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle and implementation statements</th>
<th>Assessment Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Assessment practices must advance student learning</strong></td>
<td>Clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Assessment practices align with goals, context, learning activities and learning outcomes.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) A variety of assessment tasks are used while ensuring that student and staff workloads are considered.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Assessment tasks reflect increasing levels of complexity across a program and foster enquiry-based learning.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Constructive, timely and respectful feedback develops student skills of self and peer evaluation and guides the development of future student work.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Assessment practices must be clearly communicated to students and staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Unit of study outlines are available in the first week of any offering of the unit and communicate the purposes, timing, weighting and extent of assessment in sufficient detail to allow students to plan their approach to assessment.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Unit of study outlines explain the rationale for the selection of assessment tasks (e.g. group task) in relation to learning outcomes.</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Procedures exist to ensure that all staff involved in teaching of a unit share a common understanding of assessment practices.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) The process of marking and of combining individual task marks is explicitly explained in the unit outline.</td>
<td>5, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Assessment practices must be valid and fair</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Assessment tasks are authentic and appropriate to disciplinary and/or professional context.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Assessment incorporates rigorous academic standards related to the discipline(s) and is based on pre-determined, clearly articulated criteria that students actively engage with.</td>
<td>7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Assessment will be evaluated solely on the basis of students’ achievement against criteria and standards specified to align with learning outcomes.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Principle and implementation statements

**(4)** Assessment practices address issues of equity and inclusiveness to accommodate and build upon the diversity of the student body so as not to disadvantage any student.

4. **Assessment practices must be continuously improved and updated**

   1. Assessment tasks and outcomes are moderated through academic peer review and used to inform subsequent practice.
   2. Assessment is regularly updated to ensure alignment with program learning outcomes or graduate attributes.
   3. Professional development opportunities that are related to design, implementation and moderation of assessment are provided to staff.
## SCHEDULE 2 – STANDARD ASSESSMENT TABLE FOR ALL NEW UNITS OF STUDY COMMENCING SEMESTER 1, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment title</th>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Example of Assessment type</th>
<th>Description of Assessment type</th>
<th>Exam / Quiz type</th>
<th>Individual or Group</th>
<th>Length / duration</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Due date and time</th>
<th>Closing date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free format text to name each assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid Assessment type values for each</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specify for each assessment (select one)</td>
<td>Specify word limit or time limit for each assessment</td>
<td>Specify percentage contribution to final mark (%)</td>
<td>Specify for each</td>
<td>Specify for each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of assessment task</td>
<td>Exam</td>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td>Written exam, written exam with non-written elements, or non-written exam, however administered. Worth 30% or greater. Written exam, written exam with non-written elements, or non-written exam, however administered.</td>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td>In-semester exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of assessment task</td>
<td>Skills-based assessment</td>
<td>Placements</td>
<td>Professional experience placement, internship, or site visit. Clinical skills assessment or lab skills assessment. Performance, recital or jury-assessment performance, or exhibition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Due date may be expressed as a time period when exact date not known e.g. final exam period, week 7. Time to be included where assessment must be submitted by a cut-off time e.g. 23:59 EST.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment title</th>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Example of Assessment type</th>
<th>Description of Assessment type</th>
<th>Exam / Quiz type</th>
<th>Individual or Group</th>
<th>Length / duration</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Due date and time</th>
<th>Closing date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of assessment task</td>
<td>Submitted work</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Essay, report, case study, proposal, literature review, portfolio, or design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of assessment task</td>
<td>In-class assessments</td>
<td>Tutorial quiz, small test or online task</td>
<td>Worth less than 30%.</td>
<td>Tutorial quiz, small test or online task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small continuous assessment</td>
<td>Worth less than 30%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Oral presentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional assignment or small test</td>
<td>Includes formative assessments.</td>
<td>Optional small test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of assessment task</td>
<td>Group work</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Written, non-written elements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Valid values for all assessments must comply with the requirements of section 19 of the *Learning and Teaching Policy 2015*, section 10 of the *Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016*, and section 60 of the *Coursework Policy 2014.*
SCHEDULE 3 – DECISIONS MATRIX SPECIAL CONSIDERATION AND SPECIAL ARRANGEMENTS

The Decisions Matrix is a summary table, indicating how standard requests for special consideration and special arrangements are processed. It is intended only to reflect the University’s policies on special consideration and special arrangements (sections 13 and 14, Assessment Procedures (2011)).

All requests for special consideration and special arrangements are managed by the Student Administration Services (SAS) Professional Services Unit (PSU) who use the Decisions Matrix (Special Consideration and Special Arrangements, refer to sections 13 and 14 above) to ensure that all requests are considered in the same manner (section 14 clause 2 above).

Assessment types or decisions not explicitly covered in the Decisions Matrix are considered non-standard decisions and are referred to the UOS Coordinator to determine the appropriate form of consideration.

The SAS PSU undertake data gathering from the faculty, University school, school or department before the commencement of every semester to compile the “non-repeatable” and “no mark adjustment allowed” lists. The Decisions Matrix is applied to the first special consideration request for each assessment item. Additional requests (for the same assessment item) are non-standard decisions and are referred to the UOS Coordinator for a consideration decision.

A special consideration report listing all assessments and the form of consideration granted is available to UOS Coordinators.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</th>
<th>Assessment description</th>
<th>Form of consideration</th>
<th>Conditions for standard decision</th>
<th>SAS</th>
<th>Faculty, University school, school or department</th>
<th>UOS Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td>Written exam</td>
<td>Replacement exam</td>
<td>Final exam scheduled and managed centrally</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Where the student is unable to attempt the replacement exam and a valid form of replacement assessment or alternative means of assessment is not possible, award a grade of DC (discontinue not to count as failure) if appropriate</td>
<td>Provide replacement exam paper by specified deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Construct a valid form of replacement assessment or an alternative means of assessment where the student is unable to attempt the replacement exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category</td>
<td>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, school or department</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td>Written exam with non-written elements or non-written exam</td>
<td>Replacement exam</td>
<td>Final and replacement exams may be managed by faculty, University, school, school or department</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>For final and replacement exams managed by faculty, University school, school or department the relevant area will schedule and manage the exam including managing and implementing Disability Services adjustment and informing the student of the schedule</td>
<td>Provide final and replacement exam paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For exams managed centrally, SAS will: Schedule and manage final and replacement exam; Manage and implement Disability Services adjustments; and Inform student of the schedule</td>
<td>Where the student is unable to attempt the replacement exam and a valid form of replacement assessment or alternative means of assessment is not possible, award a grade of DC (discontinue not to count as failure) if appropriate</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct a valid form of replacement assessment or an alternative means of assessment where the student is unable to attempt the replacement exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category</td>
<td>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, school or department</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>In-semester exam</td>
<td>Written exam, worth 30% or greater (refer to section 14.13(c)(iii) above)</td>
<td>Replacement exam for in-semester exam</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Schedule and manage replacement exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exam type could be any of the following: written exam, written exam with non-written elements, or non-written exam, however administered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide replacement exam</td>
<td>Inform student of replacement exam schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills based assessment</td>
<td>Placements</td>
<td>Professional experience placement, internship, or site visit</td>
<td>New or varied placement</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Schedule and inform student of new or varied placement details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills based evaluation</td>
<td>Skills based assessment</td>
<td>Clinical skills assessment or lab skills assessment</td>
<td>New or varied evaluation</td>
<td>Not on “non-repeatable” list</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category</td>
<td>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, school or department</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills based assessment</td>
<td>Skills based evaluation</td>
<td>Clinical skills assessment or lab skills assessment</td>
<td>Alternative assessment</td>
<td>On “non-repeatable” list (e.g. evaluations with specialised resource requirements)</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Determine appropriate alternative assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills based assessment</td>
<td>Creative assessments/ demonstrations</td>
<td>Performance, recital or jury-assessment performance, or exhibition</td>
<td>New or varied evaluation</td>
<td>Not on “non-repeatable” list</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Schedule and inform student of new or varied evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills based assessment</td>
<td>Creative assessments/ demonstrations</td>
<td>Performance, recital, jury-assessment performance, or exhibition</td>
<td>Alternative evaluation</td>
<td>On “non-repeatable” list, (e.g. assessments/ demonstrations with specialised resource requirements)</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Determine appropriate alternative evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted work</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Essay, report case study, proposal, literature review, portfolio or design</td>
<td>Extension of time (refer to section 14.13(b) above)</td>
<td>1. Impacted period is 20 or fewer working days (refer to section 14.13(b)(iii) above) and</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Apply extension of time to due date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category</td>
<td>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, school or department</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honours Thesis</td>
<td>Non-HDR thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. The new due date(^2) is prior to the return date(^3).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted work</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Essay, report, case study, proposal, literature review, portfolio or design</td>
<td>Determined by faculty or University school</td>
<td>1. Impacted period is more than 20 working days (refer to section 14.13(b)(iv) above) or</td>
<td>Refer to UOS Coordinator for form of consideration</td>
<td>Where the student is unable to attempt the replacement assessment or alternative means of assessment is not possible, award a</td>
<td>Determine appropriate form of consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Determine consideration longer than 20 working days or set an alternative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) New due date is the revised submission date for the assessment and is calculated using calendar days to be consistent with the return date, 
\(^3\) Return date refers to the date when an assignment or the answers are returned to the cohort and is usually within 10 working days (14 calendar days) from the original due date of the assessment, unless otherwise specified by the faculty or University school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</th>
<th>Assessment description</th>
<th>Form of consideration</th>
<th>Conditions for standard decision</th>
<th>SAS</th>
<th>Faculty, University school, school or department</th>
<th>UOS Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>Honours Thesis</td>
<td>Non-HDR thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. The new due date(^4) is after the return date(^5)</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>grade of DC (discontinue not to count as failure) if appropriate</td>
<td>assessment in cases where remaining student cohort would be disadvantaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>In-class assessments</td>
<td>Tutorial quiz, small test or online task</td>
<td>Worth less than 30% Students will be encouraged</td>
<td>Mark adjustment (refer to section) Not on “no mark adjustment allowed” list</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report Make mark adjustment (re-weight, average)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 New due date is the revised submission date for the assessment and is calculated using calendar days to be consistent with the return date.

5 Return date refers to the date when an assignment or the answers are returned to the cohort and is usually within 10 working days (14 calendar days) from the original due date of the assessment, unless otherwise specified by the faculty or University school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</th>
<th>Assessment description</th>
<th>Form of consideration</th>
<th>Conditions for standard decision</th>
<th>SAS</th>
<th>Faculty, University school, school or department</th>
<th>UOS Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small continuous assessment</td>
<td>to check with their unit of study coordinator if any repeat sessions will be available before submitting a special consideration application.</td>
<td>14.13(c) above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>etc.) Provide an alternative assessment where a student has missed more than one third of the regular assessment components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial quiz, small test or online task</td>
<td>Worth less than 30% (refer to section 14.13(c)(iii))</td>
<td>New or varied assessment</td>
<td>On “no mark adjustment allowed” list</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report Determine new or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category</td>
<td>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, school or department</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small continuous assessment</td>
<td>above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>varied assessment Schedule and inform student of new or varied assessment details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
<td>New or varied presentation</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report Schedule and inform student of new or varied presentation details Provide alternative assessment if new or varied presentation is unable to be provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class assessments</td>
<td>Optional assignment or small test</td>
<td>Includes formative assessments</td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category</td>
<td>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, school or department</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group work (refer to section 14 above)</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extension of time or alternative assessment for the impacted student</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Written, non-written elements</td>
<td>Extension of time or alternative assessment for the impacted student</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide the alternative assessment for impacted student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on other group members to be noted during marking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION

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

- Approve the Collaborative Education and Research Training Agreements Policy 2017 (provisional name) (Attachment 1)
- Approve amendments to the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 (Attachment 2)
- Approve amendments to the Student Placement Policy (new name Student Placement and Projects Policy) (Attachment 3)
- Rescind the Guidelines for Inter-Institutional Agreements (1997) (Attachment 4)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An audit of University policies on educational matters against the Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF) revealed several areas where University policy could be strengthened to bring greater clarity to the University’s aspirations against the standards and set out its obligations.

Areas that would benefit from greater clarity are:

- Expectation on the knowledge, skills and qualifications of teaching staff (Standard 3.2)
- Scope of seven-yearly comprehensive reviews of accredited courses (Standard 5.3)
- Framework for education and research training agreements with other parties (Standards 5.2, 5.4, 7.3 (j) including placement and project arrangements.

To improve the University’s education policy framework in relation to the HESF, the following policy work was carried out in July and August:

- Amendments to the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 will be made to clarify expectations on knowledge, skills and qualifications for teaching staff and the scope of comprehensive course reviews;
- The Student Placement Policy 2015 will be amended to cover student projects as well as placements;
- The Guidelines for Inter-institutional agreements 1997 will be replaced by a policy on Collaborative Education and Research Training Agreements.

The policy amendment and creation work is being carried out with the intention that it will be in place by the time that TEQSA notifies the University of the scope of their assessment in September 2017, ahead of a formal application from the University for re-registration at the end of February 2018.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

The Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF) is established under the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 and sets out threshold standards for higher education in Australia. Universities are required to meet or exceed the threshold standards and are audited in this regard by TEQSA. Meeting the standards is one of the minimum requirements for accreditation as an Australian University as set out in Part B of the standards.
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An internal audit of the standards carried out in 2017 suggested some areas where policies relating to education could be strengthened in order to bring greater visibility to the University's obligations and as one of several mechanisms to ensure quality and compliance.

These are set out in the Table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section of the HESF</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Suggested action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Section 3 Teaching  | 3.2 Staffing | (3) Staff with responsibilities for academic oversight and those with teaching and supervisory roles in courses or units of study are equipped for their roles, including having:  
(a) knowledge of contemporary developments in the discipline or field, which is informed by continuing scholarship or research or advances in practice  
(b) skills in contemporary teaching, learning and assessment principles relevant to the discipline, their role, modes of delivery and the needs of particular student cohorts, and  
(c) a qualification in a relevant discipline at least one level higher than is awarded for the course of study, or equivalent relevant academic or professional or practice-based experience and expertise, except for staff supervising doctoral degrees having a doctoral degree or equivalent research experience.  
(4) Teachers who teach specialised components of a course of study, such as experienced practitioners and teachers undergoing training, who may not fully meet the standard for knowledge, skills and qualifications or experience required for teaching of supervision (3.2.3) have their teaching guided and overseen by staff who meet the standard. | A section 24 A be inserted in Part 4 of the Learning and Teaching Policy (Attachment 2) setting out the qualifications of teaching staff |
| Section 5 Institutional Quality Assurance | 5.3 Monitoring, Review and Improvement | 1. All accredited courses of study are subject to periodic (at least every seven years) comprehensive reviews that are overseen by peak academic governance processes and include external referencing or other benchmarking activities.  
2. A comprehensive review includes the design and content of each course of study, the expected learning outcomes, the methods for assessment of those outcomes, the extent of students’ achievement of learning outcomes, and also takes account of emerging developments in the field of education, modes of delivery | Clause 6 of Section 11, Collegial Governance of the Learning and Teaching Policy (Attachment 2) be reviewed to give guidelines on the scope of reviews of accredited reviews |
| 5.4 Deliver with Other Parties Also 5.2 | 1. Work-integrated learning, placements, other community-based learning and collaborative research training arrangements are quality assured, including assurance of the quality of supervision of student experiences. | 1. The Student Placement Policy (Attachment 3) be reviewed and expanded to cover |
CONSULTATION

This memo has been circulated to the UE Research Training Committee (12 July) and the University Executive (20 July).

Policy amendments and proposals will be presented as follows:

1. **Learning and Teaching Policy**
   - Undergraduate Studies Committee/Graduate Studies Committee – 1 August
   - UE Education – 7 August
   - Academic Standards and Policy Committee – 8 August
   - University Executive – 10 August
   - Academic Board – 29 August

2. **Student Placement Policy**
   - Undergraduate Studies Committee/Graduate Studies Committee – 1 August
   - UE Research Education Committee – 2 August
   - UE Education – 7 August
   - Academic Standards and Policy Committee – 8 August
   - University Executive – 10 August
   - Academic Board – 29 August

3. **Collaborative Education and Research Training Agreements Policy** (provisional title)
   - Undergraduate Studies Committee/Graduate Studies Committee – 1 August
   - UE Research Education Committee – 2 August
   - UE Education – 7 August
   - Academic Standards and Policy Committee – 8 August
   - University Executive – 10 August
   - Academic Board – 29 August

A working group met on 22 June to review the Guidelines for Inter-Institutional Agreements 1997 and to collect feedback on what should be included in the updated policy (Attachment 1) including the indicative provisions for agreements in the case of student project agreements with outside organisations, including industry, professional and community partners, other with other educational institutions. Such provisions should also placements for HDR students.

2. The Guidelines on Inter-Institutional Agreements be replaced by a Collaborative Education and Research Training Agreements Policy (provisional title) (Attachment 1).
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scope, types of agreements covered, delegations, what the agreements must cover, quality assurance and review and renewal of agreements. A second meeting was held on 18 July to review and discuss the draft proposed policy.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 - Collaborative Education and Research Training Agreements Policy
Attachment 2 - Amendments to the Learning and Teaching Policy
Attachment 3 - Amendments to the Student Placement Policy (new name Student Placement and Projects Policy)
Attachment 4 - Guidelines for Inter-Institutional Agreements (1997) (to be rescinded)
COLLABORATIVE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH TRAINING AGREEMENTS
POLICY 2017

The Vice-Chancellor, as delegate of the Senate of the University of Sydney, adopts the following policy.

Dated:

Last amended:

Signature:

Position: Vice-Chancellor

CONTENTS

1 Name of policy

This is the Inter-Institutional Agreements Policy 2017

2 Commencement

This policy commences on [date].

3 Policy is binding

Except to the extent that a contrary intention is expressed, this policy binds the University, staff, students and affiliates.
4 Statement of intent

This policy:

(1) sets out a framework to align education and research training cooperation between the University of Sydney and other institutions with the University’s educational strategy and standards;

(2) describes the framework for establishing, maintaining and reviewing collaborative education and research training agreements, including memoranda of understanding that facilitate such agreements, between the University of Sydney and other academic institutions;

(3) describes the policy framework for situations where any part of an award course or research training activity of the University of Sydney is delivered by another institution or party other than an employee of the University, whether Australian or international;

(4) sets out principles for the approval of collaborative educational and research training agreements in accordance with the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule; and;

(5) sets out requirements for quality assurance in education and research training when conducted under an inter-institutional agreement.

5 Application

(1) This policy applies to agreements to collaborate with other parties in education, and research training including:
   (a) Memoranda of Understanding;
   (b) Educational agreements;
   (c) Research training agreements;
   (d) Staff Exchange Agreements
   (e) Placement and student project agreements;
   (f) Agreements for the provision of educational services to the University by other parties.

(2) This policy does not apply to:
   (a) funding agreements with government;
   (b) Agreements for the delivery of Educational Services to other parties covered by the Agreements for Educational Services Policy 2011;
   (c) confidentiality agreements
   (d) clinical trials agreements
   (e) student accommodation agreements
   (f) agreements that do not have an educational or research training component
   (g) research agreements

6 Definitions

In this policy:
academic unit has the meaning given in the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 which, as at the date of this policy, is:

a faculty, University school, board of studies, school, department, centre or interdisciplinary committee of the University.

Academic Board means the academic board established under Section 16 of the Act

Act Means the University of Sydney Act 1989 (as amended)

agreement means a written binding or non-binding agreement between the University of Sydney and another institution authorised by a person or persons within each institution with the delegated authority to enter into the agreement.

agreement sponsor means the person taking responsibility for the monitoring, quality and review of the agreement.

cotutelle agreement Has the meaning given in the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 which at the time of approval of this policy is:

an agreement between the University and another university or institution that:

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

dean includes, where appropriate, a Head of School and Dean of a University school.

delegate Has the meaning given in the University of Sydney (Delegations of Administrative Functions) Rule 2016 which, at the date of approval of this policy is:

an employee, member or committee of Senate or any other person or entity to whom or to which a delegation has been made by Senate

dual degree agreement means an agreement between two degree-awarding institutions whereby students are permitted to enrol concurrently in an award in each institution and receive credit from each institution for a component of learning at the other institution.

educational agreement means an agreement between institutions to cooperate on an educational program as set out in 7 (4) of this policy.

exchange student has the meaning given in the University of Sydney Coursework Policy 2014 which at the time of approval of this policy is:

An Exchange Student means a person who is:

• not an Australian citizen;
• not admitted to an award course at the University;
• admitted to a formally approved program of study at an overseas institution with which the University has
7 Purposes and principles

(1) The purpose of education and research training agreements between the University of Sydney and other institutions is to expand knowledge and the dissemination of knowledge through academic collaboration and enhanced educational opportunity.

(2) Education and research training carried out under the terms of collaborative agreements must align with the University’s strategy.

(3) The quality of education and research training carried out under the terms of a collaborative agreements must be assured to equivalent standards to other education and research training carried out at the University.

(4) Agreements must ensure that education and research training carried out with another institution or party under an inter-institutional agreement are governed by University of Sydney policies or by policies by other parties and institutions that achieve similar outcomes and have similar intentions to University of Sydney policies.
(5) Where education or research training that is provided by another party, or carried out under the terms of an agreement with another institution, contributes to a University of Sydney award, the University accepts full accountability for the standards and quality of that education.

(6) Educational and research integrity must be maintained in any education or research training carried out under a collaborative agreement and the operations and activities of partners must consistent with the University's policies on educational and research integrity.

(7) Agreements must ensure that representations by other parties about the University, its research training, education and courses are not false or misleading.

(8) Activities undertaken under an agreement must be covered by the terms of that agreement.

8 Limits on collaborative educational and research training agreements

The University will not enter into a collaborative agreement in education or research training unless:

(9) The benefits, desirability and risk of the agreement have been assessed in accordance with this policy;

(10) The agreement is consistent with the University's obligations under the Higher Education Standards Framework;

(11) The proposed agreement has been approved by the relevant delegate in accordance with this policy and any associated procedure;

(12) The agreement complies with the terms of the Intellectual Property Policy 2016.

8 Agreements

(1) Agreements may have multiple purposes and combine more than one type of agreement.

(2) Titles of agreements may vary from the terms used in this policy in accordance with policy and governance requirements of partner organisation.

(3) Agreements must:

   (a) be appropriate in scope to the activities covered by the agreement
   (b) reflect an assessment of risk and the University’s risk tolerance
   (c) make provisions for termination of the agreement by either party.

(4) Memoranda of understanding

   (a) Memoranda of understanding between the University of Sydney and another institution document an intention to collaborate on education, research training or research or a combination of these. This policy applies to memorandum of understanding that involve education or research training.

   (b) Memoranda of understanding may establish overarching principles which govern specific education and research training agreements attached to a memorandum.
(c) Principles contained in a Memorandum of understanding are not binding on either party, unless specifically stated or confirmed in specific education and research training agreements.

(d) A single Memorandum of understanding with an institution may provide the principles and frameworks for multiple agreements.

(5) Education agreements

(a) Educational agreements are an agreement between the University and another party to cooperate on an educational program

(b) Educational agreements should enhance educational opportunity

(c) Educational agreements may include collaborative education agreements, agreements on admission pathways, articulation and credit recognitions, dual degree agreements, joint delivery, dual degree agreements, an agreement by one party to deliver education for another, the sharing of education resources, curricula or academic staff, exchange and study abroad agreements, and agreements on student placements and projects.

(d) Except as specified in the agreement, students participating in education or research training under an inter-institutional agreement are governed by the Rules and Policies of the University of Sydney.

(e) Notwithstanding 3(b) students participating in education under the terms of an educational agreement may appeal results under the terms of the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended) and make complaints under the Resolution of Complaints Policy 2015.

(f) Notwithstanding 3(b) students participating in education under the terms of an education agreement must comply with the University’s policies on educational and research integrity and are subject to the terms of those policies.

(6) Research training agreements

(a) Research training agreements should enhance opportunities for research collaboration and may include collaborative research and research training agreements, cotutelle agreements, research exchange agreements and agreements on students placements and projects.

(7) Staff Exchange Agreements

(a) Staff Exchange agreements are an agreement between two institutions for members of staff at each institution to work at the other institution for a period, while retaining the conditions of employment at their original institution

(8) Placement and student project agreements

(a) Placement and student project agreements create opportunities for student placements and projects and may include agreements on clinical and non-clinical placements, preferred placement provider agreements and agreements on student projects.

Note: Placement and student project agreements must be constructed to comply with the Placement and Student Project Policy.
9 Establishing, approving, reviewing and renewing agreements

(9) An education or research agreement must have an agreement sponsor who takes responsibility for monitoring and improving the quality of the educational experience or research collaboration.

(10) Prior to entering into negotiation for an agreement the benefits, desirability and risks of the proposed agreement must be assessed by the delegate responsible for approving the agreement on the basis of an expression of interest submitted by the agreement sponsor.

(11) An Expression of Interest must set out:
   (a) the proposed parties to the agreement;
   (b) the agreement sponsor;
   (c) the strategic purpose and benefits of the agreement;
   (d) the activities to be covered by the agreement
   (e) the goals or benchmarks of success;
   (f) the proposed duration of the agreement;
   (g) a risk assessment that considers the likelihood, impact and mitigating strategies for the following;
      (i) risks to health and safety
      (ii) risks to educational and research standards including education and research integrity
      (iii) risks to the reputation of the University
      (iv) financial risks
      (v) any other identified risks.
   (h) other information required by the approver.

(12) In assessing an expression of interest to enter into an agreement, a delegate must consider:
   (a) the object of the University;
   (b) the strategic purpose and benefits relative to the University and faculty strategic plan;
   (c) the feasibility of achieving the benefits and goals;
   (d) the impact of the agreement on other educational and research activities.
   (e) risks and mitigating strategies in relation to the University’s risk tolerance.

(13) After reviewing an Expression of Interest a delegate may determine that negotiations on the agreement proceed no further.

(14) Agreements must be in a form approved by the Office of General Counsel.

(15) Agreements must specify:
   (a) the duration of the agreement up to a maximum of 5 years;
   (b) The strategic purpose and goal and benchmark for success;
   (c) activities covered by the agreement
Agreements must be approved by the delegate with authority to approve the agreement under the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule 2016.

After reviewing a proposed agreement a delegate may determine that the proposed agreement not be approved.

Where the delegate is not a Deputy Vice Chancellor a copy of the approved agreement must be sent as follows:

(a) for Education agreements and Research Training agreements to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).
(b) for International agreements to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar).

Note: where an agreement is an education or research training agreement involving an international partner, a copy should be sent to both the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar).

All agreements must be on the University's corporate record keeping system.

All agreements must be monitored against University education and research standards.

All agreements must be reviewed against the stated strategic purpose, goals or benchmarks at the conclusion of the agreement.

After review, agreements may be renewed for a period not exceeding 5 years, under the terms of this policy.

9 Quality assurance

Education carried out under an inter-institutional agreement must meet the educational excellence requirements for award courses specified in clause 8 of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

Student experience in education carried out under an inter-institutional agreement must be:

(a) measured through surveys and other appropriate instruments each time a course is offered;
(b) reviewed by the Agreement sponsor; and
(c) reported as directed by the Dean or Head of School

The agreement sponsor must provide a report on activity undertaken under the agreement during the previous year to the Dean or Deans in February each year.

The Dean must provide a report on education carried out under inter-institutional agreements to the faculty leadership group and faculty board in March each year;

The faculty board must consider the Dean’s report and forward it, with appropriate comments, to the delegate who approved the agreement.

The delegate who approved the agreement must consider the Deputy Vice-Chancellor's report and forward it, with appropriate comments, to the Academic Board.

The Academic Board:

(a) must consider the report; and
(b) may make recommendations to the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education), the University Executive, or a relevant Dean or Deputy Vice-Chancellor.
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PART 1 PRELIMINARY

1 Name of policy

This is the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

2 Commencement

This policy commences on 1 January 2016.

3 Policy is binding

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

4 Statement of intent

This policy:

(a) describes the nature of education at the University;
(b) sets out the manner in which curricula are structured;
(c) provides for the effective management of learning and teaching; and
(d) establishes quality assurance processes for learning and teaching.

5 Application

Except to the extent that a contrary intention is expressed this policy applies to the learning and teaching of coursework award courses.

6 Definitions

(1) In this policy:

academic unit means a faculty, board of studies, school, department, centre or interdisciplinary committee of the University.

assessment means the process of measuring the performance of students (as in examinations, assignments and other assessable work) that enables students to monitor their progress and contributes to their academic results in a unit of study.
Associate Dean - Education means:

- the Associate Dean of a faculty with responsibility for education at the relevant level; or
- the deputy chairperson of a board of studies; or
- a person appointed by the Dean to have responsibility within the faculty for education at the relevant level. This position may have any of a number of different titles, including Associate Dean - Education, Associate Dean - Teaching or Learning, Associate Dean - Undergraduate Students, Associate Dean - Postgraduate Coursework or equivalent. The responsibilities of the Associate Dean - Education specified in this policy may be shared between more than one Associate Dean position.

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

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

Note: See clause 18

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

Note: See clause 2.3 of the Coursework Rule 2014.

Bachelor degree has the meaning given the Coursework Policy 2014, which at the date of this policy is:

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

The University offers two types of Bachelor degrees.

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

Note: See clause 83A of the Coursework Policy 2014
Bachelor of Advanced Studies has the meaning given in the Coursework Policy 2014, which at the date of this policy is:

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

capstone experience has the meaning given in the Coursework Policy 2014, which at the date of this policy is:

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

Note: See clause 18.

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

Note: See clause 18.

core means a set of units of study that develops required knowledge and skills for an award course.

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

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

curriculum means the flexible and coherent presentation of the academic content in a unit or program in a series of learning experiences and assessments.

Note: See clauses 15 - 17.

Dean means the Dean of the relevant faculty.

department means an academic disciplinary grouping established within a school.
double degrees course means a course in which a student completes two AQF qualifications under one set of award course resolutions with no cross-crediting of units of study between the qualifications. A single testamur or separate testamurs may be issued.

faculty means a faculty or board of studies as established in each case by its constitution, and in this policy refers to the faculty or faculties responsible for the relevant award course.

faculty office means the professional staff led by a faculty manager that support learning and teaching within a faculty.

graduate qualities means the qualities demonstrated by all graduates of award courses on completion of the requirements of the award course. Part 2 of this policy details the qualities of graduates of undergraduate award courses.

Group of Eight (Go8) means the coalition of eight research-intensive Universities, comprising The University of Melbourne, The Australian National University, The University of Sydney, The University of Queensland, The University of Western Australia, The University of Adelaide, Monash University and UNSW Australia.

Note: See https://go8.edu.au/

Head of Department means an academic leader within a department who represents the department in school or disciplinary fora. A Head of Department co-ordinates the provision of teaching and the development of curriculum within a department.

Head of School means the head of a school within a faculty with responsibility for approving arrangements for teaching and appointment of casual staff within the school. This role may be fulfilled by a position with another title (e.g. Head of Discipline or the chair of a board of studies or interdisciplinary committee.)

honours units means advanced units of study at 4000-level specified as requirements to qualify for an award with honours as set out in clause 95 of the Coursework Policy 2014.

LMS means learning management system, which is the online learning system used by the University to host unit of study websites.

learning outcomes means statements of what students know, understand and are able to do on completion of a unit of study, a major, program, award course, or other curriculum component.

Liberal Studies Bachelor Degree has the meaning given in the Coursework Policy 2014, which at the date of this policy is: a program of study at Bachelor level of three years duration (or part-time equivalent) that provides students with a broad multi-disciplinary education that develops disciplinary expertise and graduate qualities.
major means a defined sequence of units of study taken by a student, which develops depth of expertise in a field of study.

Note: See clause 18.

minor means a defined sequence of units of study taken by a student, which develops expertise in a field of study.

Note: See clause 18.

mode of delivery means the manner by which courses and units of study are presented to students, and includes:

- face to face classes;
- fully online learning;
- blends of face to face and online learning; and
- on or off campus delivery, including off shore delivery.

open learning environment has the meaning given in the Coursework Policy 2014, which at the date of this policy is:

a shared pool of units of study which are:

- of zero, two or six credit points value;
- approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies; and
- available to all students according to the award course resolutions applicable to the award course in which they are enrolled.

postgraduate award course means an award course leading to the award of a Graduate Certificate, Graduate Diploma, Masters degree or a Doctorate. Normally a postgraduate award course requires the prior completion of a relevant undergraduate degree or diploma.

program means a combination of units of study that develops expertise in a multi-disciplinary domain or professional or specialist field and includes at least one recognised major.

Note: See clause 18.

program co-ordinator means the designated person responsible, at a program, major or degree level, for managing the curriculum and providing co-ordination and advice to staff and students.

Professional or Specialist Bachelor Degree has the meaning given in the Coursework Policy 2014, which at the date of this policy is:

a degree that develops disciplinary or professional expertise for a specific profession or career specialisation and graduate qualities.
shared pool means the list of majors, minors and units of study (including units in the open learning environment or Sydney Research Seminars) that are available to students enrolled in all Liberal Studies Bachelor degrees (including combined degrees with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies).

specialisation means the disciplinary or professional expertise developed for a profession or career in a Professional or Specialist Bachelor Degree or postgraduate degree.

stream means a version of a degree that can be conceptualised as a separate degree for admission purposes but that is linked to a set of other streams of the degree through shared nomenclature, shared course components and shared rules. In degree nomenclature, streams may be indicated in parentheses following the name of the main degree.

Note: See clause 18.

student means a person who is currently admitted to candidature in an award course of the University and, where relevant, an exchange student or non-award student.

Sydney Research Seminars means units of study involving a cross-disciplinary group of students and staff in exploration of an interdisciplinary issue, challenge or problem approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.

supervisor means the member of the academic staff who is appointed to supervise a dissertation, treatise or long essay component of a coursework award program or an undergraduate honours program.

teaching session means, as appropriate, a semester or a summer or winter session.

third party learning technologies means web-based and mobile applications which are not managed through a contract between the University and technology suppliers.

undergraduate award course means a coursework award course leading to the award of an Associate Diploma, Diploma, Advanced Diploma, Bachelor degree or Bachelor (Honours) degree.

undergraduate degree means an undergraduate award course at Bachelor level that achieves at a minimum the learning outcome specified for Level seven of the AQF.

unit of study means the smallest stand-alone component of an award course that is recordable on a student’s transcript. Units of study have an integer credit point value, normally six credit points except where approved by the Academic Board.

Note: See clause 18.

unit of study coordinator means the academic staff member appointed by the Dean or Head of Department with overall responsibility for the planning and delivery of a unit of study.
PART 2 THE NATURE OF EDUCATION AT THE UNIVERSITY

7 Graduate qualities and learning outcomes

(1) All undergraduate award courses must be designed to develop and assess the acquisition of the graduate qualities that the University has agreed are necessary to contribute effectively to contemporary society. These are achieved through a structured program, including learning outcomes of specific relevance to the particular award or discipline.

(2) Graduate qualities consist of:
   (a) depth of disciplinary expertise;
   (b) broader skills:
       (i) critical thinking and problem solving;
       (ii) oral and written communication;
       (iii) information and digital literacy; and
       (iv) inventiveness;
   (c) cultural competence;
   (d) interdisciplinary effectiveness;
   (e) an integrated professional, ethical and personal identity; and
   (f) influence.

(3) These qualities should be embedded in the curriculum in a way that enables students to:
   (a) excel at applying and continuing to develop disciplinary expertise;
   (b) learn and respond effectively and creatively to novel problems;
   (c) work productively, collaboratively and openly in diverse groups and across cultural boundaries;
   (d) work effectively in interdisciplinary (including inter-professional) settings;
   (e) build broader perspectives, innovative vision, and more contextualised and systemic forms of understanding;
   (f) build integrity, confidence and personal resilience, and the capacities to manage challenges and uncertainty; and
   (g) be effective in exercising professional and social responsibility and making a positive contribution to society.

(4) The graduate qualities adopted by the University for undergraduates, and their purposes, are set out in the following table (Table 1):
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate qualities</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depth of disciplinary expertise.</td>
<td>To excel at applying and continuing to develop disciplinary expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader skills:</td>
<td>To increase the impact of expertise, and to learn and respond effectively and creatively to novel problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Critical thinking and problem solving;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication (oral and written);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information/ digital literacy;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inventiveness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competence.</td>
<td>To work productively, collaboratively and openly in diverse groups and across cultural boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary effectiveness.</td>
<td>To work effectively in interdisciplinary (including inter-professional) settings and to build broader perspective, innovative vision, and more contextualised and systemic forms of understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An integrated professional, ethical and personal identity.</td>
<td>To build integrity, confidence and personal resilience, and the capacities to manage challenges and uncertainty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence.</td>
<td>To be effective in exercising professional and social responsibility and making a positive contribution to society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** See also [Good Practice Guidelines for the Development of Students Academic and Professional Communication Skills](#) and [Implementation Guidelines](#)

### 8 Educational excellence

(1) All award courses must be designed towards the achievement of excellence in outcomes, experience and environment.

(2) Educational programs and the management of learning and teaching must be designed and managed to ensure excellence in:

(a) educational outcomes: at the conclusion of their educational experience, students will demonstrate the graduate qualities to a high standard;

(b) educational experience, as shown through:

   (i) the impact of teachers and their capacity to engage students productively in the teaching and learning process; and

   (ii) students’ mastery of the meta-cognitive skills that form the basis for self-directed learning;

and

(c) educational environment, consisting of the physical learning spaces, virtual learning environment, and support, which:

   (i) facilitates excellent outcomes and experience;
(ii) fosters innovation; and
(iii) seeks continuous improvement through systematic monitoring.

(3) To ensure excellent outcomes, faculties must design processes in which:
(a) curricula provide continuous and well-co-ordinated sequences of learning experiences leading to well defined learning outcomes, involving expert guidance through well designed learning activities;
(b) students:
   (i) are actively engaged in learning;
   (ii) are challenged, guided and supported to reach a high standard of learning; and
   (iii) become increasingly aware of, and responsible for, their learning;
and
(c) students and staff demonstrate a commitment to working together to achieve excellence in educational experience and outcomes.

(4) Learning environments must be accessible to students with disabilities, allow appropriate flexibility and use technology to minimise barriers to learning caused by time constraints, timetables and other artificial rigidities.

9 Engaged enquiry

(1) Learning programs must be designed to:
   (a) enable students to acquire and apply knowledge and skills through engaged enquiry;
   (b) challenge students with novel problems; and
   (c) enable students to demonstrate increasing awareness of, and responsibility for, their learning.

(2) Engaged enquiry is a design principle which is used to develop curricula, create learning experiences, and review courses and units of study.

(3) Engaged enquiry unites learning through the thinking and discovery processes used in research with experiential development of skills and knowledge through application.

(4) Research-enriched enquiry involves the formulation and critical testing of hypotheses on the basis of evidence and prior knowledge.

(5) Engagement arises from the further development of skills and knowledge through application in work, community and interdisciplinary settings.

(6) Research-enriched enquiry and engagement together form a core principle against which learning programs must be assessed.

10 Academic integrity

(1) Academic honesty by staff and students is an underlying ethos of all education.

(2) Policy and procedures relating to academic honesty in coursework are set out in the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015.
11 Collegial governance

(1) The purpose of collegial governance is to provide a vehicle for:
   (a) continuous improvement and innovation;
   (b) an effective framework to achieve educational excellence; and
   (c) the achievement of graduate qualities and learning outcomes to a high
       standard by each student.

(2) All award course programs must be overseen by a course committee or standing
    committee of the relevant faculty or board of studies.

Note: A standing committee may have oversight of more than one award course, or of a
      category of award courses: for example, all undergraduate awards or all
      postgraduate coursework awards.

(3) All committees with responsibility for oversight of award course programs must
    include:
   (a) representatives of the academic disciplines responsible for teaching;
   (b) representatives of students enrolled in the award course program; and
   (c) the relevant Associate Dean - Education.

(4) Committees responsible for award courses may:
   (a) make recommendations to the faculty, Heads of School and Dean on:
      (i) learning outcomes;
      (ii) curricula;
      (iii) units of study;
      (iv) assessment;
      (v) educational excellence;
      (vi) academic integrity; and
      (vii) program review;

      and

   (b) take such decisions on these and other matters related to learning and
       teaching within award courses as delegated by the faculty,

       provided that the faculty retains oversight and responsibility for the outcomes,
       quality and review of award courses.

(5) Faculties, or their relevant standing committees, may also establish such other
    program committees (including, if appropriate, unit of study committees) as are
    necessary for ensuring excellence in outcomes, experience and environment.
    Program committees must include:
   (a) representatives of teachers within the program; and
   (b) students enrolled in the program.

(6) Faculties, or their relevant standing committees, must ensure that award courses
    receive a comprehensive review including external referencing or other
    benchmarking at least every seven years and must forward a report of the review
    to the Academic Board.
(7) Award course review committees must include:
   (a) representatives of the academic disciplines responsible for teaching in the
       award course;
   (b) students enrolled in, or recently graduated from the award course; and
   (c) relevant stakeholders from professions or industry, as determined by the
       committee responsible for oversight of the award course.

(8) The faculty and award course committees are responsible for obtaining approval of
    units of study, programs and award courses consistently with Part 4.

(9) Learning programs must be developed and managed through a collegial process
    which must:
    (a) be evidence based (using academic expertise, research, benchmarking, and,
        where appropriate, market appraisal); and
    (b) build on consultation with stakeholders listed in subclause 11(7).

Note: See clause 23 for specific authorities, roles and responsibilities for the
      management of learning and teaching.

PART 3 CURRICULUM STRUCTURE

12 Statement of intent

This part:
   (a) prescribes the structure of the curriculum for award courses and units of
       study; and
   (b) articulates the components of award courses and the broad structure of
       undergraduate, postgraduate and combined coursework awards.

13 Learning outcomes

(1) Learning outcomes articulate the specific achievements in skill, knowledge and
    application necessary to demonstrate graduate qualities in a particular discipline. They
    must be aligned with graduate qualities and must be assessed as part of the
    curriculum.

(2) Learning outcomes should be specified for award courses and for each of their
    components, including as relevant units of study, majors, programs and
    specialisations.

(3) Learning outcomes specified for the components of an award course should be
    aligned with each other and with the learning outcomes of the award course.

14 Award courses

(1) An award course must enable students to demonstrate graduate qualities through
    defined learning outcomes.

(2) Titles for awards in the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) must be
    consistent with the AQF Issuance Policy.
(3) The title of an award course must include:
(a) the qualification type; and

Note: See section 1.3 of the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014 and section 1.03 of the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011.

(b) the discipline.

(4) The title of an award course may include one or more optional components, such as a stream.

(5) Award courses must follow an orderly and flexible program of learning experiences in a curriculum designed and approved consistently with this policy.

(6) Award courses must have defined outcomes which:
(a) specify the relevant graduate qualities;
(b) specify the learning outcomes that must be achieved to demonstrate those graduate qualities for a particular discipline; and
(c) demonstrate achievement, at a minimum, of the learning outcomes specified for the qualifications type and level in the AQF.

(7) Award courses must follow a curriculum which:
(a) takes a student-centred approach to the achievement and assessment of learning outcomes in a coherent fashion;
(b) is regularly reviewed (at least every seven years) by faculties consistently with this policy, in the light of student outcomes and the student experience, the growth of knowledge, changes in the learning environment and stakeholder input; and

Note See clause 11.

(c) incorporates the components of the curriculum framework set out in clauses 15 - 20.

15 Curricula generally

(1) Curricula must enable students to achieve the graduate qualities and learning outcomes of an award course or component of an award course. A curriculum sets out, in a progressive and cumulative manner:
(a) specified knowledge and skills, expressed as learning outcomes;
(b) the learning experiences and inquiry processes by which they are acquired;
(c) how they are applied; and
(d) an orderly and methodical assessment process through which they are demonstrated to a high standard.

(2) Curricula should be designed to enable a combination of disciplinary depth and breadth of learning appropriate to the aims of the award course.
(a) Disciplinary depth enables students to achieve command and understanding of a discipline area and can be achieved through focussed study in a program, major, through the completion of components, or through the completion of a stream.
Disciplinary breadth enables students to contextualise their learning in the context of related studies and other disciplines, apply it to new contexts and augment it according to their learning needs and interests. Disciplinary breadth is achieved through electives, minors, additional majors, studies in other disciplines, interdisciplinary projects and the open learning environment.

A curriculum framework is a broad structure for the constituent educational experiences offered by each degree. It comprises components that are essential for every student to reach an agreed standard, and enrichment opportunities that enable students to extend learning according to individual needs and interests, but are not required or relevant for every student.

16 Curriculum framework for undergraduate education

(1) The curriculum framework for new and revised undergraduate awards must include the following components:
   (a) a program, major, stream or specialisation in at least one field of study;
   (b) a structured approach to the development of knowledge and skills;
   (c) collaborative and group-based learning activities and assessments;
   (d) interdisciplinary and inter-professional learning experiences;
   (e) authentic problems and assessments;
   (f) an open learning environment for the extension of knowledge and skills; and
   (g) project-based learning.

(2) If an undergraduate degree is offered exclusively as part of combined or double degree courses, the components may be in either award course and need not be in both individually.

(3) The following table (Table 2) sets out the graduate qualities associated with each of these components.

Note: The curricula for award courses developed prior to 1 January 2016 must include these components when reviewed in line with clause 11(6)

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Graduate qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A major or specialisation in at least one field of study</td>
<td>• Depth of disciplinary expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A structured approach to the development of knowledge and skills</td>
<td>• Depth of disciplinary expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Broader skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural competence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrated identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative and group-based learning activities and assessments</td>
<td>• Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural competence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrated identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Component | Graduate qualities
--- | ---
Interdisciplinary and inter-professional learning experiences | • Broader skills  
• Interdisciplinary effectiveness  
• Influence

Authentic problems and assessments | • Depth of disciplinary expertise  
• Broader skills  
• Interdisciplinary effectiveness  
• Integrated identity  
• Influence

An open learning environment for extension of knowledge and skills | • Broader skills  
• Interdisciplinary effectiveness  
• Integrated identity  
• Influence

Project-based learning | • Depth of disciplinary expertise  
• Broader skills  
• Integrated identity  
• Influence

### 17 Curriculum framework for postgraduate coursework education

(1) The curriculum framework for postgraduate coursework awards must include:

(a) advanced specialisation in a field of knowledge;

(b) research skills;

(c) a structured approach to the development of knowledge and skills;

(d) a capstone experience in research, scholarship or professional project.

(2) The curriculum framework for postgraduate coursework units may include one or more of the following:

(a) a major;

(b) a minor;

(c) interdisciplinary study;

(d) exchange and work based projects;

(e) professional or industry experience;

(f) authentic problems and assessments;

(g) elective units; and

(h) project-based learning.

(3) The following table (Table 3) sets out the graduate qualities associated with each of the above components of a coursework postgraduate award course.
### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Graduate qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialisation in a discipline area</td>
<td>Depth of disciplinary expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A capstone experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary study</td>
<td>Depth of disciplinary expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange and work based projects</td>
<td>Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary and inter-professional</td>
<td>Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning experiences</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional or industry experience</td>
<td>Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic problems and assessments</td>
<td>Depth of disciplinary expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interdisciplinary effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-based learning</td>
<td>Depth of disciplinary expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** See Part 17 of the [Coursework Policy 2014](#) for the requirements for different postgraduate award types.
18 Components of award courses

Note: See Clause 26 (2) for commencement dates of sub clauses 18 (1) - (8) inclusive.

(1) Streams:
   (a) can be conceptualised as separate pathways within an award course;
   (b) are versions of a degree that are separated for admission purposes but are linked to other streams of the degree through shared nomenclature, shared course components and shared rules;
   (c) consist of a combination of related units of study which are structured to provide the student with a depth of specialist knowledge of a discipline or field;
   (d) are identified by the name of the stream of the award in parentheses after the name of the award course of which they are a stream;
   (e) are recorded on the student’s transcript;
   (f) apply to 1000-, 2000-, 3000- and, where applicable, 4000-level units, as specified in the award course resolutions; and
   (g) are not restricted to a specific number of credit points.

(2) Programs:
   (a) are a combination of units of study that develop expertise in a multi-disciplinary domain or a professional or specialist field and include a recognised major in a field of study;
   (b) must have intellectual and educational coherence and specified learning outcomes as required in clause 13; and
   (c) in undergraduate degrees, comprise:
      (i) a minimum of 12 and a maximum of 24 credit points at 1000-level;
      (ii) a minimum of 12 and a maximum of 24 credit points at 2000-level;
      (iii) a minimum of 18 and a maximum of 24 credit points at 3000-level units of study;
         Note: Three year programs (available in degrees of 144 credit points) must not, when combined with the requirements of the degree core, require more than 84 credit points (72+12).
      (iv) in degrees and combined degrees requiring 192 credit points, up to 48 credit points at 4000 level;
         Note: Four year programs (available in degrees of 192 credit points) must not, when combined with the requirements of the degree core, require more than 132 credit points (120+12).
      (v) an embedded major;
      (vi) at least 12 credit points of the degree core, if a degree core is specified for the degree; and
   (d) are recorded on the student’s transcript.
(3) **Majors:**

(a) comprise a defined sequence of units taken by a student that develop depth of expertise in a field of study;

(b) must have intellectual and educational coherence and specified learning outcomes as required in clause 13;

(c) in undergraduate degrees, must require exactly 48 credit points; as specified in this sub clause;

(d) in undergraduate degrees, must include:
   
   (i) exactly 12 credit points at 1000-level units of study;

   (ii) a minimum of 12 and a maximum of 18 credit points at 2000-level; and

   (iii) a minimum of 18 and a maximum of 24 credit points at 3000-level (or, higher for degrees requiring more than 144 credit points);

(e) in undergraduate degrees, must include at the 3000-level:
   
   (i) 1 x 6 credit point unit involving completion of a project requiring the integration and application of disciplinary knowledge and skills; and

   (ii) 1 x 6 credit point unit requiring the application of disciplinary skills and knowledge in an interdisciplinary context; and

(f) are recorded on the student transcript.

**Note:** the requirements of sub clauses (3)(e)(i) and (3)(e)(ii) may both be met through a single unit. Where a student takes two majors, and a single unit or units of study exists such that the requirement for (3)(e)(i) or (3)(e)(ii) can be met in both majors, that or those units may be used in fulfilment of requirement 3(e)(i) or 3(e)(ii) in both majors, provided that all other requirements in 18(3) are met for each major.

(4) **Minors:**

(a) comprise a defined sequence of units of study taken by a student that develops expertise in a field of study;

(b) in undergraduate degrees, comprise units to the value of exactly 36 credit points including:
   
   (i) exactly 12 credit points at 1000-level;

   (ii) a minimum of 12 and a maximum of 18 credit points at 2000-level;

   (iii) a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 12 credit points at 3000-level; and

(c) are recorded on the student's transcript.

(5) **A degree core:**

(a) is a set of units of study that develops required knowledge and skills for the degree and which is required to be completed by all students within an award course or a stream or specialisation within an award course;

(b) in Liberal Studies Degrees, comprises no more than 24 credit points at 1000- or 2000-level.

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

**Note:** See *Coursework Policy 2014*
(7) **Combined degrees and double degrees** must meet the learning outcomes of both component award courses.
   
   (a) All Liberal Studies and specified Specialist or Professional Bachelor Degrees may be combined with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies as set out in the applicable award course resolutions.

(8) Award courses may achieve depth and breadth of learning by the specification of core units and elective units.
   
   (a) Units of study may be specified as core units if the faculty determines them to be essential to achieve the learning outcomes of the award course, stream, program, major, minor or specialisation. Core units must be completed by all students enrolled in the award course or relevant curriculum component or specialisation.

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

(9) **Units of study**
   
   (a) Units of study:

   (i) follow a programmed set of coherent learning experiences and assessments that lead progressively to the achievement of the learning outcomes for the unit; and

   (ii) must be completed over one or two teaching sessions.

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

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

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

   (e) Units of study must be identified by an eight character alpha-numeric code, of which the first four are letters identifying the relevant school, department or discipline and the final four are integers identifying the unit of study and the level at which it is offered.

   (f) The integers in the unit of study alpha-numeric code must commence with a number which indicates the level, in the generic form ****1xxx (for 1000-level units), ****2xxx (for 2000-level units) and so on.

   (g) 1000-level units of study have learning outcomes of a foundational or introductory nature and are designed for students in the first year of a bachelor degree.

   (h) 2000-level units of study have learning outcomes which assume prior foundational or introductory study and are designed for students who have completed the first year of a bachelor degree.
(i) 3000-level units of study have learning outcomes designed for students in the third year of a bachelor degree. In 144 credit point bachelor degrees, such units should enable students to demonstrate learning outcomes at a level expected for those completing a bachelor degree at AQF level 7.

(j) 4000-level units of study have learning outcomes at the advanced or honours level and are designed for students who have already achieved learning outcomes for a 144 credit point pass-level bachelor degree or who are completing the final year of a 192 credit point bachelor degree.

(k) 5000-, 6000- and higher level units of study have learning outcomes designed for postgraduate award courses.

(10) **Credit points and student workload**

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

(b) The full time credit point load for undergraduate and postgraduate coursework award courses is 24 credit points per semester, or 12 credit points for summer session and six credit points for the winter session. A full time credit point load for a year is 48 credit points equating to a student workload of 1350 -1800 hours per year including class time, private study, assessment and assessment preparation.

(c) The normal credit point load for a unit of study is six credit points, except where otherwise approved by the Academic Board.

(d) The credit point load for a unit of study in the open learning environment must be zero, two or six credit points.

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

(f) Where units of study are core units in more than one award course or shared individually or as part of a major or minor in the shared pool, faculties must design units of study to meet the learning needs of students in all award courses and components for which the unit is a core unit.

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

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

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

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

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

(i) Faculties introducing new units of study with a credit point value other than six must inform the Academic Board, explaining the rationale for deviating from the standard and addressing issues of compatibility.
(11) On academic grounds, a faculty may propose to the Undergraduate or Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board units of study with zero, one or two credit points.

(12) **Teaching sessions**
(a) Teaching and learning in award courses must take place in standard teaching sessions, or in special teaching sessions determined by faculties in a faculty calendar and approved by the Academic Board.
(b) The standard teaching sessions are first semester, second semester summer session and winter session.
(c) A semester comprises 13 weeks of programmed learning, one study week and one to two weeks for examination and assignment preparation.

(13) University semester dates, and dates for summer and winter sessions and teaching blocks must be approved by the Academic Board.

### 19 Assessment framework

(1) Assessment is the means by which students demonstrate graduate qualities and learning outcomes in a unit of study and in an award course.

(2) Learning outcomes for units of study must be assessed either within the unit of study or within an assessment framework for the award course or a component of an award course.

(3) The assessment framework of award courses and units of study must promote student learning and engaged enquiry, and be designed to ensure that key milestones in the achievement of learning outcomes are met to a standard sufficient to allow progression.

(4) Faculties must design the assessment framework of an award course to ensure that all students who successfully complete the award course demonstrate the graduate qualities and specified learning outcomes for the award.

(5) Unit of study co-ordinators must design the assessment framework of a unit of study to ensure that all students who successfully complete the unit of study demonstrate the graduate qualities and learning outcomes of the unit of study and are assessed to the same standard.

(6) The University's policy and procedures on assessment are set out in Part 14 of the [Coursework Policy 2014](#) and in the [Assessment Procedures 2011](#).

### 20 Academic integrity in the design of curricula

(1) Learning experiences, programs and curricula must be designed to educate students early in the first year about academic integrity, appropriate acknowledgement, academic honesty and avoiding plagiarism.

(a) This education must include an online module endorsed by the Office of Educational Integrity and should also include tutorials work and scaffolding writing tasks as appropriate.

(2) The assessment framework of award courses and the assessment matrix within each unit of study must be designed and reviewed each time the unit is offered to ensure academic integrity.
(3) Faculties must manage the risk to academic integrity within the assessment framework for each unit of study consistently with the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 and associated procedures.

Note: See clause 12 of the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015.

20A Third party learning technologies

(1) All use of third party learning technologies must be consistent with relevant University policies, including in particular:
   (a) Policy on the Use of University Information Communications Technology Resources;
   (b) Privacy Policy 2013; and
   (c) University Recordkeeping Policy.

(2) Staff members and academic units:
   (a) are responsible for identifying and managing any risks associated with third party learning technologies which they introduce and use in association with their teaching; and
   (b) must register the use of such technologies with the office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).

(3) Third party learning technologies must not be used for assessment purposes without the permission of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education).

(4) Where a third party learning technology is introduced by the University, the University must:
   (a) develop and communicate an appropriate strategy for support of the technology; and
   (b) establish and implement appropriate mechanisms for:
      (i) retrieving and storing records of student activity generated by the technology; and
      (ii) trialling and evaluating the use of the technology.

(5) Where a third party learning technology is introduced by a staff member or academic unit, the person or unit introducing it must:
   (a) develop and communicate an appropriate strategy for support of the technology; and
   (b) establish and implement appropriate mechanisms for:
      (i) retrieving and storing records of student activity generated by the technology; and
      (ii) trialling and evaluating the use of the technology.
PART 4 MANAGEMENT OF LEARNING AND TEACHING

21 Statement of intent

The purpose of this part of the policy is to set out the framework, and specific responsibilities, for the management and evaluation of learning and teaching at unit of study, degree and University level. This includes academic governance authorities, roles and responsibilities, and quality assurance processes.

22 Rescinded

23 Roles and responsibilities in managing learning and teaching

(1) Delegations of authority for the management of learning and teaching are set out in:
   (a) Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions;
   (b) Supplementary Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions; and
   (c) University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions)
       Rule 2010 (as amended).

(2) The Academic Board

   (a) subject to endorsement by Senate, approves the award course level curriculum which is developed, implemented and monitored by the faculty;
   (b) approves requirements and other elements of award courses as set out in the Coursework Policy 2014, award course resolutions and tables of units of study, including:
      (i) determining the type of degree;
      Note: types are: for bachelor degrees - liberal studies or specialist or professional; for masters degrees - advanced learning by coursework, professional by coursework, or research.
      (ii) the inclusion of degree core, programs, majors and minors in award course requirements;
      (iii) the inclusion of mandatory units, and barrier assessments;
      (iv) the table of units of study for an award course;
      (v) the curriculum of streams within an award course;
   (c) approves faculty resolutions;
   (d) approves admission requirements and pre-requisites for award courses;
   (e) approves, on the recommendation of the relevant faculty or Board of Interdisciplinary Studies:
      (i) addition and deletion of award courses, streams, programs, majors, minors; and
      (ii) changes to the degree core;
(f) approves the list of majors, minors and units of study available in the shared pool for Liberal Studies degrees and the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, on the recommendation of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies;

(g) approves changes to the mode of delivery of a course or unit of study;

(h) determines deadlines for submitting proposals for new, amended and deleted award courses;

(i) determines teaching periods and commencement and conclusion dates of the academic year and, if appropriate, variations from standard teaching sessions requested by faculties;

(j) is responsible for:
   (i) aligning the range of the University's academic programs so that all graduates demonstrate graduate qualities set out in Part 2 to a high standard;
   (ii) reviewing education programs within faculties in a seven year cycle;
   (iii) monitoring program outcomes and reports of review committees and accrediting bodies to promote educational excellence as set out in Part 2;
   (iv) monitoring processes within faculties to support the academic integrity of the University's programs and assessment;
   (v) monitoring breaches of academic integrity, reviewing processes to minimise or eliminate them and taking appropriate action;
   (vi) considering and, if appropriate, approving the name and abbreviation used for each award course; and
   (vii) developing and maintaining quality and educational excellence as set out in Part 5.

(3) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) is responsible for strategic leadership of educational excellence and educational innovation throughout the University. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education):
   (a) develops and maintains institutional systems and strategy to achieve excellence in outcomes, experience and environment. This includes curriculum frameworks, online learning, and the student experience; and
   (b) develops and maintains quality and educational excellence as set out in Part 5.

(4) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) is responsible for the institutional systems and processes that support educational excellence. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) develops and maintains institutional systems and strategy in order to achieve excellence in admission, student recruitment, and administration processes.

(5) The University Executive Curriculum and Course Planning Committee:
   (a) reviews the business case for new course proposals from faculties; and
   (b) advises the University Executive and its relevant committees in their deliberations over whether to endorse a proposed course or change for consideration by the Academic Board.
(6) The **Board of Interdisciplinary Studies** approves:

(a) units of study under a faculty’s direction which are included in the shared pool of units of study available across all Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees;

(b) units of study that are not under a faculty’s direction;

(c) the inclusion of units of study that are not under a faculty’s direction in the shared pool of units of study available across all Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees;

(d) units of study in the open learning environment, Sydney Research Seminars, and interdisciplinary units of study offered to students in any degree.

(7) **Faculties**

(a) Faculties, and their committees, are responsible for standards, assessment and quality throughout the faculty. Faculties:

(i) establish a standing committee or committees with responsibility for excellence in outcomes and experience in award courses;

(ii) consider and, if appropriate, approve curriculum for all units of study, minors, and majors and programs in an award course;

(iii) approve learning outcomes for units of study, majors and programs;

(iv) approve assessment for units of study and other curriculum components as appropriate;

(v) approve pre-requisites and co-requisites for units of study and honours components;

(vi) determine the curriculum and learning outcomes for streams for recommendation to the Academic Board;

(vii) determine integration between units of study to meet the learning outcomes of majors, programs, streams or award courses and to achieve graduate qualities;

(viii) determine faculty resolutions relating to award courses of the faculty;

(ix) develop and maintain alignment of curricula and the quality of learning and teaching to achieve high standards in award course outcomes;

(x) where appropriate, monitor alignment with standards set by professional and accrediting bodies;

(xi) advise the Academic Board of any changes to degree level curricula. This includes creation, variation and deletion of courses and changes to tables of units of study;

   **Note:** Course proposal and amendment requirements can be found on the [Academic Board website](#).

(xii) ratify assessment results;

(xiii) monitor and maintain standards in the quality of assessment practices and academic integrity;

   **Note:** See the [Coursework Policy 2014](#), the [Assessment Procedures 2011](#) and the [Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015](#).

(xiv) review and act on educational quality data each semester as set out in Part 5;

(xv) monitor breaches of academic integrity within the faculty;
(xvi) review the assessment framework of units of study and other curriculum components to eliminate or minimise the possibility of such breaches;

(xvii) report breaches of academic integrity to the Academic Board as required by the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015; and

(xviii) monitor the framework for the management of learning and teaching within the faculty and the processes for ensuring educational excellence in all programs as set out in Part 5.

Note: See clause 11. Responsibilities for standards and operational matters in connection with programs may be undertaken by relevant committees.

(8) Deans

(a) Deans have overarching responsibility for standards, quality, strategic leadership and resource allocation to achieve educational excellence within faculties. Deans:

(i) exercise strategic oversight of faculties and their committees, the Associate Dean - Education and Heads of School to develop and maintain alignment with faculty strategy and operations;

(ii) consistently with the Coursework Policy 2014, set operational parameters for teaching and curricula, including teaching workloads, staff profile, fees and student numbers;

(iii) make appropriate arrangements for quality assurance of teaching and learning within the faculty as set out in Parts 4 and 5;

(iv) direct the appropriate allocation of resources for educational excellence;

(v) direct that student representatives be elected or appointed as members of education, undergraduate, postgraduate studies committees and program committees;

(vi) direct faculty or school offices to keep current and available relevant documentation relating to the faculty’s academic programs, including documentation for units of study;

(vii) appoint an Educational Integrity Co-ordinator and, if appropriate, additional nominated academics to act as decision makers in relation to alleged breaches of academic integrity in line with the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015; and

(viii) consider and, if appropriate, approve requests by unit of study co-ordinators to opt out of the recording of lectures in University-managed lecture theatres, or delegate this authority to a Head of School.

(9) Associate Deans - Education

(a) Associate Deans - Education lead and co-ordinate strategies for educational excellence, improvement and innovation across the faculty and, on behalf of the Dean, monitor the effectiveness of processes for achieving graduate outcomes through engaged enquiry. Associate Deans – Education:

(i) co-ordinate teaching across the faculty to deliver excellent educational outcomes and experience;

(ii) review and act on data on educational quality;
(iii) monitor and direct alignment of educational standards and quality in the faculty with University policy and strategy;

(iv) implement collegial governance in the creation and review of educational programs within the faculty; and

Note: See clause 11.

(v) support quality of teaching and learning across the faculty as set out in Part 5.

(10) Supervisors

(a) Supervisors provide leadership, guidance and mentorship to students undertaking research projects, and provide academic advice to students on reporting of research findings. Supervisors:

(i) support the student in the research project, including providing timely feedback and advice;

(ii) monitor progress within the context of the overall research project;

(iii) develop in the student the necessary skills to complete the project; and

(iv) educate students about the University's policies on research integrity, data management, ethical research practice, intellectual property, relevant health and safety procedures and other relevant matters.

(11) Heads of School

(a) Heads of School lead strategies and allocate resources for educational excellence within the school. Heads of School:

(i) assign teaching duties, unit of study co-ordinator tasks, and program committee membership to staff in the school as specified in Section 24A;

(ii) review reports and data on educational quality in consultation with unit of study co-ordinators and program committees;

(iii) act in relation to staff performance and effective allocation of quality resources; and

(iv) if requested to do so by the Dean, consider and, if appropriate, approve requests by unit of study co-ordinators to opt out of the recording of lectures in University-managed lecture theatres.

(v) appoint a unit of study co-ordinator for each unit of study for which the department is responsible;

(vi) make appropriate alternative arrangements if a unit of study co-ordinator is or will be absent; and

(vii) appoint a new unit of study co-ordinator when a current unit of study co-ordinator leaves.

Note: In faculties without a school structure, the roles and responsibilities of a Head of School may be taken by the Associate Dean – Education.

(12) Heads of Department

(a) appoint a unit of study co-ordinator for each unit of study for which the department is responsible;
(b) make appropriate alternative arrangements if a unit of study co-ordinator is or will be absent; and

(c) appoint a new unit of study co-ordinator when a current unit of study co-ordinator leaves.

(13) **Unit of study co-ordinators**

(a) Each unit of study must have a named unit of study co-ordinator, appointed by the relevant Head of Department.

(b) The Unit of study co-ordinator:

(i) is appointed for the whole of a teaching period during which a unit of study is being provided;

(ii) should inform the relevant head of department of any intended or foreseeable absence, at least four weeks in advance;

(iii) develop, implement and monitor unit of study curricula, learning activities and assessment, subject to approval by the faculty;

(iv) align learning outcomes between a unit of study and an award course, and implement, at the unit study level, strategies and policies for educational excellence;

(v) review unit of study curriculum design, including learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities and assessment, and, where appropriate, align with program learning goals and graduate qualities;

(vi) document and communicate the unit of study curriculum as a unit of study outline in the LMS, and make a unit description, including pre-requisites, co-requisites and assessment, available for inclusion in the faculty handbook;

(vii) review assessment tasks and standards in relation to policy and report to the faculty and the program committee;

(viii) review the academic integrity of each assessment task and the assessment matrix of the unit of study each time it is offered to eliminate or minimise the risk of breaches of academic integrity;

(ix) design the assessment framework for the unit of study to ensure the academic integrity of each assessment in the unit as set out in the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015;

(x) report incidents of potential academic dishonesty or plagiarism in line with university policy;

(xi) gather, review and act on data on educational quality, in consultation with the unit of study team and the Head of School;

(xii) administer surveys of educational experience and provide reports to students and the faculty on the quality of the student experience as set out in Part 5;

(xiii) make recommendations to the faculty, or a relevant committee of the faculty, about changes to learning outcomes, curriculum, or assessment for a unit of study; and

(xiv) manage access to lecture recordings and, where necessary, submit applications to opt out of recordings in University-managed lecture spaces to the Dean or Dean's nominee.
(14) **Individual teachers**

(a) Educational excellence exists when teachers engage students in their learning. To this end, individual teachers:

(i) support and lead student learning of the curriculum, as specified and to the agreed standards;

(ii) prepare the educational content of units of study;

(iii) design and prepare assessment tasks as specified in the curriculum, and consistently with relevant policy;

(iv) monitor and act to support academic standards and academic integrity; and

(v) where there is more than one teacher in a unit, participate as part of the unit of study team to support the unit of study co-ordinator in his or her role and responsibilities.

(15) **Students**

(a) An essential component of educational excellence is that students gain increasing understanding of, and take responsibility for, their learning. To this end, students must:

(i) be familiar with the degree resolutions, relevant policies and other requirements for the course as set out in the faculty handbook, unit of study outline and other published guidelines; and

(ii) satisfy attendance and assessment requirements.

(b) In addition, students should participate in any evaluations of their experience, so that educational excellence is monitored and improved.

### 24 Documentation and communication

(1) This part of the policy sets out appropriate standards for:

(a) communicating with students and staff;

(b) managing the development of units of study, curricula and award courses; and

(c) institutional record keeping.

**Note:** See *University Recordkeeping Policy* and *Recordkeeping Manual*

(2) Unit of study co-ordinators, together with the faculty, must provide a unit of study website on the LMS which contains, at a minimum:

(a) the unit of study outline;

(b) relevant curriculum resources; and

(c) any other material specified in the *Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016*.

**Note:** See clause 11 of those procedures.

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

(4) After publication of the unit of study outline, changes may only be made to the nature, weighting or due date of assessment tasks in exceptional circumstances.
(5) Each faculty must publish an annual handbook, containing the minimum information specified in the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016.

Note: See clause 9 of those procedures.

(6) The Academic Board may make award course resolutions, which must contain at least the minimum information specified in the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016.

Note: See clause 8 of those procedures.

(7) Subject to Academic Board approval, faculties may make resolutions applying to all degrees within a certain category awarded by the faculty.

(8) Upon each student’s graduation the University will provide each of the following documents, which will provide the information required by the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016:
   (a) an Australian Higher Education Graduation Statement;
   (b) a transcript;
   (c) a certificate of graduate status; and
   (d) a testamur.

Note: See clause 12 of those procedures.

(9) The Australian Higher Education Graduation Statement must contain, at a minimum:
   (a) a description of the award;
   (b) any industry or professional accreditation; and
   (c) other relevant outcomes.

24A STAFFING

(1) Except as allowed for in 24a (2), a Head of School must only appoint a unit of study coordinator or teacher with appropriate knowledge skills and qualifications including:
   a. up to date knowledge of field or discipline informed by ongoing research, scholarship or contemporary professional practice;
   b. relevant skills in learning, teaching and assessment; and
   c. except for staff teaching, coordinating or supervising award courses at level 10 of the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF), a qualification at least one level higher in the AQF than the award course into which the teacher or coordinator teaches, coordinates or supervises, or equivalent academic attainment or professional experience.
   d. for teachers, coordinators or supervisors in AQF level 10 awards, a relevant qualification at AQF level 10.

(2) a. Subject to approval of an Associate Dean, a Head of School may appoint a teacher who does not possess qualifications at the level specified in 24A (1) (c) above, but who does possess equivalent academic attainment or professional experience provided that:
   i. the academic attainment or professional experience that is deemed to be the equivalent of the required qualification is documented and approved in writing by the Associate Dean;
   ii. the approval, documentation and a CV of the teacher or coordinator is stored on the University’s central record keeping system; and
   iii. the teacher is under the oversight or supervision of a coordinator.
or other teacher of the unit who possess the qualification specified in 24A (2) (c).

b. Subject to the approval of an Associate Dean, a Head of School may appoint a teacher to teach a specialized component who is undergoing training in tertiary teaching but who does not possess the qualification specified in 24A (1) (c), provided that:
   i. the approval, reason for approval and a CV of the teacher is stored on the University's central record keeping system; and
   ii. the teaching is guided or coordinated by another staff member teaching or coordinating the unit who does possess that qualification.

Note:

PART 5 QUALITY ASSURANCE

25 Quality assurance processes

(1) Quality assurance ensures that learning outcomes at the required standards are demonstrated by students in appropriate tasks and assures that, for each learning activity, a quality learning environment exists. Quality assurance processes must be:
   (a) standards driven;
   (b) evidence based; and
   (c) institutionally aligned.

(2) Quality is measured in terms of excellence in:
   (a) educational outcomes;
   (b) educational experience;
   (c) educational environment.

Note: See Part 2.

(3) Excellence in educational outcomes is measured through systematic assessment which ensures that students achieve course learning outcomes at a high standard, and through the assessment of graduate qualities.
   (a) Faculties and their Associate Deans - Education must arrange for assessments to be subject to peer feedback and periodic benchmarking.

(4) Excellence in educational experience is measured through students’ reports of their experience. Feedback should be formal and informal and captured at unit of study, major, program or degree level. University, national and international surveys should be used to collect formal feedback.
   (a) Unit of study co-ordinators and Associate Deans - Education must administer surveys of educational experience each time a unit of study is offered.
   (b) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) must implement surveys of students’ experience of their learning at a University-wide level at least annually.

(5) Excellence in educational environment is measured through students’ responses to University, national and international surveys, and targeted ad hoc assessments of learning spaces.
(a) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) must implement surveys of educational environment at a University-wide level at least annually.

(6) At unit of study level

(a) Standards for educational outcomes must be determined by the faculty with reference to the discipline.
   (i) These standards must be easily visible at faculty level, generated through scrutiny of results data, and align with awards.
   (ii) The unit of study co-ordinator must assess whether educational outcomes are meeting agreed standards, including those for academic integrity.

(b) Standards for educational experience include the student experience of learning and teaching, information about which is obtained through relevant student surveys and peer observation of teaching where appropriate.
   (i) The unit of study co-ordinator must provide annual reports on students’ experience in a unit of study and feedback from surveys to students and the faculty.

(c) Educational environment is measured in the provision of formal, informal and virtual learning spaces. Physical learning spaces are measured against:
   (i) accepted learning space standards; and
   (ii) student and teacher evaluations, including the effective use of existing resources for teaching units of study.

(7) At the curriculum level

(a) Educational outcomes must:
   (i) contribute to student qualifications;
   (ii) meet accreditation requirements; and
   (iii) be aligned with institutional, industry, professional and community expectations.

(b) Standards and outcomes must be determined by the faculty and managed by the faculty or its relevant committee.
   (i) Student survey results must be used to set standards and targets.
   (ii) Benchmarking and aligning with standards across the faculty, and other comparable institutions, and with professional disciplinary and industry expectations, must be used to measure excellence.

(c) Educational experience is provided through a thematically coherent program. Evaluation methods include student surveys, benchmarking reports, reports from accrediting bodies, and Go8 Standards Verification reports.
   (i) The Associate Dean - Education must provide annual reports on students' educational experience to the faculty.
   (ii) Faculties must provide copies of formal benchmarking reports to the Academic Board.
   (iii) Deans must provide copies of accreditation reports from external organisations to the Academic Board on receipt.
   (iv) The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education) must provide Go8 Standards Verification reports to the Academic Board on receipt.
(d) The quality of the educational environment is measured by the provision of formal and informal learning spaces, where students belong to a community of scholars within discipline and degree programs. Physical learning spaces are measured against:

(i) accepted learning space standards; and

(ii) student and teacher evaluations, including the effective use of existing resources.

(8) At the University level

(a) Educational outcomes prepare the student for learning, life and work experiences, including success in accessing further study opportunities, rewarding career paths, and contribution to the community.

(b) Educational experience is acquired through engagement and enquiry which challenges students with novel problems and issues at every stage of the educational process.

(c) Educational environment is measured in terms of the provision of physical spaces and equipment, and virtual learning environments. The environment should support working together to achieve excellence.

(d) The University must evaluate the quality of outcomes, experience and environment using methods which include:

(i) using study survey results to set targets and benchmarks at faculty and University level;

(ii) accreditation reports;

(iii) meeting Group of Eight (Go8), AQF, Higher Education Standards, and professional regulatory body requirements; and

(iv) Academic Board and UE faculty reviews.

(e) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) must monitor evaluations of the standards of educational experience and education environments and provide reports to the University Executive and the Academic Board.

(f) The Academic Board must monitor educational excellence and, where appropriate, provide advice to the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education), the Vice Chancellor and the Senate.

(g) The Academic Board and the UE must provide reports of faculty reviews to the Senate.

26 Rescissions, replacements and transitional provisions

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

(a) Academic Board Resolutions: Creation, variation and deletion of award courses and units of study which commenced on 1 January 2001

(b) Academic Board Resolutions: The Management and Evaluation of Coursework Teaching which commenced on 1 June 2001

(c) Academic Board Policy on Consultation with Students which commenced in 2008

(d) Academic Board Resolutions: Generic Attributes of Graduates of the University of Sydney which commenced in 1997
(e) Distance, Alternative and Flexible Modes of Delivery in Postgraduate Courses Policy

(f) Flexible Student-Centred Learning in the University of Sydney Policy which commenced in 1999

(g) Improved Learning and Teaching Through Collaboration, Benchmarking and Alliances Policy which commenced in 2005

(h) Principles for First Year Orientation and Transition Policy which commenced in 2001

(i) Quality Assurance and Learning Management Systems Policy which commenced in 2005

(j) Research-Enhanced Learning and Teaching Policy which commenced in 2007

(k) Written and Oral Communication Skills of Students Policy which commenced in 2002

(l) Parallel Teaching of Postgraduate and Undergraduate Students Policy which commenced in 2004

(2) Sub clauses 18(1)-(8) apply to all undergraduate degrees approved or reviewed after 25 July 2016.
### SCHEDULE ONE

**Roles and responsibilities for curriculum (standards) and operational aspects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</th>
<th>Responsibility: Operational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Be familiar with legislative and other requirements of the course as set out in the faculty handbook, unit of study outline, and other published guidelines.</td>
<td>Participate in evaluations of their experience, to ensure that educational excellence is achieved. Encouraged to participate in the development and review of courses and units of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfy attendance and assessment requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual teachers</td>
<td>Support and lead student learning of the curriculum as specified, and to the agreed standard.</td>
<td>Participate as part of the unit of study team (if appropriate) to support the roles and responsibilities of the unit of study coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design and prepare assessment tasks as specified in the curriculum and in accordance with the standards in the relevant policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor and implement academic standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educate students on academic integrity and report any breaches of academic integrity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</td>
<td>Responsibility: Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit of study co-ordinators</td>
<td>Review the design of the curriculum of the unit of study, including learning outcomes, learning and teaching activities, and assessment, to ensure ongoing alignment against program learning goals and graduate qualities. Document and communicate the unit of study curriculum as a unit of study outline in the LMS, and ensure its availability in the faculty handbook. Review assessment tasks and standards in relation to policy and report to the faculty and program committee. Review the academic integrity of each assessment task and the assessment matrix of the unit to eliminate or minimise the possibility of breaches of academic integrity. Unit of study co-ordinators must ensure that assessment framework in the unit of study is designed to ensure the academic integrity of each assessment in the unit as set out in the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015. Act on breaches of academic integrity within a unit of study, and review the assessment framework each time the unit of study is offered to eliminate or minimise the possibility of such breaches. Recommend student assessment tasks to the faculty and program committee. In consultation with the unit of study team and the Head of School, gather, review and act on data on educational quality.</td>
<td>Lead and co-ordinate the unit of study team to deliver quality teaching and assessment, including reviewing, communicating and acting on data on educational quality in the unit of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</td>
<td>Responsibility: Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Provide leadership, guidance and mentorship to students undertaking research projects.</td>
<td>Support the student in the research project, including providing timely feedback and advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide academic advice to students on the reporting of research findings in a dissertation, treatise or long essay.</td>
<td>Monitor progress within the context of the overall research plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educate students on, and monitor the project for compliance with, the University’s policies on research integrity, data management, ethical research practice, intellectual property, relevant health and safety procedures and other relevant matters.</td>
<td>Provide the student with the necessary skills to complete the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of department</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appoint a unit of study co-ordinator for each unit of study within the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of school</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assign teaching duties, unit of study co-ordinator tasks, and program committee membership to staff in the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In consultation with the heads of departments, unit of study co-ordinators and program committees, review reports and data on educational quality, and act in relation to staff performance and effective allocation of quality resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</td>
<td>Responsibility: Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Associate Dean - Education  | Lead and co-ordinate strategies for educational excellence, improvement and innovation across the faculty.  
On behalf of the Dean establish effective processes for achieving graduate outcomes through engaged enquiry.  
Align educational standards and quality within the faculty with the University policy and strategy.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Co-ordinate teaching across the faculty to deliver excellence in educational outcomes and experience.  
Review and act on data on educational quality.  
Establish and implement collegial governance, as set out in Clause 11, in the creation and review of educational programs within the faculty.  
Support quality of learning and teaching across the faculty as set out in Part 5.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Dean                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Have strategic oversight of faculties, the Associate Dean - Education and heads of school and heads of departments to ensure alignment with faculty strategy and operations (resources).  
Review and act on data relating to educational quality.  
Consistently with the Coursework Policy 2014, set operational parameters for teaching and curriculum (e.g. teaching workloads, staff profile, fees, student numbers.)  
Make arrangements for quality assurance of teaching and learning within the faculty as set out in Part 5.  
Include, where appropriate, student representatives on standard governance committees and provide them with same information as other committee members to enable effective participation.  
Ensure that faculty offices maintain and update all documentation for policy and procedures relating to the faculty’s academic programs, including documentation for units of study. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</th>
<th>Responsibility: Operational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>Plan and implement reviews of degree curriculum design, including degree learning outcomes, degree learning experiences, and degree level assessment. This will establish ongoing internal alignment and mapping coverage in relation to program goals, coherence, relevance and strategic fit. Advise the Academic Board of any changes to degree level curricula. This may include creation, variation or deletion of courses and changes to tables of units of study. Ratify assessment results with degrees and monitor and act to ensure quality of standards and quality of assessment practices. (See the Coursework Policy 2014 and the Assessment Procedures 2011). Review and act on data on educational quality and ensure educational excellence. Entrench academic integrity within the assessment framework of each award course at each stage of the program. Monitor breaches of academic integrity within the faculty, review the assessment framework to eliminate or minimise the possibility of such breaches, and report breaches of academic integrity each year to the Academic Board as set out in the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015.</td>
<td>Monitor the framework for the management of learning and teaching within the faculty and the processes for ensuring educational excellence in all programs. May devolve their responsibilities for standards and operational matters to degree, major and program committees and to degree co-ordinators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</td>
<td>Responsibility: Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Establish and support institutional systems and strategy to deliver the educational mission in order</td>
<td>Establish and support institutional systems and strategy to deliver the educational mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>to achieve excellence in outcomes, experience and environment (e.g. infrastructure, IT, curriculum</td>
<td>in relation to admission, recruitment, and administration processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frameworks, student experience).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deliver quality assurance measures as set out in Part 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Vice Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Through faculties, the Academic Board and the University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive (UE) Education Committee, review and act on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• reports of program committees, including curriculum review and assessment standards;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• data on educational quality; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• academic integrity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Name of policy

This is the Student Placement and Project Policy 2015.

2 Commencement

This policy commences on 1 January 2016.

3 Policy is binding

Except to the extent that a contrary intention is expressed, this policy binds the University, staff, students and affiliates.
4 Statement of intent

This policy:

(a) provides for students to be properly supported while undertaking professional placement programs and projects including with external partners; and

(b) sets out the University's requirements for the development and management of such programs.

5 Application

(1) This policy applies to placements and projects undertaken by students as a required part of a coursework award course.

(2) This policy does not apply to other placements or projects, but may be used as a guide to practice in relation to such placements or projects.

6 Definitions

coursework award course has the meaning given in the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014, which at the date of this policy is:

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

external partner means a person or organisation with whom or with which the University has established a partnership to provide an educational experience based on a placement or project, as defined in this policy.

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

placement means assigning a student to undertake supervised learning at a workplace that is controlled by a placement provider, for the purpose of the student’s practical education. A placement is a vocational placement as provided in the Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth).

placement co-ordinator means a member of staff of a Faculty with responsibilities as set out in this policy. The placement co-coordinator may be the unit of study co-ordinator.

placement provider means an individual or organisation with whom a student is undertaking a placement under this policy.
placement supervisor means the placement provider (if an individual) or an employee of the placement provider who is responsible for the work based supervision of a student on placement. The University may also employ supervisors who visit the workplace. In this policy the placement supervisor refers to the person employed by the placement provider.

project Has the meaning in the Collaborative Education and Research Training Agreements Policy which, at the time of approval of this policy is:

- a learning experience built around researching, proposing, creating and/or implementing solutions to a problem, either individually or in a group.

project co-ordinator Means a member of staff with responsibilities for the coordination of projects as set out in this policy and other University policies. The project co-ordinator may be a unit of study co-ordinator for project units of study.

7 Principles for placements and projects

(1) Placements and projects are intended to provide students with authentic experiential learning.

(2) In order to maximise their learning, students working on a placement should:
   (a) be given a clear explanation of the professional and academic expectations and learning outcomes of the placement;
   (b) have access to quality supervision;
   (c) be given work related responsibilities relevant to the intended learning outcomes; and
   (d) have structured opportunities for critical reflection.

(3) In order to maximise their learning, students working on a project should:
   (a) be given a clear explanation of the professional and academic expectations and learning outcomes of the project;
   (b) have access to quality preparation for the learning experience;
   (c) have access to quality guidance and advice, including in the resolution of any actual or perceived barriers to progress; and
   (d) have access to structured opportunities for critical reflection.

(4) The requirements for assessment of a placement or a project must be set out in the unit of study outline.

   (a) The final assessment mark for each student on placement must be determined by the relevant member of the faculty’s academic staff, consistently with the requirements of the Coursework Policy 2014 and the Assessment Procedures 2011.

   (b) Where a placement or project involves group work, students should be assessed according to their individual achievement of the learning outcomes and graduate qualities, which may include contribution to effective group functioning and communication in intercultural and interdisciplinary settings.

(5) For each student placement or project there must be an identified placement or project co-ordinator.
8 Engagement with placement providers and external project partners

Placement and project co-ordinators are responsible for:

(a) in the case of placements, informing placement providers of the objectives and learning outcome including the attendance requirements, of the placement;

(b) in the case of both placements and projects, establishing appropriate plans for managing any conflict of interests which may arise from any pre-existing relationships between the placement provider or project partner (or relevant member of the placement provider or project partner’s staff) and any student proposed for placement with that provider.

Note: The details of any such plan will depend on the particular circumstances of each case. If no appropriate plan can be developed, the student should be placed with another placement provider or project partner.

9 Placement and project agreements

(1) Students must not be assigned to a placement provider or to a project involving an external partner without an overarching written agreement between the University and the placement provider or external partner which sets out:

(a) the responsibilities of each of the University and the placement provider or project partner;

(b) the insurance requirements for each of the University and the placement provider or project partner;

(c) the level and nature of supervision which will be provided to students on placement or to students undertaking a project; and

(d) intellectual property, confidentiality and privacy obligations applicable to placement or project.

(2) Placement and project co-ordinators are responsible for ensuring placement providers or project partners are aware of any reasonable adjustments agreed between the University and the placement provider to accommodate a student with a disability.

Note: The University will only be able to make or agree to any such adjustments if the student has disclosed the disability and consented to the release of necessary information to the placement provider or project partner. See clause 12 of this policy.

(3) Before approving an agreement between the University and a placement provider or project partner, the relevant delegate must consider:

(a) the placement provider’s ability to meet objectives of placements or project;

(b) the appropriateness of the learning environment and the proposed learning experience.

(c) compliance with the Collaborative Education and Research Training Agreements Policy 2017.

(d) the University’s obligations under the Higher Education Standards Framework, particularly in relation to delivery with other parties.

Note: The intent of placement and project agreements is that the University should have a clear, documented agreement with each provider of student placements or project. This does not mean a separate agreement for each student, or necessarily each cohort, but a document to which each party has formally agreed which sets out the terms of the relationship.
10 Communication with students prior to placement or project

(1) Placement and project co-ordinators must inform students of the following before the student commences a placement or project:

(a) the objectives of the placement or project, including:
   (i) learning outcomes;
   (ii) assessment requirements; and
   (iii) attendance requirements.

(b) how to apply for special consideration or special arrangements in relation to the placement or project;

Note: See Coursework Policy 2014 and Assessment Procedures 2011.

(c) what other University policies or procedures apply to a particular placement or project:

Note: For example, the Travel Policy and Travel Procedures will apply to international placements.

(d) whom to contact in the Faculty if the student should have any concerns while on placement or undertaking the project, and how contact may be made;

(e) the circumstances under which a placement or project may be terminated by either the placement or project supervisor or the placement, project or unit of study co-ordinator or when a student would be considered to have failed any assessment relating to the placement or project.

Note: Requirements to complete placements and projects are specified in the relevant course resolutions.

(2) If a placement or project is terminated early for reasons beyond a student's control, the placement, project or unit of study co-ordinator must:

(a) arrange for the student to be assessed on the basis of the completed component of the placement or project; and

(b) inform the student as soon as possible of any remaining requirements to be met in order to complete the placement or project requirement of their course.

(i) If a placement or project is terminated because the placement or project provider or facilities provided are determined to be unsuitable, the placement, project or unit of study co-ordinator must work with the student to provide options for the student to meet the placement or project requirements of their course without penalty.

(3) Placement or project co-ordinators must request from students details of any pre-existing relationships between the placement or project provider (or relevant member of the placement or project provider’s staff) and any student proposed for placement or project with that provider.

(4) Faculties should develop and register local provisions setting out any requirements for placements in addition to those specified in University policy and procedures.

Note: All University policies and procedures, and registered local provisions, are available from the Policy Register.

11 Communication with students while on placement or while undertaking a project

(1) Placement or project co-ordinators must establish and maintain mechanisms for communication between the faculty and students on placement or undertaking a project, including in relation to:
(a) the quality of the placement or project experience;
(b) the student’s progress; and
(c) potential or actual problems with the placement or project.

(2) Communication mechanisms must be available to students at all time while on placement or while undertaking a project away from the University.

12 Work health and safety of students on placement or while undertaking a project

(1) Placement or project co-ordinators must:
(a) take all reasonable steps to identify and record where students are undertaking placements and projects at any given time;
(b) in the case of placements and projects undertaken on the placement provider or project partner’s premises, inform placement providers and project partners of the requirement to provide a work health and safety induction to all students on placement or undertaking a project on the partner’s premises;
(c) in the case of placements and projects undertaken on the placement provider or project partner’s premises, notify placement providers and project partners that the placement or project co-ordinator needs to be informed of any work health or safety concern during a placement or project;
(d) in the case of placements and projects undertaken on the placement provider or project partner’s premises, inform students of relevant work health and safety issues before they go on placement or commence the project; and
(e) notify students of the contact details for relevant faculty staff who should be informed of any work health or safety concern during a placement or project.

(2) Placement and project co-ordinators are responsible for recording reported work health and safety incidents occurring during placements on the University’s work health and safety reporting system, Riskware.

(3) Placement and project co-ordinators must request students to disclose health issues that have a work health and safety significance for placement before going on placement, so that student safety can be optimised.

Note: Such information must be handled consistently with the Privacy Policy 2013, Privacy Management Plan, University Recordkeeping Policy and Recordkeeping Manual.

13 Feedback after placements and projects

(1) Placement, project and unit of study co-ordinators must establish and maintain robust mechanisms to obtain feedback from:
(a) students, particularly in relation to:
   (i) the quality of the supervision; and
   (ii) students' level of preparation for the placement or project;
   (iii) the overall value of the learning experience associated with the placement or project; and
(b) placement or project providers, particularly in relation to:
   (i) the educational design of the placement or project;
   (ii) the preparedness of students on placement or project; and
(iii) the performance of students on placement or projects.

14 Transitional provisions

(1) Faculties are required to achieve compliance with the requirements of this policy by 1 January 2017.

(2) In particular, by 1 January 2017 each faculty must:

(a) develop and register appropriate local provisions for implementation of this policy in the faculty's circumstances; and

(b) develop and be ready to implement standard template agreements for student placements and projects involving external partners.
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Guidelines for Inter-institutional Agreements
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Introduction

The national and international profile of the University of Sydney is enhanced by the active participation of its staff and the visibility of its students in activities arising from cooperative cross-institutional Agreements with a range of relevant institutions both within and outside Australia. The challenge to the University is to ensure that academic cooperation is facilitated through provision of sound administrative support and that overly burdensome procedures are avoided.

Co-operative arrangements may vary in formality from formal Agreements, such as Memoranda of Understanding that are negotiated at institutional levels and signed by the CEOs of the institutions concerned to informal Agreements that result from the initiative of individual staff and relate to the conduct of particular activities or events.

While some co-operative arrangement can and will exist at an informal level, this will not apply in cases where award programs of the University of Sydney are involved. In such cases, the University's reputation and the interests of its students must be safeguarded. This will typically be achieved through the Academic Board which has the responsibility of ensuring the academic integrity of the University's programs of instruction and the quality of their modes of delivery.

Where an inter-institutional Agreement involves an award course of the University of Sydney, matters relating to Academic Board requirements for admission, assessment and curriculum requirements for the program, the methods proposed for moderation and quality assurance as well the agreement of the relevant faculty, college or other university groups will need to be addressed prior to the finalisation of the Agreement.

Scope of these guidelines

In developing guidelines for Agreements, it is not intended to impose any changes to the informal inter-institutional co-operation that occurs at the level of individual staff or groups of staff. Monitoring of these informal arrangements should occur as appropriate at departmental or faculty levels.

The guidelines proposed in this discussion paper relate to inter-institutional Agreements and are intended to apply where inter-institutional co-operation is the subject of formal documentation including Memoranda of Understanding or similar signed by one or more officers of the University of Sydney. The institutions involved in these links with the University of Sydney will commonly but not necessarily be located overseas and may involve a range of academic activities, including the delivery of programs that provide students with advanced standing to programs of this University, the delivery of programs of the University, staff and/or student exchanges.

These guidelines do not apply to inter-institutional Agreements outside the international arena, such as those concerned with the clinical placements of UG students of the University of Sydney.
A pro forma designed to assist in the process of setting up an Agreement is available. The pro forma should be used whenever a University-to-University Memorandum of Understanding or a Student Exchange Agreement is proposed.

A second pro forma (See B2 below) will be prepared following discussion of these guidelines and feedback by relevant groups, including the International Reference Group.

Guidelines

All Agreements will be for a nominated time period, commonly 3 to 5 years, after which time an Agreement will lapse unless renewed.

A. Formal inter-institutional Agreements for research cooperation and/or for staff and/or student exchanges

A1 Agreements of this nature may be entered in to support the activities of departments, faculties, Colleges or the University as a whole and typically take the form of Memoranda of Understanding to operate for a nominated period.

A2 Before their conclusion, any Agreement involving the proposed exchange of students will be referred to the International Office for advice concerning relevant matters such as visa requirements and other formalities.

A3 Such Agreements may be of various types:

(i) inter-departmental Agreements, initiated by the relevant Head(s) of Department of the University of Sydney, endorsed by the Dean(s), with the signatory on behalf of the University of Sydney being the relevant College Pro-Vice-Chancellor(s);

(ii) inter-faculty Agreements, initiated and endorsed by the Dean(s), with the signatory on behalf of the University of Sydney being the relevant College Pro-Vice-Chancellor(s);

(iii) inter-institutional Agreements, endorsed by the relevant College Pro-Vice-Chancellor(s), in which case the appropriate signatory for the University of Sydney is the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International & Development).

A4 Notwithstanding item A3 above, where the signatory of the proposed partner institution is to be its Vice-Chancellor/President/Rector/Chief Executive, the proposed Agreement will be forwarded prior to finalisation to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International & Development) to determine whether, from the University's position, the Vice-Chancellor's signature is appropriate, and if so, will forward the document to the Vice-Chancellor.

A5 Notwithstanding item A3 above, where the partner is a Department or Division of a foreign Government, the proposed Agreement will prior to finalisation be forwarded to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International & Development) to determine whether from the University's position, the Vice-Chancellor's signature is appropriate, and if so, will forward the document to the Vice-Chancellor.

A6 A copy of each Agreement signed in this category will be forwarded to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International and Development) for central records and database entry.
B. Agreements that involve the offering, in whole or part, of any existing award program of the University within Australia or overseas

B1 The Vice-Chancellor and Principal will be the signatory on behalf of the University of Sydney to an Agreement through which any degree, diploma or certificate program of the University is to be offered either in whole or part, in association with or by a partner institution in Australia or overseas.

B2 A Supporting Memorandum will be prepared by the proposing group and will provide brief comment on the partner institution under the following headings:

- academic standing and, where appropriate, financial stability;
- arrangements for the physical and pastoral care of the students involved;
- arrangements for the collection, disbursement and refund of tuition fees (if any) to be paid by those students;
- arrangements for student record keeping;
- resource implications (both human and financial) of the Agreement;
- where relevant, provisions made to protect the University’s intellectual property;
- where relevant, the arrangements to address any offshore legal and financial requirements, such as provisions for withholding tax.

A pro forma with checklist will be provided to facilitate this process.

B3 Where an Agreement involves the offering of units of study under arrangements that vary significantly from their normal modes of offering, the relevant Dean(s) and Head(s) of Department will certify that the new arrangements are appropriate.

B4 After endorsement by the relevant Dean(s) and College Pro-Vice-Chancellor(s), the proposed Agreement with the Supporting Memorandum should be forwarded to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International and Development) who will refer it to the Vice-Chancellor.

B5 A copy of any such Agreement under this category will be recorded in the central database through the Deputy-Vice Chancellor (International & Development).

C. Agreements to accept prior studies at another institution for credit or exemption towards a Degree, Diploma or Certificate of the University for international students

C1 It is acknowledged that the granting of credit for prior studies at another institution whether within Australia or overseas is governed by the Resolutions of Senate relating to particular degrees and is typically handled according to the general policies of Academic Board.

C2 Under normal circumstances, the granting of credit would not normally entail the setting up of a formal Agreement. In some cases, however, for offshore legal purposes or to enhance international student recruitment, a formal Agreement will be deemed desirable by an academic unit. Such an Agreement should specify the extent of the credit and the circumstances under which it would be granted and recognise that admission may be subject to quota restriction.

C3 The signatory for such Agreements is the relevant College Pro-Vice-Chancellor(s) after endorsement by the Dean(s).

C4 When signing such Agreements, the College Pro-Vice-Chancellors would generally satisfy themselves that:

- the proposed partner institution is of good academic standing and reputation;
- its students will be properly prepared for their proposed programs of study in Australia; and
- relevant legal and financial requirements have been addressed.
C5 A copy of any such Agreement under this category will be forwarded to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International and Development) for central records and to be included in relevant marketing material.

D. Use of the University coat-of-arms

Where an Agreement has been set up in accord with the relevant guidelines and signed by the appropriate University officers, the Vice-Chancellor or nominee may approve the limited use of the University coat-of-arms or other devices for circumscribed purposes by the other institutional party to the Agreement.

These guidelines have been developed in consultation with the International Reference Group, the Senior Executive Staff and the Vice-Chancellor's Advisory Committee and come into effect from 7 August 1997.

The guidelines will be reviewed on a regular basis.
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**RECOMMENDATION**

*That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee of the Academic Board:*
- provide feedback on the discussion paper of the Assessment Working Group;
- promote staff attendance at the relevant faculty assessment fora; and
- circulate the attached discussion paper among their colleagues and direct staff to the online form or other options for feedback.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Assessment Working Group has now met 7 times since its establishment in March 2017, and considered a range of issues related to the University’s current approach to assessment. This includes current assessment of projects, the use of assessment rubrics across the University, and the current impact of assessment on staff, students, and the educational integrity of the University’s coursework programs. In addition to discussion at the Academic Board, University Executive committees, and a University-wide town hall forum held in June 2017, a series of dedicated assessment fora for each faculty have been scheduled through late July to early September (see Attachment 1). To support these discussions, the working group has produced a paper, *Towards a University-wide approach to assessing the graduate qualities*, and made this available via a dedicated page on the staff intranet (see Attachment 2). This paper draws together the issues the working group has considered in relation to the assessment of the graduate qualities, along with planning assessment across courses, course components, and in the project units that are a hallmark of the transformed undergraduate curriculum. Feedback is now invited from all members of the University community on this paper, with a view to develop a policy paper which will reach the Academic Board in November.

**BACKGROUND / CONTEXT**

The *University of Sydney 2016-20 Strategic Plan* commits the University to significantly rethinking aspects of its educational approach relating to assessment, including measuring graduate qualities; increasing authentic assessment; problem-based and collaborative learning; reducing assessment volume; improving feedback to staff and students; and aligning and integrating assessment across units of study and course components (e.g., majors). In February 2017, the Assessment Working Group was jointly established by the Academic Board and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) to review the University’s current approach to assessment and undertake the work required to give effect to the assessment initiatives of the University strategy. By the end of 2017, the working group will be seeking University-wide agreement on common approaches to assessing the graduate qualities, planning assessment across courses and course components, and the conduct of assessment in project units.

To date, the Assessment Working Group has met seven times, and has considered a range of matters related to the University’s current approach to assessment and ways to implement the assessment-related objectives articulated in the University strategy. Specifically, the working group has considered papers on

---

1 See education strategy initiatives 4.1, 4.4, 5.1 and 5.2 of the Strategic Plan: [https://intranet.sydney.edu.au/strategy-planning/education.html](https://intranet.sydney.edu.au/strategy-planning/education.html)
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assessment in interdisciplinary projects; the current use and nature of assessment rubrics at the University; the impact of the University's current approach to assessment, particularly on staff, students and the integrity of the University's coursework programs. In relation to assessing the graduate qualities, the working group has also sought expert advice from the Educational Measurement and Assessment Hub. This advice was provided in the working paper, *Theoretical foundations of a common approach to assessment*, which formed the basis of discussion of dedicated session on assessment held by the Academic Board and via University-wide town hall forum held on 14 June.²

To promote further discussion of and wider consultation on the assessment-related initiatives outlined above, the Assessment Working Group has now published its first milestone discussion paper: *Toward a common approach to assessing the graduate qualities* (Attachment 2). This paper draws together the three main streams of work being undertaken by the working group: i.e., assessing the graduate qualities, planning assessment across courses and course components, and developing guidelines for assessment in project units. The paper articulates a series of question relevant to each of these streams, which the working group is seeking feedback from across the University at a series of dedicated faculty fora for a being held between late June and early September 2017 (Attachment 1). In addition to these fora, staff are invited to provide written feedback, along with other commentary and materials, by e-mail or an online feedback questionnaire. Further information for staff on providing feedback on the discussion paper is available on the working group’s intranet site (see footnote 2).

The information garnered through the faculty fora and feedback provided by individual staff will be considered by the Assessment Working Group as it seeks to develop a suite of proposals designed to give effect to the assessment initiatives of the University strategy. Through the third quarter of 2017, the working group will also be seeking to develop draft definitions of the graduate qualities. A final paper on a common approach on assessment and assessing the graduate qualities is expected to reach the Academic Board for its meeting on 28 November, via the Academic Standards and Policy Committee. Work on the development of formal policy and embedding these approaches will then be undertaken throughout 2018, with a view to University-wide implementation of agreed changes to assessment, including the measurement and assessment of student development of the graduate qualities from Semester 1, 2020.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – Schedule of faculty fora, July to September 2017.
Attachment 2 – *Towards a University-wide approach to assessing the graduate qualities*, Assessment Working Group Discussion Paper

² The working paper prepared by the Educational Measurement and Assessment Hub and a recording of the town hall forum are available for download from the Assessment Working Group’s intranet page: https://intranet.sydney.edu.au/teaching-support/boards-committees-working-groups/assessment-working-group.html
**ATTACHMENT 1 – SCHEDULE OF FACULTY FORA, JULY TO SEPTEMBER 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty/University School</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>24-Aug</td>
<td>12-1pm</td>
<td>Arch Lect Theatre 3, L2, Wilkinson Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>30-Aug</td>
<td>11am-12pm</td>
<td>Woolley Lecture Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>15-Aug</td>
<td>10-11am</td>
<td>The Refectory, Abercrombie Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>14-Aug</td>
<td>2-3pm</td>
<td>Conservatorium Room 1156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry*</td>
<td>16-Aug</td>
<td>1.30-2.30pm</td>
<td>Level 6 Seminar Room, CPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23-Aug</td>
<td>3.30-4.30pm</td>
<td>Westmead Ed and Conf Centre Auditorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>30-Aug</td>
<td>1-2pm</td>
<td>PNR Lecture Theatre 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>25-Jul</td>
<td>12-1pm</td>
<td>Rooms T203 &amp; T204, T Block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>08-Sep</td>
<td>12.30-1.30pm</td>
<td>Common Room, L4 New Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine*</td>
<td>16-Aug</td>
<td>1.30-2.30pm</td>
<td>Level 6 Seminar Room, CPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23-Aug</td>
<td>3.30-4.30pm</td>
<td>Westmead Ed and Conf Centre Auditorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing*</td>
<td>16-Aug</td>
<td>1.30-2.30pm</td>
<td>Level 6 Seminar Room, CPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy*</td>
<td>16-Aug</td>
<td>1.30-2.30pm</td>
<td>Level 6 Seminar Room, CPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science~</td>
<td>31-Aug</td>
<td>3-4pm</td>
<td>VSCC Seminar Room 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01-Sep</td>
<td>1-2pm</td>
<td>New Law School Lecture Theatre 024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A joint forum is being held for staff from Dentistry, Medicine, Pharmacy and Nursing at the Charles Perkins Centre. A second joint forum is also being held for staff from Dentistry and Medicine located at Westmead.
~ Jabber will be used for multi-site broadcasting of the two Science fora.
Towards a University-wide approach to assessing the graduate qualities

Discussion paper

Assessment Working Group
1 The strategic context

The University’s 2016-20 Strategic Plan identified the need to transform the undergraduate curriculum in order to produce graduates with the capacity to influence and contribute to dynamic, changing and globalised environments. Approved by the Academic Board in late 2016, the University’s new curriculum framework balances depth of disciplinary expertise with broader capabilities by providing access to broader intellectual landscapes offering more authentic, ‘real-world’ educational experiences. The framework also introduces new, common structures to liberal studies and selected other degrees that allow for more interoperability between fields of study while building deep knowledge in students’ chosen topics.

Framing the transformed curriculum are the graduate qualities (Table 1). Developed from University-wide survey and discussion in 2015, these graduate qualities are common to all bachelor degrees, whether liberal studies, professional or specialist degrees, and reframe in contemporary terms undergraduate education at the University of Sydney. They also reaffirm the University’s commitment to serving communities by providing students with the best possible foundation for making positive contributions to society and leading fulfilling lives. A key challenge for the University is to embed appropriate learning experiences within all courses to ensure all students develop the graduate qualities regardless of their chosen field of study.

Table 1: Qualities of the Sydney graduate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate qualities</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depth of disciplinary expertise</td>
<td>To excel at applying and continuing to develop expertise in the graduate’s chosen discipline or disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader skills:</td>
<td>To increase the impact of expertise, and to learn and respond effectively and creatively to novel problems and opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– critical thinking and problem solving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– communication (oral and written)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– information/digital literacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– inventiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competence</td>
<td>To work productively, collaboratively and openly in diverse groups and across cultural boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary effectiveness</td>
<td>To work effectively in interdisciplinary (including inter-professional) settings and to build broader perspective, innovative vision, and more contextualised and systemic forms of understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An integrated professional, ethical and personal identity</td>
<td>To build integrity, confidence and personal resilience, and the capacities to manage challenge and uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>To be effective in exercising professional and social responsibility and making a positive contribution to society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To support the transformed curriculum, the education portion of the University Strategy sets out a number of initiatives to renew the University’s approach to assessment.\(^2\) The increased use of problem-based, collaborative and interdisciplinary learning experiences poses new challenges for the design of assessment. As outlined in the Strategy, the new curriculum components in liberal studies degrees (along with the structured degree core of specialist and professional degrees) also make this an opportune time to consider how these structures might allow us to promote deeper learning, reduce the volume of assessment, and improve assessment-related feedback to students and staff. In addition, the University has also made a commitment to assessing students’ achievement of these graduate qualities.\(^3\)

---

1. University of Sydney 2016-20 Strategic Plan.
2. See Initiative 1 of Strategy E4 (pp.32-34), and Initiatives 1 and 2 of Strategy E5: Transform the Learning Experience (pp.38-39).
3. See Initiative 4 of Strategy E4: Transform the undergraduate curriculum (p.37) of the Strategic Plan.
The Assessment Working Group has been established as a partnership between the Chair of the Academic Board and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) to review the University’s current approach to assessment and undertake the work required to give effect to the assessment initiatives of the education strategy.

During 2017, the Assessment Working Group will:
1. develop a common approach for assessing graduate qualities
2. develop a common approach for development of aligned assessment plans at the level of course component to ensure effective placing of authentic assessment experiences and achievement of learning outcomes at the appropriate level
3. recommend optimal processes for effective assessment practice in collaborative and project-based learning
4. recommend policy and course management options for integrative assessment across units of study and disciplines and in interdisciplinary units embedded in majors, projects and the Sydney Research Seminars
5. recommend policy reforms in support of reducing summative assessment at unit of study level, making increased use of low or zero weighted formative assessment, and of learning analytics to provide feedback on learning to students and staff and on the learning process as a whole.

The Assessment Working Group has thus far investigated key issues associated with current approaches to assessment across the University, specifically the current timing, volume and inclusiveness of assessment and the impact of this on students, academic and professional staff, and the academic integrity of the University’s undergraduate award courses. Expert advice on best-practice measurement and assessment has been provided into this process by the Sydney School of Education and Social Work’s Educational Measurement and Assessment Hub.

Early input has also been sought from the Academic Board and University Executive committees and via a recent all-University forum on assessment. The results of this process to date have informed this discussion paper. The purpose of this paper is to support a wider and more targeted consultation phase during which a series of dedicated faculty fora will be held (from July to September 2017). Direct feedback on this paper is also welcome during this period. A form for feedback is at Attachment 1 and will be available via the staff intranet.

The results of this consultation process will be used to develop a suite of proposals that address these issues, to be taken to the Academic Board for approval by the end of 2017. Any relevant policy-related work is envisaged to be undertaken and completed by the end of 2018, with the full approach expected to be implemented by Semester 1, 2020.

---

4 Assessment Working Group Terms of Reference.
5 Sydney School of Education and Social Work, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
2 Discussion questions

Summarised below are the discussion questions that appear throughout this paper. More context for each set is provided in the following sections. For each group of prompts, the working group is seeking to feedback on two key questions:

1. Do you know of any good examples where this is already being done (whether within our outside of the University)?
2. What are the challenges that will need to be overcome and what are the key elements required for success?

For ease of response, a feedback form setting out these questions is at Attachment 1 and will be available on the staff intranet. Other comments or material are also welcome and can be sent to dvc.education@sydney.edu.au.

### Assessing the graduate qualities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 What approach are you taking to embedding the graduate qualities in the curriculum and how should this inform the development of a common approach to assessing graduate qualities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 What is the best means for ensuring that relevant differences are reflected appropriately in a common approach to assessing graduate qualities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Can a common rubric be used to assess students’ attainment of the graduate qualities consistently across the diversity of fields of study taught at the University? What are the key challenges in doing so?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Can we design assessment tasks that give students appropriate opportunities to develop and present evidence of their progress toward achieving the graduate qualities? What are the key challenges?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning assessment across courses and course components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 How can we increase and enhance the feedback given to students and staff about student learning while also seeking to reduce the volume of assessment at the same time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 For each major, program or degree, how can we assess and provide feedback to students on their progress toward achieving the graduate qualities earlier than final-year projects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 For each major, program, or degree, what is the optimal way to plan learning experiences and assessments so that students can work progressively toward achieving the graduate qualities and other course-level learning outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Are there any promising opportunities in your faculty’s degrees to develop assessment at a level higher than units of study?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessment in project units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 By what mechanisms can we assess an individual’s contribution to a group process and to a group outcome? Can we recognise in our assessments the level of attainment of each individual student against each graduate quality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 What are the challenges to assessing the graduate qualities in interdisciplinary projects in a way that respects the different disciplinary interpretations of, and emphases placed on, each graduate quality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 What are the challenges to using a common rubric for assessing the graduate qualities for both disciplinary and interdisciplinary projects?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Assessing the graduate qualities

Initiative 4 of Strategy E4: Transform the Undergraduate Curriculum is to “Develop a University-wide approach to assessing graduate qualities.” It states that:

We already monitor students’ educational experience through informal feedback and formal surveys, but we must also monitor educational outcomes. To track progress, we will develop a University-wide approach for assessing the degree to which graduate qualities have been attained. Ideally, these will be assessed through a final project or placement and use a to-be-developed common rubric that will also be used by students for self-assessment. Over time, this rubric will enable students’ perceptions of their own progress to be calibrated with the views of their teachers and other external assessors.\(^6\)

In order to progress this initiative, the Assessment Working Group is seeking views from across the University on the following questions.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>What approach are you taking to embedding the graduate qualities in the curriculum and how should this inform the development of a common approach to assessing graduate qualities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>What is the best means for ensuring that relevant differences are reflected appropriately in a common approach to assessing graduate qualities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Can a common rubric be used to assess students’ attainment of the graduate qualities consistently across the diversity of fields of study taught at the University? What are the key challenges in doing so?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Can we design assessment tasks that give students appropriate opportunities to develop and present evidence of their progress toward achieving the graduate qualities? What are the key challenges?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 2016, the education portfolio has allocated the Curriculum Development Fund via faculty compacts with the explicit purpose of supporting faculties to embed the graduate qualities within all undergraduate degrees. At the same time, learning outcomes have been developed in line with the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015, for each major, program, specialisation and their constituent units of study. Understanding how these elements interact across the undergraduate curriculum, and the ways in which disciplinary differences might shape the understanding of the graduate qualities and their relationship to the learning outcomes at each level is key to progressing a common framework by which the qualities might be assessed.

To complement the work of faculties, preliminary work on developing the common rubric for the graduate qualities indicated in the Strategy is being done by the Educational Measurement and Assessment Hub. Under the guidance of the Assessment Working Group, this work is being undertaken in consultation with academic staff from across the University with specialist expertise related to each of the graduate qualities. Predicated on a system of standards-referenced assessment,\(^7\) the aim is that the common rubric will define each graduate quality and describe the related standards or levels of achievement along an associated continuum of development.\(^8\)

The diverse fields of study taught at the University and the differences in the academic context that result from this diversity (termed ‘disciplinary differences’), mean that students’ demonstration of the graduate qualities will need to be interpreted at the local level. Nevertheless, to achieve the aim of a common assessment of the graduate qualities these interpretations must also be aligned with the common rubric. This means that the learning outcomes and standards expressed through the common rubric would need to be translated to rubrics developed for each field of study, creating rubrics at whatever ‘disciplinary’ level makes sense academically. Disciplinary rubrics could also

---

\(^6\) Initiative 4 of Strategy E4: Transform the undergraduate curriculum, 2016-20 Strategic Plan, p.37.

\(^7\) See the Assessment Working Group’s Working Paper 1: Theoretical foundations of a common approach to assessment.

\(^8\) This approach is consistent with the principles underpinning the University’s current policy on assessment. See: Part 14 of the Coursework Policy 2014, Clause 5 of the Assessment Procedures 2011, and Part 3 Clause 19 of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.
provide the foundation for the development of rubrics used to communicate, to both students and staff, the learning outcomes and performance standards for each assessment task used to collect evidence of student learning. The development of task-level rubrics would thus be an essential step in designing assessment tasks that have as their aim the collection of suitable evidence for assessing students’ progress toward achieving of the graduate qualities.

Adapting the common University rubric to those developed at the discipline and assessment levels would effectively construct a linked or articulated framework of rubrics for assessing the graduate qualities, which is represented visually in Figure 3.1 below. By linking rubrics at different levels in this way, measuring and reporting on students’ development of the graduate qualities becomes possible at levels higher than discrete assessment tasks and units of study. The feedback generated through the process of adapting the common rubric in different settings would also likely lead to further calibration of the learning outcomes and performance standards expressed at each level, potentially increasing consistency in the way the graduate qualities are assessed across the University over time.

Figure 3.1: Schematic representation of an articulated university framework of rubrics.
Note that ‘disciplinary’ is used here to refer to a field of study grouping based on academic commonality and does not imply an organisational structure.
4 Planning assessment across courses and course components

To enhance the effectiveness of the new curriculum, Initiatives 1 and 2 of Strategy E5: Transform the learning experience commits the University to developing learning designs that foster educational excellence and innovation, and learning environments that enable flexible and interactive learning. As stated in the Strategy:

We will also design experiences that promote learning at multiple levels, from the unit of study to the whole degree, and will ensure coordination by mapping intended learning outcomes across the curriculum by aligning activities and assessment, in order to build an integrated and coherent body of knowledge and skills… we will emphasise the integrity and effectiveness of assessment while seeking to reduce its volume.\(^9\)

The Assessment Working Group is seeking input on how assessment might best be planned across the duration of undergraduate degrees and their constituent components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>How can we increase and enhance the feedback given to students and staff about student learning while also seeking to reduce the volume of assessment at the same time?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>For each major, program or degree, how can we assess and provide feedback to students on their progress toward achieving the graduate qualities earlier than final-year projects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>For each major, program, or degree, what is the optimal way to plan learning experiences and assessments so that students can work progressively toward achieving the graduate qualities and other course-level learning outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Are there any promising opportunities in your faculty’s degrees to develop assessment at a level higher than units of study?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculties have already taken significant steps to renew the learning outcomes for the redesigned minors, majors, programs, streams and degrees, and to develop more transparent pathways through the relevant units of study. The enhanced coherence of the undergraduate curriculum structures presents a unique opportunity to improve the planning of learning experiences and assessment tasks across all undergraduate degrees, which could also lead to reducing the current burden of assessment on students and staff.

As an aid to rethinking and planning assessment in this way, each teaching team could produce an assessment plan for each course component that identifies the specific points at which students will complete the different learning activities and assessments that help the student develop the graduate qualities and learning outcomes for the component. These plans could be developed with an emphasis on providing optimal time for learning, and managing or reducing the volume of summative assessment.

By adopting an approach to assessment that was planned at the level of the course component, a reduction of the current burden of assessment could be achieved for both students and staff. This would need to occur alongside formative development activities that students complete as a means of gaining feedback on their learning. The goal would be to provide students and staff with many opportunities to evaluate the progress of a student’s learning while avoiding unnecessary repetition of the summative assessment of specific skills.

The University’s new Learning Management System, Canvas, presents dynamic opportunities in this regard, particularly in relation to the development of technology-enabled or automated formative activities. Such activities can provide students with immediate feedback on their learning, and provide staff additional ways to collect and respond to feedback on the progress of students at both an individual and cohort level. They could be assigned a low or zero weighting within the overall assessment mix with an emphasis on providing feedback towards learning goals rather than the accumulation of marks through small assessment items. Good educational design, including the approaches outlined here, could potentially address the transactional approach with which some

students approach assessment by refocusing their attention on the related learning. The education portfolio will continue to support staff to develop ways of harnessing feedback and analytics through Education Innovation Grants.

In addition to looking for opportunities to reduce summative assessment through assessment plans, thought could also be given to ways of integrating assessment at a higher level than the unit of study so that students complete a smaller number of summative assessment tasks overall.

Where a major or program allows for a series of selective units to be taken in parallel or sequentially, some thought might also be given to aligning assessment requirements and tasks such that students undertaking these units are presented with similar learning experiences that are assessed in comparable ways, so that learning outcomes for the field of study are reinforced and measured whatever path through the selectives is taken.
5 Assessment in project units

In order to facilitate the assessment of the graduate qualities in the manner envisaged in the Strategy, the new curriculum framework includes as a core requirement:

... a final year project or practicum that allows students to apply the knowledge and skills acquired across the undergraduate program to an authentic opportunity or problem and demonstrate the attainment of the graduate qualities. This project will provide challenges, novelty and the opportunity to develop creative solutions.\(^{10}\)

Primarily a feature of the liberal studies degrees, these projects will involve students working collaboratively with their peers on addressing problems identified as significant to the research community, or by industry and community partners. In many, though not all instances, these projects will be interdisciplinary in their character. In this context, and given the increased variety of fields of study and the various degree pathways open to students, the Assessment Working Group is seeking views on the below questions that might assist it identify a common framework for designing assessment within these project units.\(^1\)

| 5.1 | By what mechanisms can we assess an individual’s contribution to a group process and to a group outcome? Can we recognise in our assessments the level of attainment of each individual student against each graduate quality? |
| 5.2 | What are the challenges to assessing the graduate qualities in interdisciplinary projects in a way that respects the different disciplinary interpretations of, and emphases placed on, each graduate quality? |
| 5.3 | What are the challenges to using a common rubric for assessing the graduate qualities for both disciplinary and interdisciplinary projects? |

The work done to date by faculties on the new majors indicates that many project units will provide both the project and interdisciplinary experience required within the major, which means students completing these units should, in principle, be able to demonstrate their achievement of the full suite of graduate qualities, including the ability to work effectively in interdisciplinary contexts.

The University also needs to consider whether or how students will be provided with or construct a final report on their attainment of the graduate qualities at the point they graduate. Rather than assigning a specific mark or grade, this could be more meaningfully achieved by including on each student’s transcript or separate statement a written description of the standard achieved for each of the qualities on the basis of their performance in project work, albeit framed in terms of the language of the common rubric. However, a number of additional issues would need to be addressed if such an approach were to be pursued.

For instance, some majors embed the interdisciplinary experience in a unit of study separate to the unit in which the disciplinary project is completed. This means that assessment of the graduate qualities may need to be done across more than one unit of study, although this would include the project unit. At the same time, many students will undertake multiple projects over the course of their studies, whether this is due to completing two majors or the Bachelor of Advanced Studies (including either an Honours project or another 4000-level project). There are also the general issues associated with assessing the achievements of individual students in the context of group projects and assessment tasks. The University may thus wish to consider ways to support students collecting and synthesising separate assessments made of their development of the graduate qualities across multiple settings such that a final report on the graduate qualities provides a composite assessment and compilation of evidence of their achievements in different fields or units of study.

---

\(^{10}\) 2016-20 Strategic Plan, p.34.

\(^{11}\) Note that the Assessment Working Group has not yet considered how to assess the graduate qualities in relation to final-year placements; nor has it yet considered how the graduate qualities will be assessed in specialist degrees in a manner similar to projects (or placements) offered as part of the majors available within liberal studies degrees.
Attachment 1 – Feedback Form

Name (optional):
Faculty or University School (optional):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing the graduate qualities</th>
<th>Good Examples of where this is already done</th>
<th>Key Challenges/elements required for success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 What approach are you taking to embedding the graduate qualities in the curriculum and how should this inform the development of a common approach to assessing graduate qualities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 What is the best means for ensuring that relevant differences are reflected appropriately in a common approach to assessing graduate qualities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Can a common rubric be used to assess students’ attainment of the graduate qualities consistently across the diversity of fields of study taught at the University? What are the key challenges in doing so?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Can we design assessment tasks that give students appropriate opportunities to develop and present evidence of their progress toward achieving the graduate qualities? What are the key challenges?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning assessment across courses and course components

<p>| 4.1 How can we increase and enhance the feedback given to students and staff about student learning while also seeking to reduce the volume of assessment at the same time? |                                            |                                            |
| 4.2 For each major, program or degree, how can we assess and provide feedback to students on their progress toward achieving the graduate qualities earlier than final-year projects? |                                            |                                            |
| 4.3 For each major, program, or degree, what is the optimal way to plan learning experiences and assessments so that students can work progressively toward achieving the graduate qualities and other course-level learning outcomes? |                                            |                                            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Good Examples of where this is already done</th>
<th>Key Challenges/elements required for success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Are there any promising opportunities in your faculty’s degrees to develop assessment at a level higher than units of study?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment in project units</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>By what mechanisms can we assess an individual’s contribution to a group process and to a group outcome? Can we recognise in our assessments the level of attainment of each individual student against each graduate quality?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>What are the challenges to assessing the graduate qualities in interdisciplinary projects in a way that respects the different disciplinary interpretations of, and emphases placed on, each graduate quality?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>What are the challenges to using a common rubric for assessing the graduate qualities for both disciplinary and interdisciplinary projects?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board reaffirm its approval and endorsement of the Charter of Academic Freedom and its commitment to the University's values of courage and creativity, respect and integrity, inclusion and diversity and openness and engagement.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The University of Sydney (Academic Governance Rule) obliges the Academic Board to "safeguard the academic freedom of the University". This requirement is reiterated in the draft University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule. This year is the 10th anniversary of the approval by the Academic Board and Senate of the Charter of Academic Freedom, as attached.

Accordingly, the Academic Board is asked to approve the following:

"The Academic Board reaffirms its approval and endorsement of the Charter of Academic Freedom and its commitment to the University's values of courage and creativity, respect and integrity, inclusion and diversity and openness and engagement."
Charter of Academic Freedom

Approved by: Senate on 5 May 2008
Date of effect: 6 May 2008

The University of Sydney declares its commitment to free enquiry as necessary to the conduct of a democratic society and to the quest for intellectual, moral and material advance in the human condition.

The University of Sydney affirms its institutional right and responsibility, and the rights and responsibilities of each of its individual scholars, to pursue knowledge for its own sake, wherever the pursuit might lead. The University further supports the responsible transmission of that knowledge so gained, openly within the academy and into the community at large, in conformity with the law and the policies and obligations of the University.

The University of Sydney, consistent with the principles enunciated in its mission and policies, undertakes to promote and support:

- the free, and responsible pursuit of knowledge through research in accordance with the highest ethical, professional and legal standards
- the dissemination of the outcomes of research, in teaching, as publications and creative works, and in media discourse
- principled and informed discussion of all aspects of knowledge and culture

This Charter of Academic Freedom is endorsed by the Senate and Academic Board of The University of Sydney.
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the 2016 Consolidated Summary of the Student Experience and Graduate Outcomes report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As part of the 2016-2020 Strategic Plan the University is committed to offering an educational experience of the highest quality. We intend to achieve this through two key strategies: a transformation of undergraduate education at the University of Sydney; and a transformation of the learning experience.

In order to assess progress towards the 2016-2020 Strategic Plan goals of offering an educational experience of the highest quality, we monitor students’ satisfaction with their learning experience and track graduate employment and further study outcomes, using a standard suite of surveys.

The Quality and Analytics Group has produced a new report to summarise findings from the full suite of surveys, the 2016 Consolidated Summary of the Student Experience and Graduate Outcomes report.

The executive summary and key recommendations are included below. The complete report is attached.
REPORT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The University target for KPI-E2 (SES) was achieved in 2016, with seven faculties achieving their target.
- While we failed to achieve university targets on KPI-E1 and KPI-E3, substantial improvement was made at the university level, with several faculties achieving or just falling short of their targets.
- The University has performed relatively poorly in comparison to Australian and/or Go8 benchmarks for undergraduates in the areas of student support, learning resources, overall experience, good teaching, and percentage in further full-time study. Good teaching and learner engagement measures are low nationally. However, a positive indicator for the University is the employability of its undergraduate cohort.
- The University’s postgraduate coursework students have a relatively poor experience, particularly our international students, and student support is an issue. Good teaching is low nationally. On a more upbeat note, results have consistently improved across all areas in the past two to three years.
- Coursework students are critical of the structure of their programs, many aspects of assessment and feedback, aspects of face-to-face teaching, and of the level of concern demonstrated by teachers for student learning.
- Feedback on the learning environment suggests improvement is needed socially and cross-culturally, both through the provision of more and better physical teaching and learning spaces, student spaces and common areas, and through efforts to promote broader and more open connection among students. Students also express some dissatisfaction with class sizes.
- In 2015 and 2016, a number of Sydney-specific items that relate to Graduate Qualities identified in the University’s 2016-2020 Strategic Plan were introduced to the SES. Not surprisingly, item results indicate that the University has some strategic development work to do in these areas, as most of the Sydney-specific items are at or below 50% satisfaction. These results underline the importance of ensuring that the graduate qualities are effectively embedded in the new curriculum.
- Regarding the HDR experience, quality of supervision is ahead of the Australian and Go8 average, while performance is relatively poor in respect to infrastructure, thesis examination, and support for international students. Intellectual climate is perceived poorly nationally.
- The University of Sydney is well ahead of the Australian and Go8 average for full-time employment rate of bachelor-degree graduates. Coursework postgraduates fair slightly better than average, and research postgraduates slightly worse.
- Graduate outcomes are generally better at 12 months post-completion than at 4 months, however this does not appear to be the case for research postgraduates, who generally take longer to secure full-time employment.
- According to the new Student Perception of Overqualification scale, University of Sydney graduates (at all levels) are less likely to feel overqualified in their current full-time employment compared to the Australian and Go8 average.
- Given performance over 2014-2016, the University will need to ensure that it meets its annual Education KPI targets if it is to achieve its aspirations for an outstanding educational experience by 2020.
REPORT KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Faculties and schools should ensure that they systematically monitor and address a number of the identified issues as part of their regular learning and teaching review and improvement processes and through strategic projects underway, including projects on curriculum redevelopment, assessment and LMS renewal. In particular, this work should address:
   - Program organization and coherence;
   - Embedding of graduate qualities;
   - Assessment of graduate qualities;
   - A more coherent and targeted approach to assessment and feedback, in general; and
   - Quality of online learning materials.

2. Faculties should explicitly address the concerns identified by students in their survey feedback as they take advantage of current mechanisms to support educational quality improvement and innovation, including:
   - Compact funding agreements with the Education portfolio;
   - Strategic Education Grants;
   - Support for embedded initiatives from the Portfolio’s spoke teams in Educational Innovation, Academic Enrichment, and Industry and Community Engagement; and
   - A range of professional learning programs and opportunities (including peer observation and review, the flipped professional model offered by the Educational Innovation team, the Semester 2, 2017 First Year Coordinators program).

3. Faculty strategic plans (some of which are under current development) should set out a coherent set of aims and initiatives to address student experience issues pertinent to their local context (summarized in Section 2.2); these plans should also serve to frame the annually updated Faculty Action Plans for learning and teaching to be submitted as part of the Faculty-Education portfolio compact funding process noted in Recommendation 2. The proposed suite of actions for improving students learning experiences set out in 2016 by the Education Portfolio may serve as a stimulus (see Attachment 1).

4. Faculties should engage schools in developing strategies to address issues in particular study areas (summarized in Section 2.2), in both coursework and HDR degrees.

5. More effective use should be made of student feedback on unit of study and course experiences at all levels of the University and efforts to inform students of actions taken by different parts of the University in response to this feedback should be increased at all levels as well. A plan for student communications should be developed by the Education portfolio for consideration by the UE Education and UE Research Education Committees.

6. The University should address its poor performance in the area of Student Support as a matter of urgency, especially in the areas of academic and career advising. The DVC Registrar and DVC Education should be asked to prepare a joint plan for consideration by the UE Education, UE Research Education, and Student Life Committees.

7. The University should address the poor experience of international postgraduate coursework students. An issues paper should be developed by the Education portfolio for consideration by the UE Education Committee.

8. The University should address the HDR student experience of thesis examination. An issues paper should be developed by the Education portfolio for consideration by the UE Research Education Committee.

ATTACHMENT

- 2016 Consolidated Summary of the Student Experience and Graduate Outcomes
1. INTRODUCTION

The 2016-2020 Strategic Plan commits the University to offering an educational experience of the highest quality. We intend to achieve this through two key strategies: a transformation of undergraduate education at the University of Sydney; and a transformation of the learning experience. In order to assess progress, we have committed to monitoring students’ satisfaction with their learning experience and tracking graduate employment and further study outcomes\(^1\), using a standard suite of surveys.

A set of three Education Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) focused on students' learning experiences was introduced at the University of Sydney in 2015. In response to the current Strategic Plan a further three KPIs have been added in 2017. These additional KPIs focus on graduate outcomes, student retention, and demand for the new undergraduate curriculum. Only the KPIs related to the student experience and graduate outcomes are presented here. Table 1 indicates the baselines and University-wide targets approved by Senate March 2017 for these four Education KPIs, defined below.

- **KPI-E1: Student Satisfaction - Unit of Study Survey (USS)** is the mean score across all core items of the USS. The annual improvement target is 7.5% of the difference between the perfect scale score of 5 and prior year outcome.

- **KPI-E2: Student Satisfaction - Student Experience Survey (SES)** is the mean of scale scores for Skills Development, Learner Engagement and Teaching Quality on the national SES. The annual improvement target is 5% of the difference between the perfect scale score of 100 and prior year outcome.

- **KPI-E3: Higher Degree Research (HDR) Experience** is the average of all items measuring Overall Satisfaction, Intellectual Climate, Skills and Supervision on the Student Research Experience Questionnaire (SREQ) in even years, and on the Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ) in odd years. The annual improvement target is a biennial improvement of 9.75% of the difference between the perfect scale score of 5 and outcomes two years prior.

- **KPI-E4: Employment/Further Study – Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS)** is the percentage of graduating cohort in full-time employment or full-time further study 4 months post-completion. The target is to be in the top decile of Australian universities by 2020.

\(^1\) We will also monitor retention, demand for the new undergraduates curriculum, HDR completions, the teaching experience, uptake of a range of professional learning opportunities by staff, uptake of experiential learning opportunities by students, and assess acquisition of the graduate qualities.
Table 1. Survey-related Education Strategy KPIs: Baselines and Targets to 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2017</th>
<th>Target 2018</th>
<th>Target 2019</th>
<th>Target 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI-E1</strong>: Student Satisfaction – Unit of Study Survey (USS)</td>
<td>4.03 (2016)</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI-E2</strong>: Student Satisfaction – Student Experience Survey (SES)</td>
<td>73.76 (2016)</td>
<td>75.07</td>
<td>76.32</td>
<td>77.50</td>
<td>78.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI-E3(a)</strong>: HDR Experience – Sydney Research Experience Questionnaire (SREQ)</td>
<td>4.01 (2016)</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI-E3(b)</strong>: HDR Experience – Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ)</td>
<td>4.20 (2015)</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI-E4</strong>: Employment/ Further Study – Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS)</td>
<td>=6th</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these indicators, other scales collected as part of the GOS and the Student Barometers yield important benchmarking information. Also, since 2015 we have conducted the internal Sydney Graduate Trajectories Survey (SGTS) to assess graduate outcomes 12 months post-completion, to complement the GOS which is conducted approximately 4 months post-completion. An overview of the full suite of student surveys is available at [https://intranet.sydney.edu.au/teaching-support/quality-analytics/surveys.html](https://intranet.sydney.edu.au/teaching-support/quality-analytics/surveys.html).

The report is organized as follows.

Section 2 provides an executive summary of the results overall, as well as some key recommendations for the University for addressing the substantial challenges that face us in achieving the outstanding educational experience to which we aspire.

Section 3 presents high-level information about student experience and graduate outcomes performance across the University against our own internal KPIs, and against Australian and Group of Eight (Go8) benchmarks where available.

Section 4 presents information by themes (teacher approaches relevant to learning, the learning environment, graduate qualities, and graduate outcomes) using relevant items from across the full survey suite.

Section 5 presents performance on survey scales across the University for 2014-2016, broken down by Faculty and study level.

The attachments supplement the data presented in Sections 2-5. Attachment 1 contains a summary of potential strategies for improving students’ learning experiences. Attachment 2 presents a further breakdown of the data presented in Section 3 by the 20 national Quality Indicators of Learning and Teaching (QILT) study area categories. These tables should allow faculties and schools to benchmark specific scales on the SES, CEQ, PREQ and GOS.
2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Executive summary

▪ The University target for KPI-E2 (SES) was achieved in 2016, with seven faculties achieving their target.

▪ While we failed to achieve university targets on KPI-E1 and KPI-E3, substantial improvement was made at the university level, with several faculties achieving or just falling short of their targets.

▪ The University has performed relatively poorly in comparison to Australian and/or Go8 benchmarks for undergraduates in the areas of student support, learning resources, overall experience, good teaching, and percentage in further full-time study. Good teaching and learner engagement measures are low nationally. However, a positive indicator for the University is the employability of its undergraduate cohort.

▪ The University's postgraduate coursework students have a relatively poor experience, particularly our international students, and student support is an issue. Good teaching is low nationally. On a more upbeat note, results have consistently improved across all areas in the past two to three years.

▪ Coursework students are critical of the structure of their programs, many aspects of assessment and feedback, aspects of face-to-face teaching, and of the level of concern demonstrated by teachers for student learning.

▪ Feedback on the learning environment suggests improvement is needed socially and cross-culturally, both through the provision of more and better physical teaching and learning spaces, student spaces and common areas, and through efforts to promote broader and more open connection among students. Students also express some dissatisfaction with class sizes.

▪ In 2015 and 2016, a number of Sydney-specific items that relate to Graduate Qualities identified in the University's 2016-2020 Strategic Plan were introduced to the SES. Not surprisingly, item results indicate that the University has some strategic development work to do in these areas, as most of the Sydney-specific items are at or below 50% satisfaction. These results underline the importance of ensuring that the graduate qualities are effectively embedded in the new curriculum.

▪ Regarding the HDR experience, quality of supervision is ahead of the Australian and Go8 average, while performance is relatively poor in respect to infrastructure, thesis examination, and support for international students. Intellectual climate is perceived poorly nationally.

▪ The University of Sydney is well ahead of the Australian and Go8 average for full-time employment rate of bachelor-degree graduates. Coursework postgraduates fair slightly better than average, and research postgraduates slightly worse.

▪ Graduate outcomes are generally better at 12 months post-completion than at 4 months, however this does not appear to be the case for research postgraduates, who generally take longer to secure full-time employment.

▪ According to the new Student Perception of Overqualification scale, University of Sydney graduates (at all levels) are less likely to feel overqualified in their current full-time employment compared to the Australian and Go8 average.

▪ Given performance over 2014-2016, the University will need to ensure that it meets its annual Education KPI targets if it is to achieve its aspirations for an outstanding educational experience by 2020.
2.2 Benchmarking summary

- **UNDERGRADUATE BENCHMARKING**
  
  - **Highlights for Sydney:**
    - % graduates in full-time employment
    - Relatively positive experience in particular study areas: Psychology (CEQ); Law and paralegal studies (CEQ), Nursing (SES); Teacher education (SES + CEQ); Creative arts (SES); Dentistry (CEQ); Social work (CEQ)
  
  - **Areas of concern for Sydney:**
    - Overall experience (SES + CEQ)
    - Student support (SES + SB + CEQ)
    - Learning resources (CEQ)
    - Learning overall (ISB/SB)
    - Relatively poor experience in particular study areas: Science and mathematics (SES); Computing and information systems (SES); Engineering (SES); Pharmacy (SES); Rehabilitation (SES + CEQ); Humanities, culture and social sciences (SES); Social work (SES); Communications (SES); Agriculture and environmental studies (CEQ); Health services and support (CEQ)
  
  - **Areas of concern for the sector as a whole:**
    - Learner engagement (SES)
    - Good teaching (CEQ)

- **POSTGRADUATE COURSEWORK BENCHMARKING**
  
  - **Highlights for Sydney:**
    - Relatively positive experience in particular study areas: Health services and support (CEQ); Teacher education (CEQ); Business and management (CEQ); Humanities, culture and social science (CEQ); Communications (CEQ)
  
  - **Areas of concern for Sydney:**
    - Learning overall (ISB), for international students
    - Support overall (ISB), for international students
    - Relatively poor % graduates in full-time employment in particular study areas: Engineering; Psychology
    - Relatively poor experience in particular study areas: Pharmacy (CEQ); Rehabilitation (CEQ)
  
  - **Areas of concern for the sector as a whole:**
    - Good teaching (CEQ)
HDR BENCHMARKING

- Highlights for Sydney:
  - Supervision
  - Relatively positive experience in particular study areas: Engineering; Medicine
  - Relatively positive % graduates in full-time employment in particular study areas: Humanities, culture and social sciences

- Areas of concern for Sydney:
  - Infrastructure
  - Thesis examination
  - Support overall (ISB), for international students
  - Relatively poor % graduates in full-time employment in particular study areas: Psychology
  - Relatively poor experience in particular study areas: Architecture and built environment; Dentistry; Veterinary science; Law and paralegal studies

- Areas of concern for the sector as a whole:
  - Intellectual climate

2.3 Issues underlying the student experience results

A thematic analysis of items, using benchmarking data where available suggest the following are particular issues contributing to our relatively poor coursework student experience.

- Teaching:
  - program design
  - concern and understanding for students
  - quality of lectures and explanations
  - engagement in active learning and motivating teaching
  - clarity of assessment expectations and marking criteria
  - feedback that guides learning and helps students improve future performance
  - (HDR) guidance on literature searching

- Learning environment:
  - quality of a range of spaces used by students – teaching and learning spaces, student spaces, common areas
  - quality of online learning materials
  - active facilitation of interaction among students
  - class sizes
  - a sense of belonging to the University community

- Graduate qualities development:
  - information and digital literacy
  - inventiveness and the ability to respond creatively to novel problems
  - cultural competence
  - interdisciplinary effectiveness
  - ability to respond constructively to challenge
  - ability to contribute positively to the community
  - ability to exercise leadership and influence when required
2.4 Key recommendations

1. Faculties and schools should ensure that they systematically monitor and address a number of the identified issues as part of their regular learning and teaching review and improvement processes and through strategic projects underway, including projects on curriculum redevelopment, assessment and LMS renewal. In particular, this work should address:
   - Program organization and coherence;
   - Embedding of graduate qualities;
   - Assessment of graduate qualities;
   - A more coherent and targeted approach to assessment and feedback, in general; and
   - Quality of online learning materials.

2. Faculties should explicitly address the concerns identified by students in their survey feedback as they take advantage of current mechanisms to support educational quality improvement and innovation, including:
   - Compact funding agreements with the Education portfolio;
   - Strategic Education Grants;
   - Support for embedded initiatives from the Portfolio’s spoke teams in Educational Innovation, Academic Enrichment, and Industry and Community Engagement; and
   - A range of professional learning programs and opportunities (including peer observation and review, the flipped professional model offered by the Educational Innovation team, the Semester 2, 2017 First Year Coordinators program).

3. Faculty strategic plans (some of which are under current development) should set out a coherent set of aims and initiatives to address student experience issues pertinent to their local context (summarized in Section 2.2); these plans should also serve to frame the annually updated Faculty Action Plans for learning and teaching to be submitted as part of the Faculty-Education portfolio compact funding process noted in Recommendation 2. The proposed suite of actions for improving students learning experiences set out in 2016 by the Education Portfolio may serve as a stimulus (see Attachment 1).

4. Faculties should engage schools in developing strategies to address issues in particular study areas (summarized in Section 2.2), in both coursework and HDR degrees.

5. More effective use should be made of student feedback on unit of study and course experiences at all levels of the University and efforts to inform students of actions taken by different parts of the University in response to this feedback should be increased at all levels as well. A plan for student communications should be developed by the Education portfolio for consideration by the UE Education and UE Research Education Committees.

6. The University should address its poor performance in the area of Student Support as a matter of urgency, especially in the areas of academic and career advising. The DVC Registrar and DVC Education should be asked to prepare a joint plan for consideration by the UE Education, UE Research Education, and Student Life Committees.

7. The University’s International Student Experience Taskforce should be asked to include student experience survey results for international students, especially those in postgraduate coursework programs, as part of its forthcoming deliberations. A more detailed report on international student survey data should be prepared by the Education portfolio for consideration by the Taskforce.

8. The University should address the HDR student experience of thesis examination. An issues paper should be developed by the Education portfolio for consideration by the UE Research Education Committee.
3. PERFORMANCE ON STUDENTS’ LEARNING EXPERIENCES AND GRADUATE OUTCOMES 2016

Section 3 presents 2016 Education KPI performance against the 2016 targets, which used 2015 survey results as a baseline, with the exception of the biennial SREQ which used 2014 survey results as a baseline. The GOS was run for the first time in 2016, so there was no 2016 target set for KPI-E4.

3.1 2016 Performance against internal KPI targets

Table 3.1. 2016 KPIs: targets and performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>KPI-E1: USS</th>
<th>KPI-E2: SES</th>
<th>KPI-E3: SREQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.

*^2016 Agriculture and Veterinary Science students are included in Science results following transition to School of Life and Environmental Sciences.

As the table indicates, our performance on KPI-E2 was positive across the University and in a number of faculties, reflecting a more positive evaluation of the degree-level experience of coursework students. While we failed to achieve the university target on KPI-E1 and KPI-E3, it should be noted that significant improvement was made at the university level, with several faculties achieving or just failing short of their targets. Engineering and Information Technology and Law were the only two faculties to achieve all three of their KPI targets in 2016, while Business, Dentistry, and SCA achieved both of their targets for coursework indicators (KPI-E1 and KPI-E2). These data reinforce the challenge and urgency of the task ahead: to improve the quality of students’ learning experiences as we transform the undergraduate curriculum and students’ learning experiences.
3.2 Overall performance relative to national benchmarks

With respect to the sector nationally, our performance is generally below average. In Table 3.2 we summarise the scale scores and overall experience indicators for each of the national survey instruments. Note that SES benchmarking data is not available for coursework postgraduates, as they are an optional cohort for this survey. The GOS was introduced in 2016, so data is not available for 2014-2015.

Table 3.2. Scale scores and overall experience trend data for University of Sydney, with 2016 benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDERGRADUATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Experience Survey (SES)</td>
<td>Skills Development</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learner Engagement</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Quality</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Support</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Resources</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall experience</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ)</td>
<td>Good Teaching</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generic Skills</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Qualities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS)</td>
<td>% in full-time employment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% in full-time study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Attrib: Adaptive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Attrib: Collaboration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Attrib: Foundation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern'l Student Barometer/Student Barometer (ISB/SB)</td>
<td>Learning overall</td>
<td>88/-</td>
<td>84/85</td>
<td>84/83</td>
<td>87/87</td>
<td>87/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support overall</td>
<td>89/-</td>
<td>86/84</td>
<td>86/81</td>
<td>89/88</td>
<td>89/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COURSEWORK POSTGRADUATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Experience Survey (SES)</td>
<td>Skills Development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learner Engagement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Quality</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Resources</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall experience</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ)</td>
<td>Good Teaching</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generic Skills</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Qualities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS)</td>
<td>% in full-time employment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% in full-time study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Attrib: Adaptive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Attrib: Collaboration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Attrib: Foundation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern'l Student Barometer/Student Barometer (ISB/SB)</td>
<td>Learning overall</td>
<td>84/-</td>
<td>84/84</td>
<td>82/83</td>
<td>86/85</td>
<td>85/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support overall</td>
<td>86/-</td>
<td>85/86</td>
<td>86/88</td>
<td>89/88</td>
<td>89/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESEARCH POSTGRADUATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ)</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual Climate</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill Development</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thesis Examination</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goals and Expectations</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall satisfaction</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS)</td>
<td>% in full-time employment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% in full-time study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Attrib: Adaptive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Attrib: Collaboration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Attrib: Foundation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern'l Student Barometer/Student Barometer (ISB/SB)</td>
<td>Learning overall</td>
<td>90/-</td>
<td>89/89</td>
<td>92/90</td>
<td>90/90</td>
<td>90/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support overall</td>
<td>88/-</td>
<td>85/89</td>
<td>85/85</td>
<td>89/86</td>
<td>89/86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the table indicates, there is substantial opportunity for improvement in these indicators, particularly the undergraduate student experience as the University of Sydney is below the national average on many indicators (including Support, Learning Resources and Overall Experience on the national SES).

Encouragingly there has been improvement in regards to overall satisfaction and generic skills of recent graduates, with both these measures now closer in line with the Australian and Go8 average.

There has also been encouraging improvement in the experience of coursework postgraduates, with improvement on most SES and CEQ measures over recent years. While SES benchmarks are not available for the SES, we are broadly in line with the Australian and Go8 average on all CEQ scales.

Performance on HDR indicators is mixed, with quality of supervision ahead of the Australian and Go8 average, and performance relatively poor in respect to intellectual climate, infrastructure and thesis examination. Support for international HDR students is also a concern.

The University’s performance in the area of Student Support is a particular concern. University of Sydney students assign low ratings to the availability and helpfulness of both academic advice (less than 60% satisfaction on the SES since 2014) and career advice (less than 40% satisfaction on the SES since 2014). Although the focus of this report is on the quality of students’ learning experiences and outcomes, it is clearly important that the University address students’ concerns about student support as a matter of urgency.

Attachment 2 contains a breakdown of the results summarised in Table 3.2 for the 20 study areas used to present data to prospective students on the Quality Indicators of Learning and Teachers (QILT) website; see https://www.qilt.edu.au. The website allows prospective students to compare institutional results by choosing one of these 20 study area categories.
4. RESULTS BY THEME

We now present the data at item level, clustered in a way that focuses on:

- Students' judgments of teacher approaches that are relevant to learning (Table 4.1);
- Students' assessments of the environment for learning (Table 4.2);
- Students' employment outcomes as graduates (Table 4.3); and
- Students' perceptions of their development of graduate qualities (Table 4.4).

Table 4.1 Students' perceptions of teacher approaches relevant to learning 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-Scale: item</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Go8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Study well-structured and focused</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Study relevant to education as a whole</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS: The work has been intellectually rewarding</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Learning Overall</td>
<td>84/85</td>
<td>87/86</td>
<td>87/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Program content</td>
<td>88/89</td>
<td>90/90</td>
<td>90/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Program organization</td>
<td>81/75</td>
<td>86/80</td>
<td>86/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Teachers engaged you actively in learning</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Teachers demonstrated concern for student learning</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Teachers stimulated you intellectually</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Teachers seemed helpful and approachable</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Quality of teaching</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS-1: Overall I was satisfied with the quality of teaching by the teacher(s)</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GTS: The teaching staff of this course motivated me to do my best work</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GTS: My lecturers were extremely good at explaining things</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GTS: The teaching staff worked hard to make their subjects interesting</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GTS: The staff made a real effort to understand difficulties I might</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Expert lecturers</td>
<td>92/94</td>
<td>93/95</td>
<td>93/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Academics’ English</td>
<td>91/91</td>
<td>91/92</td>
<td>91/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Good teachers</td>
<td>85/85</td>
<td>88/88</td>
<td>88/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Quality lectures</td>
<td>84/85</td>
<td>88/87</td>
<td>88/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Teachers provided clear explanations on coursework and assessment</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Teachers set assessment tasks that challenge you to learn</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS-5: The assessment tasks challenged me to learn</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Marking criteria</td>
<td>78/72</td>
<td>84/76</td>
<td>84/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Assessment</td>
<td>85/84</td>
<td>88/87</td>
<td>88/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEDBACK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Teachers commented on your work in ways that help you learn</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS-6: I have been guided by helpful feedback on my learning</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GTS: The staff put a lot of time into commenting on my work</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GTS: The teaching staff gave me helpful feedback on how I was going</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Performance feedback</td>
<td>78/72</td>
<td>85/77</td>
<td>84/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH POSTGRADUATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-SU: Supervision was available when I needed it</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-SU: My supervisor/s made a real effort to understand difficulties I faced</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-SU: My supervisor/s provided additional information relevant to my topic</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-SU: I was given good guidance in topic selection and refinement</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-SU: My supervisor/s provided helpful feedback on my progress</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-SU: I received good guidance in my literature search</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SES results include undergraduates only, as other institutions do not include postgraduates. USS, CEQ and ISB/SB results include both undergraduates and coursework postgraduates. PREQ results include research postgraduates only.

N/A: Not applicable, as the USS is an internal survey conducted only at Sydney
TBA: To be announced, item level benchmarks for QILT surveys were not available at the time of this report.

With respect to students' perceptions of teachers' approaches summarised in Table 4.1, the only item where University of Sydney students rated their experience more positively than students nationally was for 'Teachers stimulated you intellectually'. Students are positive, in other words, about the capacity of teachers to engage them intellectually, but this positive response is arguably more muted than is desirable.
for a leading research-intensive university. Moreover, students' responses are at their least positive when they are reflecting more directly on the impact of their teachers on their learning. They are critical of the structure of their programs, many aspects of assessment and feedback, and of the level of concern demonstrated by teachers for student learning. Relative to the benchmark groups, they are especially critical of marking criteria and feedback on students' performance.

Table 4.2 Students' perceptions of the learning environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-Scale: Item</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Go8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEARNING SPACES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LR: Quality of teaching spaces</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LR: Quality of student spaces and common areas</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LR: Quality of laboratory or studio equipment</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB: Physical library</td>
<td>87/86</td>
<td>88/88</td>
<td>88/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB: Laboratories</td>
<td>88/86</td>
<td>90/92</td>
<td>90/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB: Learning spaces</td>
<td>84/80</td>
<td>90/87</td>
<td>89/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEARNING RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS-4: I have had good access to valuable learning resources</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LR: Quality of online learning materials</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LR: Quality of assigned books, notes and resources</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LR: Quality of library resources and facilities</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB: Online library</td>
<td>93/94</td>
<td>91/93</td>
<td>93/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERACTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LE: Had a sense of belonging to your university</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LE: Interacted with students outside study requirements</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LE: Interacted with students who are very different from you</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LE: Been given opportunities to interact with local students</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB: Class sizes</td>
<td>82/85</td>
<td>90/91</td>
<td>87/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNOLOGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LR: Quality of computing/IT resources</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB: Virtual learning</td>
<td>91/85</td>
<td>92/89</td>
<td>92/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB: Technology</td>
<td>91/89</td>
<td>91/89</td>
<td>90/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESEARCH POSTGRADUATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-IC: The department provided opportunities for social contact with other postgrads</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-IC: I was integrated into the department's community postgraduate students</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-IC: The dept't provided opportunities to be involved in the broader research culture</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-IC: A good seminar program for postgraduate students was provided</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-IC: The research ambience in the department or faculty stimulated my work</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-TE: The thesis examination process was fair</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-TE: I was satisfied with the thesis examination process</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-GE: I developed an understanding of the standard of work expected</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-GE: I understood the required standard for the thesis</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-GE: I understood the requirements of the thesis examination</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SES results include undergraduates only, as other institutions do not include postgraduates. USS, CEQ and ISB/SB results include both undergraduates and coursework postgraduates. PREQ results include research postgraduates only.

N/A: Not applicable, as the USS is an internal survey conducted only at Sydney
TBA: To be announced, item level benchmarks for QILT surveys were not available at the time of this report.

Table 4.2 summarises students’ views of the learning environment and demonstrates that we still have some challenges in developing the physical and virtual learning environment to the standard that students expect. The data also suggest we need to do more to enrich the environment socially and cross-culturally, both through the provision of more and better student spaces and common areas, and through efforts to promote broader and more open connection among students and to the University community more broadly. A number of HDR students also see the intellectual climate in less than positive terms.

The strategic plan prioritises a learning environment that supports collaborative and active learning and the development of flexible, collaborative, connected, informal spaces. For HDR students, it seeks to enrich
the environment in ways that will broaden students’ perspectives and skills and create an intellectual community within and across faculties.

Table 4.3 Students’ perceptions of their development of graduate qualities 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-Scale: Item</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Go8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPTH OF DISCIPLINARY EXPERTISE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-SD: Developed knowledge of field studying</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BROADER SKILLS: CRITICAL THINKING AND PROBLEM SOLVING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-SD: Developed critical and analytical thinking</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-SD: Developed ability to solve complex problems</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS-3: I have developed relevant critical and analytical thinking skills</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GSS: The course sharpened my analytic skills</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GSS: The course developed my problem solving skills</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GSS: As a result of my course, I feel confident about tackling unfamiliar problems</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BROADER SKILLS: COMMUNICATION (ORAL AND WRITTEN)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-SD: Developed written communication skills</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-SD: Developed spoken communication skills</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GSS: The course improved my skills in written communication skills</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BROADER SKILLS: INFORMATION/DIGITAL LITERACY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-Syd: Ability to work effectively with digital and online tools and information</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BROADER SKILLS: INVENTIVENESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-Syd: Ability to respond creatively to novel problems</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL COMPETENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-Syd: Ability to work effectively with people from cultures other than your own</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERDISCIPLINARY EFFECTIVENESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-Syd: Ability to work effectively with others studying in a different field(s)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEGRATED IDENTITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-Syd: Capacity to respond constructively to challenge</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFLUENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-Syd: Ability to contribute positively to the community</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-Syd: Ability to exercise leadership and influence when required</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-SD: Developed ability to work effectively with others</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LE: Worked with other students as part of your study</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LE: Participated in discussions online or face-to-face</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GSS: The course helped me develop my ability to work as a team member</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-SD: Developed confidence to learn independently</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LE: Felt prepared for your study</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GSS: My course helped me to develop the ability to plan my own work</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work-related</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-SD: Developed work-related knowledge and skills</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESEARCH POSTGRADUATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-SD: My research further developed my problem-solving skills</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-SD: I learned to develop my ideas and present them in my written work</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-SD: My research sharpened my analytical skills</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-SD: Doing my research helped me to develop my ability to plan my own work</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-SD: As a result of my research, I feel confident about tackling unfamiliar problems</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SES results include undergraduates only, as other institutions do not include postgraduates. Sydney Graduate Qualities items (Syd) on the SES are additional Sydney-specific items. USS, CEQ and ISB/SB results include both undergraduates and coursework postgraduates. PREQ results include research postgraduates only.

N/A: Not applicable, as the USS is an internal survey conducted only at Sydney

TBA: To be announced, item level benchmarks for QILT surveys were not available at the time of this report.
Table 4.3 summarises students’ perceptions of their development of broad capabilities. The data indicate that University of Sydney students see their capabilities as well developed as other students on average, both while they are students and also 4-6 months post-completion. Relative to other students, Sydney students feel less well prepared for the study they are doing now, and they see themselves as less well prepared for any work that may follow.

In 2015 and 2016, a number of Sydney-specific items that relate to Graduate Qualities identified in the University’s 2016-2020 Strategic Plan were introduced to the SES (identified in Table 4.3 as SES-Syd). Item results confirm the expected need to embed the development of these qualities more thoroughly in the curriculum as most of the Sydney-specific items are at or below 50% satisfaction. These items will be helpful in assessing student perceptions of the success of this embedding work.

Table 4.4. Students’ outcomes as graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator: measure</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Go8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDERGRADUATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS: % of those available in full-time employment (4 months post-completion)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS: % of cohort in full-time further study (4 months post-completion)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS: Student Perception of Overqualification scale (of those in full-time employment)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGTS: % of those available in full-time employment (12 months post-completion)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGTS: % of cohort in full-time further study (12 months post-completion)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** COURSEWORK POSTGRADUATES**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS: % of those available in full-time employment (4 months post-completion)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS: % of cohort in full-time further study (4 months post-completion)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS: Student Perception of Overqualification scale (of those in full-time employment)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGTS: % of those available in full-time employment (12 months post-completion)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGTS: % of cohort in full-time further study (12 months post-completion)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** RESEARCH POSTGRADUATES**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS: % of those available in full-time employment (4 months post-completion)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS: % of cohort in full-time further study (4 months post-completion)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS: Student Perception of Overqualification scale (of those in full-time employment)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGTS: % of those available in full-time employment (12 months post-completion)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGTS: % of cohort in full-time further study (12 months post-completion)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The GOS is a snapshot of graduate outcomes 4-6 months after award completion, and the SGTS is 12 months after award completion.

N/A: Not applicable as the SGTS is an internal survey conducted only at Sydney.

Table 4.4 summarises the data on graduate employment outcomes. The introduction of the Graduate Outcomes Survey in 2016 and its revised methodology (to better reflect Australian Bureau of Statistics definitions of full-time employment) has seen an increase in the percentage of bachelor-level graduates in full-time employment 4 months post-completion, compared to previous years (64% in 2015 as measured by the now superseded Australian Graduate Survey). The University of Sydney is well ahead of the Australian and Go8 average for bachelor-degree graduates on this new measure. Coursework postgraduates fare slightly better than average, and research postgraduates slightly worse.

Graduate outcomes are generally better at 12 months post-completion than at 4 months, however this does not appear to be the case for research postgraduates, who generally take longer to secure full-time employment.

According to the new Student Perception of Overqualification scale, University of Sydney graduates (at all levels) are less likely to feel overqualified in their current full-time employment compared to the Australian and Go8 average.
5. FACULTY PERFORMANCE ON SCALES OVER TIME

Section 5 presents performance on survey scales across the University for 2014-2016, broken down by Faculty and study level. These tables should be helpful for faculties as they determine areas on which to focus their improvement efforts.

Table 5.1 Undergraduate performance on SES scales 2014-2016 by Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES: Undergraduates</th>
<th>Skills Development</th>
<th>Learner Engagement</th>
<th>Teaching Quality</th>
<th>Student Support</th>
<th>Learning Resources</th>
<th>Overall Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Environment</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-^</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, D&amp;P</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Science</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Social Work</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; IT</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80^</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. College of the Arts</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. Conserv. of Music</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-^</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ 2016 Agriculture and Veterinary Science students are included in Science results following transition to School of Life and Environmental Sciences.

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.

** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table 5.2 Coursework postgraduate performance on SES scales 2015-2016 by Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES: Coursework PGs</th>
<th>Skills Development</th>
<th>Learner Engagement</th>
<th>Teaching Quality</th>
<th>Student Support</th>
<th>Learning Resources</th>
<th>Overall Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Environment</td>
<td>98*</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66*</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>96*</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, D&amp;P</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Science</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Social Work</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; IT</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. College of the Arts</td>
<td>76*</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. Conserv. of Music</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>72*</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>90*</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38*</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>38*</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ 2016 Agriculture and Veterinary Science students are included in Science results following transition to School of Life and Environmental Sciences.

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.

** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
**Table 5.3 Undergraduate performance on CEQ scales 2014-2016 by Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQ: Undergraduates</th>
<th>Good Teaching</th>
<th>Generic Skills</th>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Environment</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40*</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, D&amp;P</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Science</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Social Work</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; IT</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. College of the Arts</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. Conserv. of Music</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The Graduate Qualities scale of the CEQ was run for the first time in 2016.
* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
### Table 5.4 Coursework postgraduate performance on CEQ scales 2014-2016 by Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQ: Coursework PGs</th>
<th>Good Teaching</th>
<th>Generic Skills</th>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Environment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, D&amp;P</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Science</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>74*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Social Work</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; IT</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. College of the Arts</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>73*</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. Conserv. of Music</td>
<td>79*</td>
<td>68*</td>
<td>90*</td>
<td>65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>67*</td>
<td>77*</td>
<td>86*</td>
<td>79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Graduate Qualities scale of the CEQ was run for the first time in 2016.

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.

** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table 5.5 Research postgraduate performance on PREQ scales 2014-2016 by Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Environment</td>
<td>77* 88* 100*</td>
<td>93* 74* 89*</td>
<td>78* 76* 78*</td>
<td>93* 96* 100*</td>
<td>70* 97* 78*</td>
<td>81* 80* 100*</td>
<td>100* 90* 100*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, D&amp;P</td>
<td>67* 92* 100*</td>
<td>77* 69* 67*</td>
<td>60* 73* 67*</td>
<td>100* 96* 100*</td>
<td>83* 56* 50*</td>
<td>100* 100* 86*</td>
<td>83* 100* 67*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Science</td>
<td>80 80 87</td>
<td>55 61 59</td>
<td>55 69 60</td>
<td>88 97 96</td>
<td>71 76 58</td>
<td>91 88 99</td>
<td>71 85 84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>85* 81* 100*</td>
<td>89* 91* 100*</td>
<td>69* 67* 80*</td>
<td>94 81* 100*</td>
<td>89* 85* 100*</td>
<td>98* 93* 100*</td>
<td>89* 89* 100*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>94* 57* 67*</td>
<td>78* 64* 83*</td>
<td>77* 40* 17*</td>
<td>88* 96* 83*</td>
<td>74* 73* 33*</td>
<td>96* 80* 83*</td>
<td>100* 80* 67*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Social Work</td>
<td>76* 87* 100*</td>
<td>75* 64* 69*</td>
<td>72* 54* 65*</td>
<td>96* 87* 94</td>
<td>85* 75* 77*</td>
<td>94* 91 94*</td>
<td>88* 94* 88*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; IT</td>
<td>75 79 84</td>
<td>82 84 84</td>
<td>67 76 66</td>
<td>93 98 95</td>
<td>86 86 84</td>
<td>95 96 91</td>
<td>82 91 86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>86 93 87</td>
<td>76 67* 55</td>
<td>56 60* 47</td>
<td>91 100* 93</td>
<td>87 72* 90</td>
<td>91 94* 84</td>
<td>92 100* 87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>40* ..* 70</td>
<td>56* ..* 50*</td>
<td>36* ..* 40*</td>
<td>60* ..* 90*</td>
<td>60* ..* 80*</td>
<td>..* ..* 80*</td>
<td>40* ..* 80*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>79 85 85</td>
<td>83 83 84</td>
<td>70 73 69</td>
<td>92 94 96</td>
<td>83 83 76</td>
<td>93 93 95</td>
<td>88 92 86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>95* ..* ..*</td>
<td>79* ..* ..*</td>
<td>60* ..* ..*</td>
<td>100* ..* ..*</td>
<td>87* ..* ..*</td>
<td>100* ..* ..*</td>
<td>100* ..* ..*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>74* ..* 82</td>
<td>78* ..* 77*</td>
<td>69* ..* 65*</td>
<td>100* ..* 100*</td>
<td>94* ..* 71*</td>
<td>97* ..* 88*</td>
<td>100* ..* 82*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>71 81 80</td>
<td>76 85 75</td>
<td>67 79 59</td>
<td>95 93 95</td>
<td>81 73 70</td>
<td>90 90 90</td>
<td>80 95 86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. College of the Arts</td>
<td>76 62* 91</td>
<td>67 58* 43</td>
<td>57 42* 57</td>
<td>96 83* 95</td>
<td>84 77* 76</td>
<td>90 85* 86</td>
<td>74 69* 81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. Conserv. of Music</td>
<td>73* 83* 96</td>
<td>62* 67* 68</td>
<td>50* 53* 64</td>
<td>96* 91* 96</td>
<td>67* 74* 59</td>
<td>94* 89* 86</td>
<td>91* 78* 96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>92* 85* 72*</td>
<td>71* 59* 67*</td>
<td>64* 48* 44*</td>
<td>96* 100* 89*</td>
<td>94* 70* 72</td>
<td>94* 86* 78*</td>
<td>100* 100* 83*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>78 82 86</td>
<td>76 75 72</td>
<td>64 69 62</td>
<td>93 94 95</td>
<td>82 78 73</td>
<td>92 90 91</td>
<td>84 90 86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table 5.6 Performance on GOS scales 2016 by Faculty and study level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOS Faculty</th>
<th>% in full-time employment</th>
<th>% in full-time study</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Adaptive</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Collaboration</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>PGCW</td>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>PGCW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Environment</td>
<td>89*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>75*</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, D&amp;P</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>40*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Science</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>80*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>58*</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Social Work</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>57*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; IT</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>88*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. College of the Arts</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>71*</td>
<td>71*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. Conserv. of Music</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29*</td>
<td>88*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>67*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: UG = Undergraduates; PGCW = Coursework postgraduates; HDR = Research postgraduates.
* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
### Table 5.7 Performance on ISB 2014-2016 by Faculty and study level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISB: International Students</th>
<th>Undergraduates</th>
<th>Coursework Postgraduates</th>
<th>Research Postgraduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Overall</td>
<td>Support Overall</td>
<td>Learning Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Environment</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>77*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, D&amp;P</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Science</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Social Work</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; IT</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. College of the Arts</td>
<td>92*</td>
<td>75*</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. Conserv. of Music</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>100*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
# Table 5.8 Performance on SB 2015-2016 by Faculty and study level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SB: Domestic Students</th>
<th>Undergraduates</th>
<th>Coursework Postgraduates</th>
<th>Research Postgraduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Overall</td>
<td>Support Overall</td>
<td>Learning Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Environment</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, D&amp;P</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Science</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Social Work</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; IT</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. College of the Arts</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. Conserv. of Music</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The University took part in the Student Barometer (for Domestic students) for the first time in 2015.
* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
ATTACHMENT 1. Strategies for improving students’ educational experience

1. Embed the new graduate qualities and the new curriculum framework:
   • Ensure course coherence and alignment with learning outcomes (including graduate qualities) at the level of degree, program, major, utilising curriculum mapping software where appropriate
   • Develop/contribute to new learning experiences and units to ensure embedding of curriculum framework, including interdisciplinary experiences, opportunities for research, entrepreneurship, industry and community engagement, mobility experiences, and the Open Learning Environment

2. Provide more interactive learning experiences:
   • Design active and collaborative learning experiences including wider use of pre-class preparation
   • Encourage development and effective use of eLearning resources e.g. in-class polling, video, animation, visualisation, simulation
   • Design learning experiences that make effective use of available learning technologies, including the suite of enterprise tools (e.g., LMS, Echo 360, Kaltura, Pebblepad, etc)
   • Shift content delivery online and maximise interactivity in face-to-face classes
   • Develop and trial use of new technologies and teaching strategies, recognising that it can take time to ‘tune’ new approaches

3. Provide richer peer engagement:
   • Encourage cohort-building activities at course, program, major, and unit of study levels
   • Establish peer support and mentoring/leadership programs to facilitate interactions across year levels, and where possible embed these activities into units of study e.g. project-based units, interdisciplinary units
   • Explicitly encourage student involvement in co-curricular activities
   • Design activities that encourage peer discussion, inquiry, analysis, and problem solving
   • Shift content delivery online and maximise peer-to-peer and teacher interaction in-class
   • Design interesting in-class discussions and collaborative activities
   • Support out-of-class interaction between students (and staff) with effective discussion boards and other peer communication tools

4. Assessment and feedback:
   • Where appropriate, use early diagnostic assessments of pre-requisite knowledge and skills, and provide opportunities for further development as needed
   • Review assessment to ensure integrity, challenge, promotion of learning, and alignment with unit of study/course learning outcomes
   • Develop use of online marking tools and rubrics, peer- and self-assessment
   • Ensure ample formative feedback opportunities, including via automated feedback on quizzes and writing tasks,
• Use low stakes assessments to encourage preparation before class
• Use learning analytics tools to gain insights into student progress, and provide personalised learning support
• Avoid over-assessment and provide feedback on drafts of larger tasks
• Where possible, use authentic assessments that emphasise the application of skills and knowledge in meaningful, contextualised situations
• Engage in benchmarking of assessment and student learning outcomes, including through the Go8 Quality Verification System

5. Utilise information, feedback and analysis effectively
• Ensure that each unit of study coordinator has access to information on the composition of students in their class, including the distribution of qualifying awards (Australian or international), course enrolments, intended majors (where available), and completion of relevant units of study.
• Access learning analytics reports within LMS unit of study sites as a means of understanding students’ responses to learning activities, learning resources, and assessment tasks
• Use learning analytics approaches and tools to undertake personalised learning support
• Complement systematic University-level approaches to monitoring the university experience with fast, local feedback mechanisms, such as: in-class polling, staff-student liaison committees; formative assessment results; and regular informal meetings with students
• Give students confidence that their feedback is effective by reporting back to them (e.g. using the Closing The Loop process) on the impact of their feedback
• Read, discuss, respond and act on the rich qualitative feedback students provide

6. Integrative experiences:
• Ensure that the final year of every major, program or stream offers experiences – preferably in required (core) units – that challenge students to integrate what they have learnt in the course, stream, program or major (e.g. through project work, research, entrepreneurship opportunities, applied problem solving, clinical work, internships, placements, work experience)
• Where appropriate, provide opportunities for students to experience the workplace settings, activities and challenges for which the course serves as preparation
• Engage with relevant industry and community groups to ensure (a) exposure of students to industry and community needs (e.g. through guest lectures, field trips) and (b) support the development of experiential course components (e.g. industry and community-based projects and internships)

7. Promote peer review and professional development among staff:
• Encourage peer review of educational design, including assessment and resources, and of in-class and online teaching
• Set faculty-level targets for participation in professional development activities and work with DVC Education portfolio to monitor participation and its effectiveness
• Work with the DVC Education portfolio to ensure that professional development activities are targeted effectively and offered in ways that meet academic staff needs, including through local delivery where appropriate and feasible
• Use and contribute to the review and improvement of professional development activities for sessional staff, including tutors

• Make effective use of the AP&D process and mentoring to support the development of skills and leadership for all staff involved in teaching and learning

• Ensure sustained focus on quality improvement for all units of study, but especially those with Unit of Study Survey outcomes in the lower quartile

8. **Recognise excellence and innovation in Teaching and Learning:**

• Develop faculty processes to identify, recognise and celebrate excellence and innovation in teaching, including through nomination for national and new University awards

• Apply education criteria for appointment, confirmation, professional development and promotion, systematically and rigorously
ATTACHMENT 2. Performance by study area relative to national benchmarks

Results on the national Quality Indicators of Learning and Teachers (QILT) suite of surveys (the SES, GOS and CEQ) are made publically available on the QILT website (https://www.qilt.edu.au). They allow prospective students to compare institutional results by choosing one of 20 study area categories. Tables A2.1 to A2.7 present results on the QILT suite of surveys broken down by these 20 study areas, benchmarked against the national Go8 average. PREQ results are also presented, although they are not currently made available via the QILT website.

Table A2.1 Undergraduate performance on 2016 SES scales by study area, with 2016 benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Skills Development</th>
<th>Learner Engagement</th>
<th>Teaching Quality</th>
<th>Student Support</th>
<th>Learning Resources</th>
<th>Overall Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sydney Australia</td>
<td>Go8</td>
<td>Sydney Australia</td>
<td>Go8</td>
<td>Sydney Australia</td>
<td>Go8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and mathematics</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing and info. systems</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; built enviro.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; enviro. studies</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services and support</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary science</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and management</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, culture &amp; social sci.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and paralegal studies</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative arts</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A2.2 Undergraduate performance on 2016 CEQ scales by study area, with 2016 benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQ: Undergraduates</th>
<th>Good Teaching</th>
<th>Generic Skills</th>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Go8</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and mathematics</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing and info. systems</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; built enviro.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; enviro. studies</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services and support</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary science</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and management</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, culture &amp; social sci.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and paralegal studies</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative arts</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A2.3 Coursework postgraduate performance on 2016 CEQ scales by study area, with 2016 benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQ: Coursework Postgrads</th>
<th>Good Teaching</th>
<th>Generic Skills</th>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Go8</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and mathematics</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing and info. systems</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; built enviro.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; enviro. studies</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services and support</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary science</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and management</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, culture &amp; social sci.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and paralegal studies</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative arts</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ: Research PGs</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Intellectual Climate</td>
<td>Skill Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and mathematics</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing and info. systems</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>63*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; built enviro.</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; enviro. studies</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services and support</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>-.**</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>-.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>82*</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>65*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Dentistry                           | 67*         | 82*  | 81* | 17*    | 47*  | 44* | 83*    | 94*  | 94*| 83*    | 88*  | 88*| 33*    | 59*  | 56*| 83*    | 94*  | 94*| 67*    | 88*  | 88*
| Veterinary science                  | 72*         | 70   | 69  | 44*    | 58   | 56  | 89*    | 94   | 92  | 67*    | 70   | 69  | 72*    | 82   | 79  | 78*    | 88   | 87  | 83*    | 86   | 82 |
| Rehabilitation                      | 100*        | 96   | 94* | 55*    | 61   | 61*| 100*   | 100* | 100*| 55*    | 63   | 61*| 100*   | 86   | 94*| 91*    | 96   | 94*| 100*   | 100* | 100*
| Teacher education                   | 100*        | 86   | 85  | 63*    | 57   | 57  | 94*    | 92   | 91  | 67*    | 67   | 57  | 79*    | 80   | 82  | 95*    | 92   | 91  | 89*    | 86   | 88 |
| Business and management             | 100*        | 86   | 87  | 67*    | 63   | 66  | 100*   | 93   | 93  | 80*    | 80   | 81  | 80*    | 80   | 80  | 100*   | 91   | 90  | 93*    | 86   | 86 |
| Humanities, culture & social sci.   | 86          | 81   | 80  | 62     | 56   | 57  | 95     | 94   | 94  | 60     | 67   | 62  | 60     | 76   | 77  | 97     | 90   | 89  | 83     | 85   | 82 |
| Social work                         | -.**        | 72*  | 50* | -.**   | 61*  | 33* | -.**   | 89*  | 83*| -.**   | 72*  | 50*| -.**   | 61*  | 33*| -.**   | 94*  | 100*| -.**   | 78*  | 67*
| Psychology                          | 83          | 81   | 81  | 57     | 50   | 54  | 96     | 93   | 93  | 74     | 77   | 78  | 74     | 77   | 78  | 83     | 88   | 87  | 87     | 84   | 84 |
| Law and paralegal studies           | 70*         | 83   | 79  | 40*    | 53   | 56  | 90*    | 95   | 92  | 50*    | 63   | 59  | 80*    | 77   | 74  | 80*    | 90   | 85  | 80*    | 86   | 82 |
| Creative arts                       | 93          | 82   | 84  | 64     | 55   | 55  | 95     | 96   | 93  | 55     | 59   | 53  | 66     | 71   | 65  | 86     | 86   | 86  | 89     | 84   | 81 |
| Communications                      | -.**        | 78   | 83  | -.**   | 38   | 50  | -.**   | 93   | 92  | -.**   | 57   | 71  | -.**   | 72   | 71  | -.**   | 89   | 92  | -.**   | 78   | 83 |
| Overall                             | 86          | 81   | 81  | 62     | 61   | 64  | 95     | 94   | 94  | 72     | 76   | 76  | 73     | 78   | 78  | 91     | 91   | 91  | 86     | 85   | 86 |

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
### Table A2.5: Undergraduate performance on 2016 GOS scales by study area, with 2016 benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>% in full-time employment</th>
<th>% in full-time study</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Adaptive</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Collaboration</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Aus.</td>
<td>Go8</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Aus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and mathematics</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing and info. systems</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; built enviro.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; enviro. studies</td>
<td>76*</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services and support</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>58*</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary science</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and management</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, culture &amp; social sci.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and paralegal studies</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative arts</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>63*</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table A2.6 Coursework postgraduate performance on 2016 GOS scales by study area, with 2016 benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>% in full-time employment</th>
<th>% in full-time study</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Adaptive</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Collaboration</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science and mathematics</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing and info. systems</td>
<td>94*</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; built enviro.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; enviro. studies</td>
<td>69*</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services and support</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary science</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and management</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, culture &amp; social sci.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and paralegal studies</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative arts</td>
<td>75*</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.

** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table A2.7 Research postgraduate performance on 2016 GOS scales by study area, with 2016 benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>% in full-time employment</th>
<th>% in full-time study</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Adaptive</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Collaboration</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science and mathematics</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing and info. systems</td>
<td>75*</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; built enviro.</td>
<td>..**</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>..**</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; enviro. studies</td>
<td>..**</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>..**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services and support</td>
<td>92*</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>..**</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>..**</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>88*</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>..**</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82*</td>
<td>..**</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary science</td>
<td>73*</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education</td>
<td>62*</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and management</td>
<td>80*</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, culture &amp; social sci.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>..**</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>..**</td>
<td>..**</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and paralegal studies</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative arts</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>..**</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65*</td>
<td>..**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.