# NOTICE OF MEETING

Meeting 7/2017 of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee will be held from 2:00pm – 4:00pm on Tuesday 26 September 2017 in the Senate Room, Quadrangle. The Agenda for the meeting is below.

Dr Matthew Charet  
Executive Officer to Academic Board

## AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Samay Sabharwal is the new nominee of the President of SUPRA.  
Professor Sandra van der Laan replaces Associate Professor Geoff Frost as representative of the Business School. Associate Professor Michael Halliwell is in attendance for Associate Professor Jennifer Rowley, representing the Sydney Conservatorium of Music. |
| **2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS** |       |
| 2.1 Minutes of Previous Meeting | Chair | attached |
| 2.2 Business Arising | Chair | verbal |
| **3 STANDING ITEMS** |       |
| 3.1 Report of the Chair | Chair | verbal |
| 3.2 Report of Academic Board | Tony Masters | attached |
| **4 ITEMS FOR ACTION** |       |
| 4.1 Consultation Drafts – Privacy and Recordkeeping policies | Tim Robinson | attached |
| 4.2 Course Review Template | Kate Small | attached |
| 4.3 Higher Education Standards Framework and University Policy | Peter McCallum | attached |
| 4.4 Amendments to the Assessment Procedures 2011 | Chair | attached |
| 4.5 Amendments to the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (as amended) | Ross Coleman | attached |
| 4.6 Amendments to the Progress Planning and Review of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy and Procedures 2015 | Ross Coleman | attached |
| 4.7 Amendments to the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013 | Ross Coleman | attached |

Respect is a core value of the Academic Board
4.8 Amendments to the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015  
Ross Coleman  
attached

4.9 Nursing: Faculty Resolutions  
Vasiliki Betihavas  
attached

4.10 Pharmacy: Faculty Resolutions  
Veysel Kayser  
attached

4.11 Science: Faculty Resolutions  
Helen Agus  
attached

5 ITEMS FOR NOTING

5.1 Educational Integrity Trend Report, Semester 1, 2017  
Peter McCallum  
attached

5.2 Education Key Performance Indicators 2016 Performance and 2017 Targets  
Pip Pattison  
attached

5.3 Student Misconduct Report 2015-2016  
attached

6 OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 Any Other Business

Next meeting: 2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 14 November 2017  
Senate Room, Quadrangle

Academic Standards and Policy Committee - Terms of Reference

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

Terms of Reference
1. To play an active role in assuring the quality of teaching, scholarship and research in the University and co-ordinate and maintain an overview of the academic activities of all academic units.
2. To formulate and review policies, guidelines and procedures in relation to academic matters, particularly with respect to academic issues that have scope across the University, including equity and access initiatives.
3. To determine policy concerning the programs of study or examinations in any Faculty, college or Board of Studies.
4. To advise the Academic Board and Vice Chancellor on policies concerning the academic aspects of the conditions of appointment and employment of academic staff.
5. To play an active role in assuring the quality of teaching, scholarship and research in the University by ensuring the body of academic policies and degree resolutions are self-consistent, incorporate the best ideas and are aligned with the strategic goals of the University.
6. In pursuit of the above objectives,
   6.1. request reports from, or refer matters to academic units for consideration and action as required;
   6.2. consider and take action as required on reports or academic submissions from academic units;
   6.3. initiate and oversee, in collaboration with the University Executive, a formal and regular program of review of academic activities of all academic units.
7. To actively seek and evaluate opportunities to improve the University’s pursuit of high standards in all academic activities.
8. To ensure proper communication channels are established with other committees of the Academic Board and University Executive to promote cross-referencing and discussion of matters pertaining to academic standards and policy.
9. To receive regular reports from, and provide advice to the Deputy Vice-Chancellors pursuant to maintaining the highest standards in teaching, scholarship and research.
10. To exercise all reasonable means to provide and receive advice from the University Executive and its relevant subcommittees.
11. To provide regular reports on its activities under its terms of reference to the Academic Board.
12. To consider and report on any matter referred to it by the Academic Board, the Vice-Chancellor or the Deputy Vice-Chancellors.
Submission To Academic Standards & Policy Committee
Date 26 September 2017
Item No 2.1
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Author Dr Matthew Charet, Executive Officer to Academic Board
Reviewer/Approver Professor Jane Hanrahan, Chair
Paper title Minutes of the Previous Meeting
Purpose To seek approval of the minutes of the previous meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolve that the minutes of meeting 6/2017, held on 8 August 2017, be confirmed as a true record.

MINUTES

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY COMMITTEE
2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 8 August 2017
Senate Room, Quadrangle (A14)

Members Present: Professor Jane Hanrahan (Chair); Helen Agus (Science) (from 3:15pm); Associate Professor Tim Allender (Education & Social Work); Andrew Barnes (SCA); Dr Vasiliki Betihavas (Nursing); Isabella Brook (President, SRC); Associate Professor Alex Chaves (Veterinary Science); Dr Frances Di Lauro (Arts & Social Sciences); Kerrie Henderson (Office of General Counsel); Associate Professor Glen Hill (Architecture, Design & Planning); Associate Professor Veysel Kayser (Pharmacy); Dr Peter Knight (Medicine); Associate Professor Tony Masters (Chair of the Academic Board); Associate Professor Peter McCallum (Director, Educational Strategy) (for Professor Pip Pattison); Kiriti Mortha (Co-President, SUPRA); Associate Professor John O’Byrne (Science) (until 3:20pm); Associate Professor Maurice Peat (Medicine); Professor Anne Twomey (Law); Amy Wenham (Undergraduate Student).

Attendees: Dr Matthew Charet (Secretary); Myrophora Koureas (former Policy Analyst, Office of the DVC (Education)).

Apologies: Associate Professor Geoff Frost (Business); Associate Professor Vincent Gomes (Engineering & IT); Associate Professor Mark Melatos (Arts and Social Sciences); Professor Pip Pattison (Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)) (Associate Professor McCallum attending instead);

6/2017

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES
The Chair welcomed new members Andrew Barnes (from the Sydney College of the Arts) and Associate Professor Vincent Gomes (from the Faculty of Engineering & Information Technologies), and extended apologies as recorded above.

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

2.1 Minutes of the Previous Meeting
The minutes of the previous meeting held on 11 July 2017 were approved as a true record of that meeting.
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Resolution ASPC17/6-1
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.

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 ASPC17/6-2
That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the report of the Chair.

3.2 Report of Academic Board

Further to the written report circulated with the agenda, Associate Professor Masters informed the committee that at its 25 July 2017 meeting, the Academic Board passed a motion to amend the proposed University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017 to extend the electorate for election of the Chair to include ex officio members of the Academic Board. Ordinarily, such a change would have been referred back to the committee for discussion, but in this instance timing necessitates the presentation of the amended Rule to Senate at its next meeting. This is to enable the conduct of elections later this year for the 2018 term of office.

Resolution ASPC17/6-3
That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 25 July 2017.

4 ITEMS FOR ACTION

4.1 Election Candidates’ Conduct Procedures 2017

In discussion, a number of wording changes and clarifications were recommended to clauses 4(2), 5(2)(b) and 7, which the University Policy Manager undertook to update before promulgation.

Resolution ASPC17/6-4
That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee discuss the Election Candidates’ Conduct Procedures 2017, as presented.

4.2 Assessment Procedures 2011 – Amendments

Ms Koureas provided an overview of the proposed amendments to the Assessment Procedures 2011, advising that the amendments have arisen from a student-led working group on Special Consideration relating to replacement examinations, as well as feedback received around Disability Services and from the centralisation of examinations administration.

In discussion, concern was expressed at the specific wording of clause 14(13)(a)(v) mandating the provision of a second replacement examination within three weeks of the initial replacement examination. It was observed that this may not always be in the best interests of the student, and that timing of placements or the University’s Summer closedown period may also interfere with such scheduling. Members were informed that the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) has suggested that professional faculties will have some flexibility regarding timing to accommodate placements, and to enable this it was suggested that this clause be reworded to read “will/should be held within three weeks of the date of the first replacement assessment where practicable.” The impact of the new semester dates model was also flagged for future consideration.

A question was raised as to how many attempts at an examination are permitted by clause 14(13)(a)(vi), and Associate Professor Masters advised that it was the intent of the working group to prevent infinite replacement assessment opportunities. The challenge of writing multiple examination papers that equally assess the course content was also discussed, and members were informed that in some faculties, the need for multiple written papers was addressed by making the second replacement examination an oral one. This enables the same content to be
tested as a written exam while allowing greater flexibility. The University Policy Manager undertook to reword clause 14(13)(a)(vi) to clarify its intent. She would also renumber the reference in clause 14(13)(a)(i) before presentation of the proposal to the Academic Board.

Resolution ASPC17/6-5
That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that Academic Board:
(a) approve the amendment of the Assessment Procedures 2011, as amended; and
(b) approve the adoption of the amended policy with effect from 12 September 2017 (for Semester 2 examinations).

4.3 Higher Education Standards Framework and University Policy
Associate Professor McCallum informed members that following an audit earlier this year, gaps have been identified in the University’s compliance with the Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF), especially relating to third party agreements and the qualifications of teaching staff. He advised that the HESF assigns the University responsibility for the educational standards of external providers with whom we have teaching agreements, and also requires all teachers to have a qualification at least one AQF level higher than the level of award course into which they are teaching (with the exception of the PhD, which is the highest level of the AQF). As the University is being visited by TEQSA in 2018, it is highly desirable to enact a number of policy changes to address these compliance issues and a suite of proposed changes was circulated for consideration.

The introduction of a Collaborative Education and Research Training Agreements Policy 2017 was proposed, and the University Policy Manager suggested that rather than establishing another policy, the incorporation of the necessary requirements into related existing policies. It was agreed that this should be explored and the proposed policy was withdrawn from consideration at the present time.

Amendments were proposed to the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015, in particular the addition of section 24A relating to the qualifications and skills of staff. This section reflects the requirements outlined under the HESF and provides flexibility to recognise professional experience or demonstrated attainment, so long as these are appropriately documented (by provision of a CV, for example). In discussion, it was proposed to amend the section relating to unit of study coordination to enable oversight by staff who have an appropriate qualification, and this was supported. It was observed that the amendment as drafted enables students who are undertaking teaching development training to teach components of units of study, provided they are supervised by a staff member with an appropriate qualification. The definition of “teacher” was also explored, and it was agreed that it would be helpful for a definition to be added to the policy. Guest lecturers are not formally members of the academic staff of the University and so fall outside the scope of the policy.

Amendments were also proposed to the Student Placement Policy 2015 to expand the definition of “placement” to include projects involving external parties. In discussion, the definition of what constitutes a ‘project’ was identified as problematic as it potentially covers every assessment activity, not only those that involve an experiential learning component. Projects within a unit of study, for example, do not involve an external partnership and are not intended to be captured by the amended policy. Associate Professor McCallum welcomed further feedback on this. The possibility of including a requirement to inform students of placements “in a timely manner” was raised, to better enable students to make appropriate arrangements to meet placement requirements (such as securing time off work or arranging travel and accommodation). In discussion, it was agreed that timing and location of placements is often outside the control of the University, and that while every effort is made to communicate changed requirements in a timely fashion, a policy establishing rigid timeframes would be unworkable and unachievable. Faculties are, however, welcome to register local provisions in this regard where they feel that such would be achievable. Acknowledging that the draft as presented required further refinement, it was agreed that a revised version of the Student Placement Policy 2015 be presented to a future meeting.

The proposed rescission of the Guidelines for Inter-Institutional Agreements 1997 was identified as necessary as they do not reflect current University structures and expose the University to risk.
In summary, it was agreed that the Collaborative Education and Research Training Agreements Policy 2017 and the Student Placement Policy 2015 would be reworked for presentation to a future meeting; that the amendments to the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 be endorsed for presentation to the Academic Board; and that the Academic Board be asked to recommend to the Vice-Chancellor the rescission of the Guidelines for Inter-Institutional Agreements 1997.

Resolution ASPC17/6-6
That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board:
   a) approve amendments to the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015, as amended; and
   b) recommend to the Vice-Chancellor the rescission of the Guidelines for Inter-Institutional Agreements 1997, as presented.

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

Associate Professor McCallum informed members that a series of fora are proposed over August and September to initiate discussion of the measurement of graduate qualities, use of assessment plans to reduce the volume of summative assessment tasks, improve formative feedback, and work towards pan-unit of study mechanisms of assessment. These fora have emerged from discussion at the Assessment Working Party. The papers circulated with the agenda provide a series of questions with which faculties are asked to engage, and also present a rubrics-based approach to each of the graduate qualities. This is to be implemented University-wide, but interpreted at a disciplinary level. It is intended for assessment plans to move assessment from individual units of study to a broader view (for example, across a major or a degree) and assess against the graduate qualities. Project units of study will be used strategically and capture (as largely as possible) the graduate qualities, with a text-based statement of achievement of the graduate qualities to be provided for each student. This paper seeks to initiate an ongoing discussion, with the development of concrete policy development relating to assessment to take place through 2018.

Resolution ASPC17/6-7
That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee:
   (a) provide feedback on the discussion paper of the Assessment Working Group;
   (b) promote staff attendance at the relevant faculty assessment fora; and
   (c) circulate the attached discussion paper among their colleagues and direct staff to the online form or other options for feedback.

4.5 Charter of Academic Freedom

Associate Professor Masters informed members that it has been ten years since the Charter of Academic Freedom was endorsed by the Academic Board and Senate, and in light of recent bullying and death threats directed at several members of staff arising from their academic activities, it is timely to reaffirm the Academic Board’s commitment to academic freedom. If the Academic Board is comfortable to confirm its ongoing commitment to the Charter, Associate Professor Masters undertook to communicate that commitment to Senate at a future meeting. It is not currently proposed to revise the Charter, although this could be undertaken at a future juncture.

With the observation that the Charter has served its purpose well, the committee agreed that the Academic Board be asked to reaffirm its commitment to academic freedom and the University’s values of courage and creativity, respect and integrity, inclusion and diversity and openness and engagement.

Resolution ASPC17/6-8
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.
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5 ITEMS FOR NOTING

5.1 2016 Consolidated Summary of the Student Experience and Graduate Outcomes

Speaking to the report as circulated with the agenda, Associate Professor McCallum advised that the University has met KPI 2 but has not reached KPIs 1 and 3. It is of ongoing concern that considerable challenges remain in student support and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) intend to convene a group to investigate this. Challenges are also identified regarding learning resources and teaching quality, and although employability of undergraduate students is positive, international postgraduate students report dissatisfaction in this regard. An International Student Taskforce, chaired by Professor Greg Whitwell (Dean of the University of Sydney Business School), has been set up to further explore this. Positive feedback has been provided regarding clarity of assessment, and indicators confirm that there is a correlation between the assessment of graduate qualities and learning outcomes, which will continue to be further refined.

Acknowledging that the topic of assessment is a work in progress, the committee was assured that steps are being taken across the institution to meet the required standards, and were asked to provide any further comment arising from the report either via the Chair or directly to Associate Professor McCallum.

Resolution ASPC17/6-9

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the 2016 Consolidated Summary of the Student Experience and Graduate Outcomes report.

6 OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 Any Other Business

There being no other business, the meeting concluded at 3:47pm.

Next meeting: 2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 26 September 2017
Senate Room, Quadrangle
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Author: Matthew Charet, Executive Officer to Academic Board
Reviewer/Approver: Associate Professor Tony Masters, Chair of the Academic Board
Paper title: Report of the Academic Board meeting
Purpose: To advise the Academic Standards and Policy Committee of the outcomes of the Academic Board meeting held on 29 August 2017

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 29 August 2017.

REPORT OF ACADEMIC BOARD MEETING

Items related to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee
The Academic Board noted the report from the meeting of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee held on 8 August 2017; and
• did not approve the proposed amendment of the Assessment Procedures 2011 but referred the proposal to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee for further discussion;
• recommended to the Vice-Chancellor the rescission of the Guidelines for Inter-Institutional Agreements 1997;
• noted the Election Candidates’ Conduct Procedures 2017; and
• noted the 2016 Consolidated Summary of the Student Experience and Graduate Outcomes report.

Items related to the Admissions Committee
The Academic Board noted that the Admissions Committee had not met since the previous meeting of the Academic Board.

Items related to the Graduate Studies Committee
The Academic Board noted the report from meeting of the Graduate Studies Committee held on 1 August 2017 and:
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to introduce the Graduate Certificate in Computing and amend the Graduate Diploma in Computing; 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 Engineering and Information Technologies, approved the implementation or amendment of course resolutions arising from the proposal; and approved the implementation or amendment of the tables of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Development Studies and approved the amendment of the course resolutions and table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Political Economy and approved the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Human Rights, Master of International Relations, Master of International Security, Master of International Studies, Master of Public Policy, Master of Political Economy, Master of Development Studies and Master of United States Studies and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from the proposal; with effect from 1 January 2018;
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- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Dentistry to amend the Doctor of Dental Medicine; recommended that Senate approve the amendment of the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014; and approve the amendment of the faculty resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposed amendments to the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015 and approved the proposed workflow for appointment of examiners and adopt the modified appointment of examiners form to reflect the new process;
- approved the proposed amendments to the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Guidelines for Examiners 2015 and approved the proposed amendments to the Higher Degrees by Research Examiner’s Report on Thesis form;
- approved the proposal from the Sydney Medical School to amend the Master of Medicine / Master of Science in Medicine (Infection and Immunity) and approved the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine and approved the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Master of Clinical Psychology and Master of Clinical Psychology / Doctor of Philosophy and approved the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Master of Nutrition and Dietetics and approved the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from the DVC Education Portfolio to amend the procedure for the implementation of R to the award of HDR scholarships; and
- noted the proposal from Sydney Medical School to amend the Master of Medicine/Science in Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology) (Metabolic Health), Master of International Public Health, Master of Health Policy, Master of Public Health, Master of Public Health (Professional Practice) and Master of Surgery and related embedded programs and noted the changes to unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Items related to the Undergraduate Studies Committee
The Academic Board noted the report from meeting 2017/02 of the Undergraduate Studies Committee held on 1 August 2017 and:
- approved the proposal from the Deputy Vice Chancellor Education Portfolio to make a minor amendment to the progression and entry requirements for the Dalyell Stream in course resolutions and unit of study tables;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Liberal Arts and Sciences and approved the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science / Master of Nutrition and Dietetics and approved the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018; and
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science and approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal (Neuroscience Major Table 1), with effect from 1 January 2018.

Other matters
The Academic Board also:
- reaffirmed 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, and referred the Charter to the Culture Taskforce for discussion;
- noted the set of Graduate Qualities and consider potential changes to the PhD student experience;
- approved changes to the membership of the Board and its committees;
- noted the timeline for Academic Board elections for terms of office commencing 1 January 2018;
- noted the 2018 meeting schedule;
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- noted the verbal report from the Chair of the Academic Board on matters considered by Senate at its 23 August 2017 meeting;
- noted the report of the student members of the Academic Board;
- noted the verbal report from the Vice-Chancellor and Principal on matters considered by Senate at its 23 August 2017 meeting, including a presentation on the University’s presence in Western Sydney; and
- approved the 2018 Academic Calendar for Sydney Nursing School.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Tim Robinson, Manager, ARMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer/Approver</td>
<td>Richard Fisher, General Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper title</td>
<td>Consultation Drafts – Privacy and Recordkeeping policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>The consultation drafts of the Recordkeeping and Privacy policies are presented to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee for noting and referral to the Academic Board for noting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board note the consultation drafts of the Recordkeeping Policy 2017 and Privacy Policy 2017 (“the Policies”), as presented.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Recordkeeping Policy 2017 (Attachment 1) reflects the compliance requirements of the Standard on Records Management issued under the State Records Act 1998 (NSW) (“the Act”). The 2017 policy demonstrates the University’s compliance with the Act and ensures the effective creation, management, maintenance and disposal of University records.

The current Privacy policy 2013 and the Privacy Management Plan 2013 have been reviewed, condensed and combined into one document, the Privacy Policy 2017 (Attachment 2). This policy meets the requirements of NSW privacy legislation and sets out the privacy responsibilities of University staff and students.

In accordance with the University’s policy development process, the Academic Standards and Policy Committee is requested to note the policies, and refer them to the Academic Board for noting.

CONSULTATION

The Policies have followed the consultation process in accordance with the University of Sydney (Policies Development and Review) Rule 2011 (as amended).

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Recordkeeping Policy 2017
Attachment 2 – Privacy Policy 2017
RECORDKEEPING POLICY 2017

The General Counsel as delegate of the Senate of the University of Sydney, adopts the following policy.

Dated:

Last amended:

Signature: DRAFT ONLY – NOT FOR SIGNATURE

Name: Mr Richard Fisher, AM

CONTENTS

1 Name of policy
2 Commencement
3 Policy is binding
4 Statement of intent
5 Application
6 Definitions
7 Recordkeeping principles
8 Records management program
9 Responsibilities
10 Breach of policy
11 Recordkeeping manual
12 Rescissions and replacements

Notes

Amendment history

1 Name of policy

This is the Recordkeeping Policy 2017.

2 Commencement

This policy commences on the [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:

(a) requires all activities undertaken by or on behalf of the University to be documented through the proper creation, capture, management and maintenance of University records;

(b) provides for orderly and accountable disposal of University records;

(c) facilitates appropriate access to University records, and

(d) supports the University’s compliance with the requirements of the State Records Act 1998 (NSW) (“the Act”).

5 Application

(1) This policy applies to:

(a) all staff and affiliates;

(b) all activities undertaken by or on behalf of the University;

(c) all information created and received by or on behalf of the University, in any format or medium; and

(d) all software applications, including enterprise business information systems, used to create, manage and store information and records.

(2) This policy does not apply to library material or to archival or heritage material held in the collections of the University’s libraries and museums.

6 Definitions

ARMS means Archives and Records Management Services.

business means all activities undertaken by or on behalf of the University, including teaching and learning, community service, administration, commercial and cultural activities. It includes outsourced, contracted and cloud-based activities

business owner means, in relation to a business system, the most senior University employee responsible for its management and implementation.

business system means an automated system that creates or manages information about the University’s activities. It includes software applications whose primary purpose is to facilitate transactions between an organisational unit and its customers e.g. e-commerce systems, client relationship management systems, purpose-built or customised databases, finance or human resources systems.

disposal has the meaning given in section 3.8 of the Australian and International Standard AS ISO 15489.1-2016, Records Management which at the date of this document is:

means the range of processes associated with implementing records retention, destruction or transfer decisions, which are documented in disposal authorities or other instruments.
record has the meaning given in section 3(1) of the State Records Act 1988 (NSW), which at the date of this document is:

means any document or other source of information that is compiled, recorded or stored, in written form or on film, by electronic process, or in any other manner or by any other means

A record may be in any format and in any medium.

recordkeeping has the meaning given in NSW State Records Glossary of recordkeeping terms which, at the date of this document is:

the making and maintaining of complete, accurate and reliable evidence of business transactions in the form of recorded information.

recordkeeping system means a business system capable of capturing, maintaining and providing access to records over time.

senior responsible officer means the individual with corporate responsibility for the oversight of records and information management as required by section 1.3 of the State Records Standard No 12, Standard on records management, 2014. At the University this is the Group Secretary.

State archive means a State record that belongs to a class of records that the NSW State Records Authority identifies as “required as State archives.” University records that are classed as State archives are also University archives.

State record has the meaning given in section 3(1) of the State Records Act 1988 (NSW), which at the date of this document is:

any record made and kept, or received and kept, by any person in the course of the exercise of official functions in a public office, or for any purpose of a public office, or for the use of a public office

Note: The University is a public office and its records are State records.

unit means any of the following:

• a faculty
• University school
• a portfolio controlled by a Deputy Vice-Chancellor, a Vice-Principal, the General Counsel or the Director, University Libraries
• a professional service unit within the portfolio of the Vice-Principal (Operations)
• a Level 4 centre, as defined in the Centres and Collaborative Networks Policy 2017; and
• other groups as determined by the General Counsel from time to time

University archive means a University record that has continuing value because it is significant for administrative or historical reasons.

University means any record that is made or received by or on behalf of the
record

University. All University records are also State records.

7 Recordkeeping principles

(1) The University must establish and maintain a records management program.

(2) The records management program must meet the minimum compliance requirements of State Records Standard No 12, Standard on records management, 2014.

   (a) The components of the University’s records management program are specified in clause 8 of this policy.

(3) Records and information needed to meet or support the requirements of the University must be identified as such.

   (a) Business needs for information and accountability must be identified.
   (b) Risks to information or systems that hold records and information must be identified and mitigated.

(4) The University’s business must be appropriately recorded.

   (a) Records must be made to document or facilitate the transaction of any University business activity.

      (i) Records can be automatically generated by a business system or deliberately made by a person involved in the transaction.

   (b) Records must be full, accurate, authentic, reliable and trustworthy.
   (c) Decisions about what records need to be created to support particular business activities must be based on an evaluation of the risks involved.
   (d) If a record was not an automatic or direct byproduct of business activity, the record should be made as soon as practicable after the event.

(5) Records must be captured in one of the following recordkeeping systems:

   (a) the University recordkeeping system managed by ARMS;
   (b) one of:

      (i) an enterprise business system;
      (ii) a local business system, or
      (iii) a local process

      which meets the requirements of the State Records Authority’s standard on records management Standard No 12, Standard on records management, 2014;

   or

   (c) any other system approved by the Manager, ARMS.

(6) Records must be appropriately managed across all operating environments including diverse system environments and physical locations.

(7) Records must be maintained and managed for as long as they are needed.

   (a) The University recordkeeping system must be designed to maintain and manage records for as long as needed.
(b) The University Archives must provide permanent custody for University archives and State archives.

(c) Business systems must be:
   (i) designed and managed as recordkeeping systems; or
   (ii) structured to transfer records to the University recordkeeping system managed by ARMS.

(d) Contractual arrangements for outsourced, cloud and similar service agreements must:
   (i) require that records are maintained, secure and accessible for as long as they are required; and
   (ii) specify what must happen to the records at the expiration of the agreement.

(8) Recordkeeping systems must be authorised, maintained and managed for as long as they are needed.
   (a) Business owners must ensure that business systems meet the requirements of this policy, particularly those of subclause 7(6)(c).
   (b) When business systems are upgraded or replaced the records they contain, together with their recordkeeping metadata, must be migrated to the upgraded or replacement system.

(9) Decommissioning of business systems must be appropriately managed.
   (a) When business systems are upgraded, replaced or abandoned the business owner, or other responsible person if there is no longer a business owner, must make arrangements with ARMS for authorised disposal of the records they contain.

(10) Disposal of records must be appropriately authorised.
   (a) Records must not be destroyed or otherwise disposed of without authorisation:
      (i) Approval for the disposal of records must be sought from the Records Manager, as specified in the Recordkeeping Manual.
      (ii) Records may only be destroyed in a manner approved by ARMS.
      (iii) Ephemeral, duplicated and merely facilitative records may be destroyed in accordance with the normal administrative practice procedures specified in the Recordkeeping Manual.
   (b) Records required to be retained as University archives or State archives must, when they cease being in active use, be managed in accordance with the Recordkeeping Manual.

(11) Access to records must be appropriately authorised.
   (a) All staff must have access to the records that they need for business purposes.
   (b) Access to records which have restricted access requirements must be approved by the head of the unit which manages that class of record.
   (c) Staff should access records only when they have a business need to do so.
   (d) Records and the information in them must be accessed, used and disclosed only in accordance with legislative requirements and University policies and procedures.
ARMS will manage all applications for access to records under right to information or privacy legislation and in response to subpoenas or warrants.

(i) All staff and affiliates must comply when ARMS seeks records for these purposes.

(12) Amendment of records must be appropriately authorised and documented.

(a) Records must only be amended with proper authorisation.

(b) Details of each amendment must remain attached to the record’s recordkeeping metadata.

(c) When records are amended in accordance with the *Privacy and Personal Information Act 1998* (NSW), the *Health Records and Information Privacy Act 2002* (NSW) or by court order, details of the amendment must remain attached to the record’s recordkeeping metadata.

8 Records management program

(1) The University’s records management program consists of:

(a) policy, procedures and guidelines including:

(i) this policy;

(ii) the *Recordkeeping Manual*;

(iii) guidelines and advice on the ARMS website (http://sydney.edu.au/arms/); and

(iv) local business systems for recordkeeping and information management;

(b) records management systems, including:

(i) the University recordkeeping system (Records Online http://sydney.edu.au/arms/rol/index.shtml);

(ii) enterprise business systems that function as recordkeeping systems;

(iii) local business systems that function as recordkeeping systems;

(iv) other structured local systems for managing records which meet the requirements of the *State Records Authority’s Standard No 12, Standard on records management, 2014*;

(v) the University Archives;

(c) Records Management personnel including:

(i) ARMS staff;

(ii) other staff with specific responsibility for recordkeeping as part of their duties; and

(iii) any other staff or affiliates who deal with records.

(2) The University’s records management program and recordkeeping systems must be monitored by ARMS.

(a) ARMS must co-operate with NSW State Records in relation to monitoring programs, practices and systems.
9 Responsibilities

(1) The Vice-Chancellor has statutory responsibility under section 10 of the Act for ensuring the University’s compliance with the requirements of the Act.

(2) The General Counsel has portfolio responsibility for records management within the University, consistently with the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule 2017.

(3) The Group Secretary is the senior responsible officer.

(4) The Manager, ARMS is responsible for:
   (a) managing the recordkeeping program;
   (b) developing and maintaining a Recordkeeping Manual to support the recordkeeping program; and
   (c) approving local recordkeeping systems.

(5) The Records Manager is responsible for:
   (a) developing and implementing the recordkeeping program;
   (b) authorising the disposal of University records;
   (c) managing requests for access to University records other than under right to information or privacy legislation; and
   (d) monitoring compliance with the recordkeeping program.

(6) Heads of units are responsible for:
   (a) requiring full and accurate records of the business activities for which they are responsible to be created, captured into a recordkeeping system and managed in accordance with this policy and the Recordkeeping Manual;
   (b) adopting and maintaining business systems that comply with this policy, particularly those of subclause 7(6)(c);
   (c) requiring that proper retention and disposal processes for records are managed through system and service transitions or the decommissioning of systems.

(7) All staff and affiliates are responsible for:
   (a) making and keeping full and accurate records of business activities in which they engage; and
   (b) complying with the Recordkeeping Manual.

(8) No person may destroy, transfer out of University custody or otherwise dispose of University records without the authorisation of the Manager, ARMS.

10 Breach of policy

(1) Any staff member or affiliate who becomes aware of a breach or potential breach of this policy must report it as soon as possible to the Manager, ARMS for appropriate action.

(2) Failure to ensure that University records remain under the control of the University and in safe custody in University-provided facilities is an offence under the Act.
Note: See State Records Act 1998 (NSW) s21

(3) Breach of this policy may, in appropriate cases, result in disciplinary action against staff members or affiliates involved.

11 Recordkeeping manual

(1) The Manager, ARMS will prepare and maintain a Recordkeeping Manual for approval by the General Counsel.

(2) The Recordkeeping Manual:
   (a) will set out the procedures which must be followed in implementing this policy; and
   (b) must be published on the University web site.

(3) The Recordkeeping Manual has the status of procedures under the University of Sydney (Policies Development and Review) Rule 2011.

12 Rescissions and replacements

This document replaces University Recordkeeping Policy 2000, which is rescinded as from the date of commencement of this document:

NOTES

Recordkeeping Policy 2017

Date adopted:
Date commenced:
Administrator: Manager ARMS
Review date:
Rescinded documents: University Recordkeeping Policy 2000
Related documents:

State Records Act 1998 (NSW)
State Records Regulation 2015 (NSW)

University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule 2010 (as amended)

State Records Standard No 12, Standard on records management, 2014

Privacy Policy 2013
Risk Management Policy 2013
Privacy Management Plan 2013
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1 Name of policy

This is the Privacy 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:

(a) states the University’s commitment to protecting privacy, in compliance with its legal and regulatory obligations;
(b) provides for the appropriate and compliant management of personal and health information;
(c) sets out the privacy responsibilities of the University, its staff, students and affiliates; and
(d) meets the statutory requirement for the preparation and implementation of a University privacy management plan.

5 Application

This policy applies to the University, staff, students and affiliates.

6 Definitions

privacy breach means when personal or health information held by the University is:

- lost; or
- subjected to, or likely to be subjected to, unauthorised access, modification or disclosure.

health information has the meaning provided in section 6 of the Health Records and Information Privacy Act 2002 (NSW).

health privacy principles (HPPs) means the principles set out in Schedule 1 to the Health Records and Information Privacy Act 2002 (NSW).

information protection principles (IPPs) mean the principles set out in Part 2 Division 1 of the Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998 (NSW).

notifiable privacy breach has the meaning given in clause 9 of this policy.

personal information has the meaning provided in section 4 of the Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998 (NSW).

privacy acts means either or both of the Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998 (NSW) (the ‘PPiP Act’) and the Health Records and Information Privacy Act 2002 (NSW) (the ‘HRIP Act’).

privacy officer means the Manager, Archives and Records Management Services, or the occupant of any position nominated as privacy officer by the General Counsel.

privacy means the privacy management plan required by section 33 of the Privacy...
management plan and Personal Information Protection Act 1998 (NSW) and established by clause 8 of this policy.

unit means, as appropriate, any of the following:

- a faculty
- University school
- a portfolio controlled by a Deputy Vice-Chancellor, a Vice-Principal, the General Counsel or the Director, University Libraries
- a professional service unit within the portfolio of the Vice-Principal (Operations)
- a Level 4 centre, as defined in the Centres and Collaborative Networks Policy 2017; and
- other groups as determined by the General Counsel from time to time.

7 Privacy management principles

(1) The University, its staff, affiliates and, where appropriate, students must comply with all IPPs and HPPs.

(2) The IPPs and HPPs set out the legal requirements for:

(a) collecting personal and health information;
(b) storing personal and health information;
(c) access to and accuracy of personal and health information;
(d) using personal and health information; and
(e) disclosing personal and health information.

(3) In addition, HPPs set out further legal requirements for:

(a) using identifiers to protect identity;
(b) the right to anonymity in receiving health services;
(c) the flow of health information across the NSW border; and
(d) consent for linking health records of an individual in a system.

Note: See Part 2 Division 1 of the Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998 (NSW); and Schedule 1 of the Health Records and Information Privacy Act 2002 (NSW).

8 Privacy management plan

(1) The University's privacy management plan is set out in sub-clauses 8(1) to 8(6).

(2) This plan is:

(a) made in accordance with the University’s policy framework established by clause 5 of the University of Sydney (Policies Development and Review) Rule 2011; and

(b) supported by:

(i) this policy, which is publicly available on the University Policy Register;
(ii) the Privacy Procedures 2017; and
(iii) guidelines and information on the University's privacy website.

(3) The University will:

(a) provide a direct link to information about privacy (with a link to this policy) in the footer of the University’s web site; and

(b) provide an online training course on privacy as part of its workplace ethics and integrity training program which all existing and new staff are required to complete.

Note: The online training course is available on the University’s Careerpath website.

(4) A person who considers that the University has breached an IPP or HPP is entitled to an internal review of that conduct by the University.

(a) Applications for internal review must:

(i) be made in writing to a privacy officer by email or by mail at the address specified on the University’s privacy website;

(ii) include a return address within Australia; and

(iii) be lodged within six months of the applicant becoming aware of the relevant conduct.

Note: The University’s form for Application for Review of Conduct under Section 53 of the PPIP Act may be used for this purpose

(b) Upon receipt of an application for internal review, a privacy officer will:

(i) refer details of the application and the applicant’s name to the NSW Privacy Commission, as required by section 54(1) of the PPIP Act; and

(ii) keep the NSW Privacy Commissioner informed of the progress of the review.

(c) The internal review will be decided by the Group Secretary or, if that person is unable to do so, by the Secretary to Senate.

(d) The decision maker will:

(i) come to a conclusion about the subject matter of the application;

(ii) advise the applicant of the results and of any action that the University proposes to take in respect of the complaint; and

(iii) report the findings and any proposed actions to the NSW Privacy Commissioner within 60 days of the date of receipt of the application.

(5) A person who is dissatisfied with the way the University deals with internal reviews or who disagrees with the University’s findings can ask the NSW Civil and Administrative Tribunal (NCAT) to review the conduct.

Note: The address of NCAT is available on the University’s privacy website.

(6) Whether or not a person applies for an internal review, they can also make a complaint to the NSW Privacy Commissioner about an alleged breach of their privacy.

Note: The address of the Commissioner is available on the University’s privacy website.

(7) The University’s privacy website will also provide:

(a) significant information about privacy, personal information and health information, and individual rights in relation to them;
(b) information, and links to relevant procedures, for staff, affiliates and students about collecting, storing, using and disclosing personal and health information;
(c) forms to apply for access to or amendment of personal or health information, and for making privacy complaints;
(d) contact details for the University’s privacy officers.
   (i) Privacy officers may be contacted on an identified or anonymous basis.

9 Notifiable privacy breaches

(1) A notifiable privacy breach is a breach that requires notification to one or more of:
   (a) external stakeholders, such as the NSW Privacy Commissioner or the Commonwealth Privacy Commissioner; or
   (b) internal stakeholders, such as those impacted by the breach and other University stakeholders.

(2) A notifiable privacy breach involves one or more of:
   (a) a real risk of serious harm to those impacted by it;
   (b) ongoing consequences, or the risk of ongoing consequences in terms of the number of people who may be impacted;
   (c) the potential for serious reputational damage to the University; or
   (d) the potential for legal or financial penalties to the University.

(3) A notifiable privacy breach requires high level coordinated management response from the University, which will be co-ordinated by the Manager, Archives and Record Management Services.

10 Tax file numbers

(1) As the recipient of tax file numbers, the University will collect, retain and disclose tax file number information of staff and students in accordance with taxation, personal assistance or superannuation law.

Note: See the Privacy (Tax File Number) Rule 2015 issued under section 17 of the Privacy Act 1998 (Cth).

(2) Where required, the University will comply with the notifiable data breach scheme established by the Privacy Act 1998 (Cth).

Note: See Schedule 1 the Privacy Amendment (Notifiable Data Breaches) Act 2017 (Cth).

11 Roles and responsibilities

(1) The Group Secretary is responsible for:
   (a) determining applications for access to, and amendment of, personal information under the privacy acts;
   (b) determining applications for internal review conducted under Part 5 of PPIP Act;
   (c) approving the disclosure of personal information of members of the public, without the individual’s consent in cases of emergency.
(2) **The Secretary to Senate** is responsible for making the decisions referred to in sub-clause 11(1) if the Group Secretary is unable to do so.

(3) **The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar)** is responsible for approving the disclosure of personal information of students without the individual’s consent in cases of emergency.

(4) **The Chief Human Resources Officer** is responsible for approving the disclosure of personal information of staff without the individual’s consent in cases of emergency.

(5) **The Manager, Archives and Records Management Services** is responsible for

   (a) coordinating the management and reporting of notifiable privacy breaches; and

   (b) administering the University’s compliance with the privacy acts

(6) **Privacy officers** are responsible for receiving:

   (a) privacy complaints and requests for information access; and

   (b) reports of breaches of the IPPs and HPPs.

(7) **Unit Heads** are responsible for:

   (a) making contractors and consultants aware of their privacy obligations in relation to their engagement by the University; and

   (b) requiring compliance with this policy and its associated procedures.

(8) **Staff, affiliates and, where appropriate, students:**

   (a) are responsible for ensuring their own work practices comply with this policy and any associated procedures;

   (b) must report any privacy breach to a privacy officer as soon as possible after becoming aware of it.

   **Note:** ICT information security incidents must be reported to ICT Support: [https://intranet.sydney.edu.au/services/it-phones/it-security.html#report](https://intranet.sydney.edu.au/services/it-phones/it-security.html#report)

(9) **Staff and affiliates who direct students’ research** are responsible for ensuring that students under their direction are informed of their obligations under the privacy acts.

### 12 Breaches of this policy

Failure to comply with this policy may constitute misconduct, and may result in disciplinary action being taken by the University.

### 13 Rescissions and replacements

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

(1) Privacy Policy 2013, which commenced on 1 February 2013

(2) Privacy Management Plan 2013, which commenced on 4 April 2013

### NOTES

Privacy Policy 2017
Date adopted: [This is the date on which the policy is formally signed]
Date commenced: [This is the date on which the policy will commence, suggest at least two weeks from date of adoption/approval]
Administrator: Group Secretary
Review date: [This date must be no more than 5 years from the date of commencement.]

Rescinded documents: Privacy Policy 2013
Privacy Management plan 2013

Related documents: Privacy Act 1988 (Commonwealth) Part IIIC
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Health Records and Information Privacy Act 2002 (NSW)
Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009 (NSW)
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| Purpose | To seek approval for  
1) a University-wide course review process and  
2) a Course Review Template  
in order to improve quality assurance and ensure compliance with the Higher Education Standards Framework. |

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board:  
(1) Endorse the proposal to establish a University-wide course review process; and  
(2) endorse the Course Review Template, as presented,  
with effect from 1 January 2018.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A seven-year cycle of comprehensive course reviews is a core standard of the new Higher Education Standards Framework (5.3.1-5.3.3) (“the Standards”) and is also a requirement of the University’s Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 (“the Policy”). The Standards and the Policy both require that the review process is overseen by the Academic Board, and respectively establish a number of requirements for the content of reviews and composition of review panels.

Both the University’s TEQSA Working Group and the University’s external adviser on the TEQSA project have identified Standard 5.3 as a current compliance gap for the University. To date, the University has not had a regular schedule for course reviews, and does not provide faculties with templates or guidelines for the conduct and content of reviews. Recent consultation with faculties has indicated a desire for more guidance from the Academic Board and/or central coordination and support for the course review process.

Three related proposals to improve the University’s compliance with Standard 5.3 have been developed:  
1) To establish of a formal course review schedule detailing completed and planned reviews for the period 2011-2023 (2017 +/- 7 years). Approximately 220 courses or course “families” have been identified as in scope for review. A draft schedule was developed in late 2016.  
2) To establish an enhanced and formalised course review process, in which faculties will be prompted to conduct course reviews and will be provided with relevant data in advance of scheduled reviews.  
3) To adopt a Course Review Template to establish consistent parameters for the conduct and reporting of course reviews.

The purpose of this document is to seek approval for the second and third of these proposals.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

TEQSA requirements and registration process

- As of 1 January 2017, the University is required to be compliant with the new Higher Education Standards Framework. TEQSA can require that the University provide evidence of compliance with any standard at any time.  
- The University of Sydney’s current registration under the TEQSA Act expires on 31 August 2018, and the University must submit an application for re-registration no later than 180 days (6 months approx.) before that date (end of February 2018 approx.).
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- The University has appointed a University Quality Manager who reports to the Provost and is responsible for coordinating the University's application to TEQSA.
- A University-level TEQSA working group comprising the DVC(E), the Chair of the Academic Board, the University Quality Manager, Higher Education Policy and Projects and a group of representatives of portfolios, PSUs and faculties has met monthly since 2016 and has prepared a draft TEQSA Compliance Framework.
- This group has conducted an analysis of compliance gaps, and has identified Standard 5.3 as a critical gap.

Higher Education Standards Framework - Standard 5.3

Standard 5.3 is a core standard, meaning that the University must provide TEQSA with evidence of compliance with this standard as part of its application for reregistration in 2018. It is a new standard in this version of the Framework, and establishes the seven-year timeline for reviews. Sections of Standard 5.3 with which the University is not currently compliant are:

- 5.3.1 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.
- 5.3.2 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, the changing needs of students and identified risks to the quality of the course of study.

The complete text of Standard 5.3 is provided for reference as Attachment 1.

Current practice

Section 11.6 of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 requires that:

“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.”

Faculties currently self-monitor compliance with this aspect of the Policy. The Academic Board has recently undertaken a process to develop a course review schedule, but does not currently specify review guidelines, provide a standard review template or prompt faculties to complete reviews. Advice from the Secretariat has indicated that the Board is provided with the outcome of course reviews on an ad-hoc basis, usually as part of a formal course amendment proposal. Board minutes do not provide any indication that the Board or its committees have considered any course reviews not associated with a course amendment proposal over the past 12 months.

Course reviews are also within the remit of the University Executive’s Curriculum and Course Planning Committee (CCPC), the terms of reference for which include provision for CCPC to “Review degree programs and make recommendations to SEG [UE] for appropriate reform and improvement”. The CCPC does not currently maintain a schedule for the review of individual courses.

ISSUES

Compliance with Standard 5.3 will require that the University adopts a systematic and consistent approach to the scheduling, conduct and reporting of course reviews. The establishment of a course review process is also an opportunity for the University to implement quality assurance processes which exceed the minimum compliance requirements of the Standards, and provide an effective mechanism for quality assurance of courses across a broad range of educational and sustainability considerations.

While the course review process will apply to all courses, the Academic Board may in future wish to consider and consult with the Education portfolio on how it is applied to the generalist Bachelor degrees in the new undergraduate curriculum. Review at the level of major or stream may be useful to supplement course-level review for these degrees.
Scale and resourcing
The latest draft of the Academic Board’s course review schedule identified approximately 220 courses or embedded course “families” that will be subject to the course review process, although this number is expected to gradually decline as the new undergraduate curriculum takes effect. For now, this would equate to approximately 31 individual course reviews each year over a seven year cycle. The course review process therefore needs to be efficiently support meaningful review and oversight of courses at this volume, and to minimise the administrative impost of the review process on academic units, governance bodies and the portfolios.

Options for minimising the administrative impost of the course review process include:

- Conducting reviews of portfolios of courses (e.g. Business School postgraduate coursework; non-accredited Nursing courses) rather than individual courses in order to minimise the number of review panels required and identify and consider common issues across programs.
- Aligning course reviews with external and professional accreditation reviews where applicable. While TEQSA does not regard professional accreditation reviews (generally focused on inputs rather than student outcomes) as sufficient for compliance with Standard 5.3, faculties could add any additional student-focused criteria to accreditation processes rather than conducting multiple reviews.
- Using existing reports and forms throughout the process where possible, for example by using professional accreditation reports in course review submissions, and alignment between or acceptance of course review documents as justification for course amendment proposals.
- The development of a standard course information pack/report (“Know Your Course”), available to faculties either on a regular schedule or as required so that course review panels can direct their attention to analysis rather than data gathering.

Academic Board approval for two related proposals is sought:

1. **Course review process**
   The course review process detailed in Attachment 2 proposes that the newly formed University Quality team support the course review process by maintaining course review schedules and action logs, coordinating the provision of data and input from portfolios to faculties and serving as a central point of contact for the review process. Faculties will retain responsibility for establishing review panels and conducting course reviews. The Academic Board will retain responsibility for oversight of the process overall, review of the content of individual course reviews, monitoring implementation of review recommendations, and for establishing and maintaining an appropriate channel for the reporting of course review outcomes to the Senate. CCPC could be incorporated in the review or reporting process on either a routine or an as-required basis.

   The role of the University Quality team in this process would be limited to supporting the administrative aspects of the course review process, analogous to the role played by the Provost’s office in preparing the schedule, templates and data for the joint Academic Board-UE Reviews of Faculties. It is anticipated that the resource implications for the University Quality Office could be met from within the existing staff budget for this office.

2. **Course review template**
   A Course Review Template is provided in Attachment 3. This draft draws on the current Course Management Template in order to reduce duplication if faculties need to submit course review and course amendment requests simultaneously. It also draws on a previous Academic Board course review template circa 2004, responds to the requirements of the HESF and addresses issues commonly included in previous course reviews submitted to the Board. The draft template does not currently include detailed financial or market analysis, which is beyond the requirements of the HESF and the remit of the Academic Board, but could be incorporated in future versions of the draft template for CCPC purposes.

   The attached template has been designed to support establishment of a course review process to meet the requirements of the HESF as an immediate priority in 2017. In the longer term, there are significant opportunities for process improvements such as streamlining and/or integrating course proposal, course amendment and course review templates; the use of online forms, data verification and workflow processes; integration with the new curriculum mapping system; and greater collaboration between faculties, portfolios and PSUs at various stages of the review process.
CONSULTATION

USC, GSC, CPCC, UE-Education, DVC-Education, Provost and DVC, and representatives from FASS, Science, Business, Health Sciences, Medicine, Nursing and Law.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Higher Education Standards Framework - Standard 5.3 Review, Monitoring and Improvement (pg. 4)
Attachment 2: Proposed course review process (pg. 5)
Attachment 3: Draft Course Review Template (pg. 7)
Attachment 1: Higher Education Standards Framework - Standard 5.3 Review, Monitoring and Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.3</th>
<th>Monitoring, Review and Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3.1</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.2</td>
<td>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, the changing needs of students and identified risks to the quality of the course of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.3</td>
<td>Comprehensive reviews of courses of study are informed and supported by regular interim monitoring of the quality of teaching and supervision of research students, student progress and the overall delivery of units within each course of study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5.3.4 | Review and improvement activities include regular external referencing of the success of student cohorts against comparable courses of study, including:  
   a. analyses of progression rates, attrition rates, completion times and rates and, where applicable, comparing different locations of delivery, and  
   b. the assessment methods and grading of students’ achievement of learning outcomes for selected units of study within courses of study. |
| 5.3.5 | All students have opportunities to provide feedback on their educational experiences and student feedback informs institutional monitoring, review and improvement activities. |
| 5.3.6 | All teachers and supervisors have opportunities to review feedback on their teaching and research supervision and are supported in enhancing these activities. |
| 5.3.7 | The results of regular monitoring, comprehensive reviews and external referencing and student feedback are used to mitigate future risks to the quality of the education provided and to guide and evaluate improvements, including the use of data on student progress and success to inform admission criteria and approaches to course design, teaching, supervision, learning and academic support. |
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Attachment 2: Proposed course review process

1. Scheduling and preparation
   • Establish and maintain review schedule (UQM)
   • Confirm scheduled reviews with faculties 6 months in advance (UQM)
   • Ensure that faculties receive/have access to the course information pack^2 (UQM)
   • Provide faculties with any other relevant information or input from portfolios (UQM)

2. Course review
   • Appoint course review panel (faculty)
   • Conduct course review (faculty)
   • Complete course review template and submit to relevant AB subcommittee (faculty)

3. AB/CCPC review
   • Note and discuss course review^3 (AB [CPCC?])
   • Request additional information from faculty if required (AB [CPCC?])
   • Advise UQM when review is finalised so review schedule and action logs can be updated.

4. Report to Senate and ongoing monitoring
   • Include summary of course reviews and key issues in reports to Senate (AB)
   • Annual report on implementation of recommendations to relevant AB committee (faculty)

Notes:
1. AB = Academic Board, UQM = University Quality Manager, IAP = Institutional Analytics and Planning, Ed = Education Portfolio, CCPC = Course and Curriculum Planning Committee, faculty = faculty or University School
2. Providing faculties/University schools with a standard suite of relevant data upfront would:
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a) minimise the need for and workload implications of ad-hoc requests for data to IAP, the Education portfolio and other parts of the University,

b) ensure that data are consistent and comparable across faculties,

c) provide faculties with access to essential data and data they might not otherwise consider and

d) allow faculties to direct resources for the review towards analysis and planning rather than background research and information gathering.

The UQM will work with IAP and the Education portfolio to develop a standard data pack which can be efficiently generated for multiple reviews. Subject to availability at course level, this will include data such as student demand, load, demographics, retention, mobility, success, progression and completion rates, Go8 benchmarking including the QVS, surveys such as the USS, CEQ and other QILT surveys, educational integrity stats, graduate quality outcomes (when finalised) and key strategy metrics.

3. An evaluation template including background information or guidance notes on specific standards or parts of the course review template could be prepared to support discussion at the relevant AB committee.
Course Review Template

It is a requirement of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 that faculties ensure that award courses receive a comprehensive review including external referencing or other benchmarking at least every seven years and forward a report of the review to the Academic Board. In accordance with the Higher Education Standards Framework, this review must include 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 take account of emerging developments in the field of education, modes of delivery, the changing needs of students and identified risks to the quality of the course of study. These comprehensive reviews must be informed and supported by regular interim monitoring of the quality of teaching and supervision of research students, student progress and the overall delivery of units within each course of study.

Course review panels should be established by the faculty/University school responsible for the award course and comprise of at least six members including:

- A Chair, who may be an academic member of staff internal or external to the faculty/University school, or an external stakeholder with appropriate expertise;
- At least two representatives from the academic disciplines responsible for teaching in the award course;
- At least two academic staff members from two different faculties/University schools other than the faculty/University school responsible for the award course;
- At least one student enrolled in, or recently graduated from the award course; and
- Relevant stakeholders from professions or industry, as determined by the committee responsible for oversight of the award course.

All academic members of the course review panel should be selected on the basis of recognised educational excellence.

Where a course has been reviewed or accredited by an external professional body, the faculty may choose to complete some sections of this template by referring to the relevant sections or pages of the accreditation report, which should be attached to the completed template.

Faculties/University schools will be provided with a course data pack [in development] including key statistics, benchmarking data and information from the portfolios at least 3 months in advance of scheduled reviews as per the Course Review Schedule.

Completed course review templates should be submitted to the [TBC pending new Academic Board structure in 2018] Committee of the Academic Board. The annual calendar of relevant committee meetings is located online at: http://sydney.edu.au/secretariat/academic-board-committees/academic-board/index.shtml

Faculties/University schools are required to report to [Committee] on the implementation of the recommendations of the review on an annual basis until all recommended actions have been taken.

Enquiries about this template may be submitted to [contact TBC].
### PART 1: COURSE DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Course name: e.g., Master of Social Studies (International)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Course abbreviation: e.g., MSocStud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Combined degree? □ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Combined type: (if applicable) □ Combined means a single program with a single set of course Resolutions leading to the award of two degrees unless otherwise specified in the Resolutions □ Double means a program where students are permitted by participating faculties (and/or by specific Resolutions within a single award) to transfer between courses in order to complete two awards □ Combined Level means a single program with a single set of course Resolutions leading to the award of two degrees at two different levels unless otherwise specified in the Resolutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Honours offered? □ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Honours type: (if applicable) □ Appended Students satisfy requirements for the award of a Bachelor (Pass) degree and on this basis qualify for admission to an additional Honours year □ Integrated Students undertake Honours components in Year 2, Year 3 etc. of the Bachelor course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Course group: □ Undergraduate □ Postgraduate coursework □ Postgraduate research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Course AQF Level □ Level 5: Diploma □ Level 6: Advanced diploma/Associate degree □ Level 7: Bachelor degree □ Level 8: Bachelor Honours degree, Graduate Certificate, Graduate Diploma □ Level 9: Masters degree (research, coursework and extended) □ Level 10: Doctoral degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Short course description: for the UAC Guide, Good Universities Guide Limit 40 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Full course description: for Sydney Courses Limit 200 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Expected normal length of candidature: Full-time Min: Max: Part-time Min: Max:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Minimum credit points for completion:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Location/campus for student attendance: □ Camperdown and Darlington □ Camden □ Cumberland □ Rozelle □ Conservatorium □ Mallett Street □ Fully online □ Offshore (please specify): □ Other (please specify): □ Hospital (Clinic) (please specify):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Mode of delivery: Face-to-face teaching □ Yes □ No ___% Will international students be able to study in ‘face-to-face’ mode for at least 75% of the time each semester? □ Yes □ No ___% Distance education □ Yes □ No ___% Offshore delivery □ Yes □ No ___%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>Timetabling: □ Standard □ Non-standard (e.g. Summer or Winter School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>Does the course involve clinical or industrial placement/experience? □ Yes □ No If yes, please provide details, including a list of the Units of Study, and advise whether or not appropriate clinical/internship partnerships are in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>Does the course involve internships or overseas study? □ Yes □ No If yes, please provide details, including a list of the Units of Study and location (city/region)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>Is this a course which provides entry to a profession i.e. needs professional accreditation? □ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART 2: REVIEW DETAILS

2.1 REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position title and organisation (if applicable)</th>
<th>Student or recent graduate (Y/N)</th>
<th>External to University (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Consultees</th>
<th>Method of consultation</th>
<th>Evidence of consultation*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART 3: COURSE CONTEXT

3.1 STRATEGIC AND ACADEMIC RATIONALE

Explain the purpose and value of the course and describe its alignment with University and Faculty strategy. Comment on any specific issues raised by the portfolios in the course data pack (if applicable).

---

3.2 ACADEMIC OBJECTIVES AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

Describe the overall academic aims of the course and specify the learning outcomes that graduates will demonstrate and achieve by the conclusion of the course. Note if these have changed since course approval / the previous course review (whichever is more recent). Relate these outcomes to the University’s Graduate Qualities and the outcomes specified at the appropriate course level in the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF).

---

3.3 MARKET ANALYSIS

Describe the general level of demand, competition, pricing etc for the course in the market, emphasising changes since course establishment/ previous review (whichever is more recent).
3.4 DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL COMPARATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Name of comparable course</th>
<th>Domestic Fees/ EFTSL</th>
<th>International Fees/ EFTSL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 COURSE HISTORY
Describe any major changes to the course since course approval / the previous course review (whichever is more recent). If the learning outcomes have changed, show how the new outcomes map to AQF learning outcomes (in terms of knowledge, skills and application of knowledge and skills descriptions of learning outcomes) at the appropriate course level.

3.6 DEVELOPMENTS IN FIELD OF EDUCATION
Describe recent or emerging developments in the field of education e.g. changing content, student demographics, course delivery methods or emerging issues in the field.

PART 4. STUDENT COHORT
Data related to questions 4.1 and 4.2 are provided in the Course Review Pack.

4.1 STUDENT PROFILE
Indicate the optimal size and composition of the student cohort for this course. Has the cohort been achieved, and if not, how is this being addressed?

4.2 STUDENT DEMAND
Describe any significant trends or changes in student demand for the course or specific majors (if applicable) within the course since the last review. Indicate if student demand is sufficient to sustain the desired enrolment profile for the course.

4.3 ADMISSIONS
Specify the major admissions methods/pathways for this course. Evaluate the effectiveness of admissions criteria, pathways and processes.
PART 5. LEARNING AND TEACHING

5.1 COURSE STRUCTURE
Briefly describe the overall structure of the course. Specify any core, barrier or capstone units, and list available majors. Evaluate the overall structure of the course. Consider questions such as: is the course structure current and relevant? Does the content in the core and the majors reflect recent developments in the field of education? Do the core and majors (if available) provide a coherent sequence of learning aligned to learning outcomes and supporting the achievement and evaluation of graduate qualities?

5.2 PEDAGOGICAL APPROACH
Describe the pedagogical approach adopted within core units and across the award course as a whole (lectures and tutorials, laboratory-based learning, one-to-one instruction, experience-based learning in professional placement, etc). Do the chosen modes of delivery facilitate student learning; for example, what is the purpose of the use of lectures/tutorials/online units/laboratory work/studio or performance experience in terms of achieving the stated learning outcomes? Provide details of any mandatory placements or fieldwork.

5.3 ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES
Specify the assessment regime in each core, barrier and capstone unit of study i.e. the proportion of coursework to practical components and examinations. Indicate whether external assessors are used and describe the benchmarking or reporting role of such assessors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Study</th>
<th>Assessment (%)</th>
<th>Use of external assessors/examiners (Yes/No) (if yes, please provide details)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 ASSURANCE OF LEARNING
Evaluate if the assessment regime in 5.3 ensures that the learning outcomes and graduate qualities have been achieved. This section should address the issue of how assessments provide an assurance of learning in terms of the learning outcomes of the course described at 3.2 above.
5.5 QUALITY ASSURANCE
What quality assurance processes are used in the assessment of students’ work, and measuring the extent of students achieving learning outcomes? Have any subject areas within the course been evaluated through the Group of Eight’s Quality Verification System, a similar external benchmarking process or a professional body and with what outcome?

5.6 ACCESSIBILITY AND SUPPORT
Describe and evaluate the teaching strategies and delivery modes used in this course to ensure the needs of students with different learning styles and/or from culturally diverse backgrounds and/or with disability are addressed.

5.7 TEACHING QUALITY
Describe how teaching quality is monitored, including how feedback from Unit of Study surveys and any other formal and/or informal feedback on teaching has been used to improve teaching quality in this course.

5.8 BENCHMARKING
Evaluate the content and quality of the course in relation to similar courses at other universities. Describe any examples of good practice that could be adopted from other universities. (Some benchmarking data are provided in the course review pack; course review committees may also consider other sources of information such as course outlines from similar courses or feedback from advisory panels, graduate employers, industry groups or peers at other institutions).

PART 6. STUDENT OUTCOMES
Data related to questions in Part 6 are provided in the Course Review Pack.

6.1 STUDENT RETENTION
Is the retention rate (percentage of students who have either re-enrolled in or completed the course year-on-year) both a) similar to that of comparable internal and external courses and b) satisfactory in terms of course and University objectives? Describe any plans or current initiatives designed to improve retention rates (if applicable).

6.2 STUDENT SUCCESS AND COMPLETION
Are success (unit of study pass rates), and completion (percentage of students who complete course requirements) rates both a) similar to that of comparable internal and external courses and b) satisfactory in terms of course and University
6.3 ACHIEVEMENT OF LEARNING OUTCOMES
Describe the outcomes of the assurance of learning processes described at 3.2. Indicate to what extent students are achieving course learning outcomes. Evaluate if the assessment regime provides valid and reliable data about student achievement of learning outcomes. Describe any plans or current initiatives designed to support or improve achievement of learning outcomes (if applicable).

6.4 ACHIEVEMENT OF GRADUATE QUALITIES
For courses where graduate outcomes are currently tracked: Indicate to what extent graduates demonstrate achievement of graduate qualities. Evaluate if the assessment regime provides valid and reliable data about student achievement of graduate qualities. Describe any plans or current initiatives designed to support or improve achievement of graduate qualities (if applicable).

6.5 STUDENT MOBILITY
Is the level of study mobility within the course satisfactory? Does the course structure provide opportunities for students to undertake international mobility experience/s?

6.6 STUDENT FEEDBACK
Indicate how students are involved in course governance and the mechanisms available for students to provide feedback on their educational experience in this course. Describe any changes made in response to student feedback.

6.7 GRADUATE DESTINATIONS
What are the graduate destinations of students who have completed this course? What action to ensure successful graduate outcomes is planned or underway?
6.8 GRADUATE SURVEYS
Does the course perform substantially better or worse on any specific aspects of the Course Experience Questionnaire and the Graduate Outcomes Survey than comparable programs? Describe any plans or current initiatives designed to improve graduate outcomes overall or in relation to specific elements of the CEQ or GOS.

PART 7: RESOURCES
7.1 RESOURCE SUFFICIENCY
Are adequate resources for the delivery of the program currently available in each of the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Available? Y/N (if no, specify any plans to address unmet resource need)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and support staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional placement locations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other resources (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART 8: OUTCOMES OF REVIEW
8.1 SUMMARY
Summarise the overall findings/conclusions and recommendations of the course review committee. (Note that any changes to the course will require approval through the Course Amendment process.)

8.2 STRENGTHS AND OPPORTUNITIES
Identify the major strengths of the course, and specify if any opportunities for development or improvement have been identified.

8.3 RECOMMENDATIONS
List of the recommendations of the review panel in order of priority, where 1 is the most important.

8.4 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
Provide an action plan specifying how each recommendation will implemented, who is responsible, the due date and how it will be reviewed. The faculty/University school should report to the Academic Board on the progress of implantation of recommendations on an annual basis, with the first update due 12 months after the submission of this initial review report.
8.5 REVIEW SCHEDULE
Courses must be reviewed at least every seven years, but may be reviewed more frequently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of next review (month/year)</th>
<th>Full or Partial Review? (for partial review, please detail)</th>
<th>Purpose of review (internal / external / accreditation (include name of accrediting body) /other)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Author | Sarah Vandepeer, Senior Policy and Project Officer
Reviewer/Approver | Peter McCallum, Director, Education Strategy
Paper title | Higher Education Standards Framework and University Policy
Purpose | To advise the Committee on education policy initiatives arising from an audit against the Higher Education Standards Framework

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee:
(1) recommend that the Academic Board approve the amendment of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015, as presented in Attachment 1, and the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016, as presented in Attachment 2, and recommend that the Academic Board adopt the amended Policy and Procedures;
(2) recommend that the Academic Board approve the amendment of the Student Placement Policy (renamed the Student Placement and Projects Policy), as presented in Attachment 3, and recommend that the Academic Board adopt the amended Policy;
(3) recommend that the Academic Board invite the Vice Chancellor to approve the Educational Services Agreements Policy 2017, as presented in Attachment 4, and recommend the adoption of the amended Policy; and
(4) recommend that the Academic Board invite the Vice Chancellor to rescind the Agreements for Educational Services Policy 2011, as presented in Attachment 5, and the Agreements for Educational Services Procedures 2011, as presented in Attachment 6.

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 during 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 and Agreements for Educational Services Policy 2011 will be replaced by a policy on Educational Services Agreements.

The Academic Standards and Policy Committee considered these three policies at its meeting of 8 August and resolved to recommend them to the Academic Board subject to revision by the Policy Unit. The attached versions incorporate feedback received both at that meeting and during further consultation with faculties and the Policy Unit. In summary the proposals recommend the following changes to existing policy:
- The Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 has been updated to reflect changes to the Delegations of Authority. Section 24A, Qualifications of teachers, co-ordinators and supervisors, has been added to the policy and, since the meeting on 8 August, 24A (3) has been amended to broaden exceptions to
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The rule that teaching academics must have qualifications one higher than the AQF level classes. Clause 24(8) of the Learning and Teaching Policy and clause 12(1) of the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016 have been deleted to remove reference to the Australian Higher Education Graduation Statement (AHEGS).

- The definition of project has been refined in the Student Placements and Projects Policy 2017, taking into account feedback received at the ASPC on 8 August.
- The provisional title ‘Collaborative Education and Research Training Agreements Policy’ has been changed to ‘Educational Services Agreements Policy 2017’ reflecting the combining of this draft policy with the Agreements for Educational Services Policy 2011, expanding the scope and flexibility to identify new types of agreements in future. Other changes since the meeting of 8 August include updates the risk management section to reflect the current University risk strategy, clearer distinction between MOUs and agreements and the additional requirement for agreements to be registered in the University’s contracts register.

These policies will be presented to the Academic Board on 10 October.

The current Agreements for Educational Services Policy 2011 will be replaced by the new Educational Services Agreements Policy 2017 and should be rescinded. The Guidelines for Inter-institutional Agreements 1997 has already been rescinded by the Academic Board on 29 August.

**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.

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>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 3 Teaching</td>
<td>3.2 Staffing</td>
<td>(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.</td>
<td>A section 24 A has been inserted in Part 4 of the Learning and Teaching Policy (Attachment 1) setting out the qualifications of teaching staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section of the HESF</td>
<td>Subsection</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Deliver with Other Parties</td>
<td>Also 5.2 Academic and Research Integrity (4)</td>
<td>(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.</td>
<td>1. The Student Placement Policy (Attachment 3) be reviewed and expanded to cover 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Also 6.1 Corporate Governance (3)(c)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>2. The Guidelines on Inter-Institutional Agreements and the Agreements for Educational Services Policy 2011 be rescinded and replaced by a Educational Services Agreements Policy 2017 (Attachment 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Also 7.3 Information Management (1) (j)</td>
<td>2. When a course of study, any parts of a course of study, or research training are delivered through arrangements with another party(ies), whether in Australia or overseas, the registered higher education provider remains accountable for the course of study and verifies continuing compliance of the course of study with the standards in the Higher Education Standards Framework that relate to the specific arrangement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSULTATION**

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 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. A draft of the policy was circulated to this working group on 28 July for further feedback.

A memo on HESF-related policy amendments was circulated to the UE Research Training Committee (12 July), the University Executive (20 July), the Undergraduate Studies Committee/Graduate Studies Committee (1 August), the UE Education committee (7 August), Academic Standards and Policy Committee (8 August).

Policy amendments and proposals will be presented as follows:
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1. Learning and Teaching Policy
   Academic Standards and Policy Committee – 26 September
   Academic Board – 10 October

2. Student Placement Policy
   Undergraduate Studies Committee/Graduate Studies Committee – 1 August
   Academic Standards and Policy Committee – 26 September
   Academic Board – 10 October

3. Educational Services Agreements Policy
   Academic Standards and Policy Committee – 26 September
   Academic Board – 10 October

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 - Amendments to the Learning and Teaching Policy
Attachment 2 - Amendments to the Learning and Teaching Procedures
Attachment 3 - Amendments to the Student Placement Policy (renamed the Student Placement and Projects Policy)
Attachment 4 – Educational Services Agreements Policy
Attachment 5 - Agreements for Educational Services Policy (to be rescinded)
Attachment 6 - Agreements for Educational Services Procedures (to be rescinded)
LEARNING AND TEACHING POLICY 2015

The Academic Board, as delegate of the Senate of the University of Sydney, adopts the following policy.

Dated: 2 December 2015

Last amended: [insert date]

Signature: 

Position: Chair, Academic Board
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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, 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 or University school 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 in 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:

- in relation to a faculty, the Dean of the relevant faculty.
- in relation to a University school, the Head of School and Dean of the relevant University school.

See: University of Sydney (Governance of Faculties and University Schools) Rule 2016

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, University school or appropriate board of studies and in this policy refers to the faculty, faculties or University schools responsible for the relevant award course.

See: University of Sydney (Governance of Faculties and University Schools) Rule 2016

faculty office means the professional staff led by a faculty manager or faculty general 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 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 Director means the 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.

teacher means a member of the academic staff involved in any of teaching, unit of study coordination or assessment.

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

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

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

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

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

10 Academic integrity

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

Policy and procedures relating to academic honesty in coursework are set out in the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 and the Academic Honesty Procedures 2016.

11 Collegial governance

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.

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.

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.

Committees responsible for award courses may:

(a) make recommendations to the faculty or Head 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.
(b) 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.

(3) 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></td>
<td>• Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrated identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative and group-based learning activities and assessments</td>
<td>• Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrated identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Influence</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.

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 learning experiences</td>
<td>• Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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.
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.

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

Note: See Coursework Policy 2014

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.

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.

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) University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016; and
   (b) University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule 2016.

(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 Part 4 and Part 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.
Supervisors
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.

Heads of School
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 school 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.

Unit of study co-ordinators
Each unit of study must have a named unit of study co-ordinator, appointed by the relevant Head of School.

(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 School 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.

(13) 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.

(14) 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) a transcript;  
(b) a certificate of graduate status; and  
(c) a testamur.  

*Note:* See clause 12 of those procedures.

24A Qualifications of teachers, co-ordinators and supervisors

(1) Heads of school must appoint unit of study co-ordinators and teachers who have appropriate knowledge, skills and qualifications, including:

(a) up to date knowledge of a relevant field or discipline, which is informed by any of:  
   (i) ongoing research;  
   (ii) scholarship; or  
   (iii) contemporary professional practice; and  
(b) relevant skills in learning, teaching and assessment.

(2) Individuals teaching, co-ordinating or supervising units of study in award courses below AQF Level 10 must have:

(a) a relevant qualification at least one AQF level higher than the course being taught, co-ordinated or supervised;  
(b) equivalent academic attainment; or  
(c) equivalent professional experience; or  
(d) appropriate training, and as well as guidance and oversight from a supervisor or coordinator who is an academic staff member with the qualifications, experience, knowledge and skills in 24A(1) and 24A(2) (a) to (c), be undergoing appropriate training in higher education teaching.

(3) Individuals appointed on the basis of subclauses 24A(2)(a) to (c) may also co-ordinate units of study in award courses below AQF Level 10.
Individuals appointed on the basis of subclauses 24A(2)(d) may be appointed to teach specialised components of a course such as demonstrating or tutoring but must not be appointed to co-ordinate units of study or as the sole-teacher.

Individuals teaching, co-ordinating or supervising units of study in an award course at AQF Level 10 must have:

(a) a relevant qualification at AQF Level 10;
(b) equivalent academic attainment; or
(c) equivalent professional experience; or
(d) appropriate training, and as well as guidance and oversight from a supervisor or coordinator who is an academic staff member with the qualifications, experience, knowledge and skills in 24A(1) and 24A(4) (a)-(c).

If individuals are appointed on the basis of equivalent academic merit or professional experience under subclauses 24A(2) (b) to (d) or 24A(4) (b) to (d), the academic attainment or professional experience must be documented and approved in writing by the head of school;

Note: Records of approval must be retained and stored consistently with the requirements of the University Recordkeeping Policy and the Privacy Policy 2013.

If an individual is appointed under subclause 24A(2), their work must be overseen or supervised by an appropriate University staff member who possesses the relevant AQF qualification; or
If an individual is appointed under subclause 24A(3), their work must be guided or co-ordinated by an appropriate University staff member who possesses an AQF Level 10 qualification.

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

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.

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 Deputy 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.

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
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(I) 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.

(3) For staff employed prior to 1 January 2018, Section 24A Subclause 2(a)(ii) and (2)b(i) take effect on by 31 December 2018.
# 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfy attendance and assessment requirements.</td>
<td>Encouraged to participate in the development and review of courses and units of study.</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 co-ordinator.</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 school</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appoint a unit of study co-ordinator for each unit of study within the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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 schools, 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>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean - Education</td>
<td>Lead and co-ordinate strategies for educational excellence, improvement and innovation across the faculty.</td>
<td>Co-ordinate teaching across the faculty to deliver excellence in educational outcomes and experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On behalf of the Dean establish effective processes for achieving graduate outcomes through engaged enquiry.</td>
<td>Review and act on data on educational quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Align educational standards and quality within the faculty with the University policy and strategy.</td>
<td>Establish and implement collegial governance, as set out in Clause 11, in the creation and review of educational programs within the faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support quality of learning and teaching across the faculty as set out in Part 5.</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>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have strategic oversight of faculties, the Associate Dean - Education and heads of school and heads of schools to ensure alignment with faculty strategy and operations (resources).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review and act on data relating to educational quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consistently with the <em>Coursework Policy 2014</em>, set operational parameters for teaching and curriculum (e.g. teaching workloads, staff profile, fees, student numbers.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make arrangements for quality assurance of teaching and learning within the faculty as set out in Part 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include, where appropriate, student representatives on standard governance committees and provide them with same information as other committee members to enable effective participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</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>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.</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></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and act on data on educational quality and ensure educational excellence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrench academic integrity within the assessment framework of each award course at each stage of the program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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></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 Education</td>
<td>Establish and support institutional systems and strategy to deliver the educational mission in order to achieve excellence in outcomes, experience and environment (e.g. infrastructure, IT, curriculum frameworks, student experience). Deliver quality assurance measures as set out in Part 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Vice-Chancellor Registrar</td>
<td>Establish and support institutional systems and strategy to deliver the educational mission in relation to admission, recruitment, and administration processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| University                    | Through faculties, the Academic Board and the University Executive (UE) Education Committee, review and act on:  
  • reports of program committees, including curriculum review and assessment standards;  
  • data on educational quality; and  
  • academic integrity.                       |                                                                                                 |
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1 Purpose and application

(1) These procedures are to give effect to the *Learning and Teaching Policy 2015* (*the policy*).

(2) These procedures apply to the learning and teaching in coursework award courses.

2 Commencement

These procedures commence on 25 July 2016.

3 Interpretation

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

   Note: See clause 6 of the policy.

(2) In these procedures:

   - **CCPC** means the University Executive Curriculum and Course Planning Committee.
   - **change** in relation to an award course or unit of study, includes an amendment to, or deletion of, the award course or unit of study.
   - **faculty** in relation to the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, a reference to a faculty includes a reference to the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.
   - **Sydney Student** means the University’s online student administration system.
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.

unit of study master file means the central computerised repository of details of all units of study offered by the University in a given year, which is compiled and maintained by the office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar).

USS means Unit of Study Survey.

4 Process for approving new or changed courses

(1) No new or changed course may be advertised or offered until approval or preliminary approval has been obtained, as specified in this clause.

(a) It is the responsibility of the relevant Deans and faculty managers to ensure that necessary approvals are obtained in good time to meet any applicable external or internal deadlines. Meeting schedules are available on the relevant committee websites.

Note: Academic Board meeting dates; Academic Board committee dates; CCPC meeting dates; UE meeting dates.

(b) Key dates include:

(i) cut off dates for notifying Year 10 students of changes that may affect HSC subject selection;
(ii) cut-off date for the Universities Admissions Centre Guide for admissions in the subsequent calendar year;
(iii) deadline for publication of the faculty handbook for the subsequent year; and
(iv) finalisation date for the units of study master file for the subsequent year.

(2) The Academic Board may provide a preliminary approval for new or changed courses before the required endorsements are obtained if the new or changed course may affect students’ subject choices for Year 11 and Year 12 (for example, the establishment of a pre-requisite).

(3) Faculties proposing new or changed courses must provide notice of the proposed change to any other faculty or school which might be affected by it before submitting an expression of interest or proposal (as appropriate).

(4) Faculties wishing to make a minor change to an existing course are not required to comply with subclauses 4(3) to 4(7) inclusive, but may instead:

(a) develop a full proposal as required by subclause 4(6);
(b) submit it to the relevant Academic Board committee; and then
(c) follow the remainder of the process set out in this clause.
(5) Faculties wishing to introduce a new course or to make a major change to an existing course must submit an expression of interest to the CCPC before work commences on developing the new or changed course.

(6) Expressions of interest must:
   (a) explain the strategic rationale for the course or changed course;
   (b) briefly outline the business case;
   (c) identify potential issues which may arise in the development process; and
   (d) be submitted in the form prescribed by the CCPC.

   Note: Expression of interest forms are available from the staff intranet.

(7) The CCPC will consider the expression of interest and determine whether to recommend it to the University Executive for endorsement.

   (a) The CCPC may request a faculty representative to attend at a meeting of the CCPC to explain the case for the new or changed course.

(8) If the University Executive endorses the expression of interest, the faculty may then develop a full course proposal, using the template determined by the Academic Board for that purpose.

   Note: Course proposal forms are available from the staff intranet

(9) Proposals for changed courses must include details of transitional arrangements to ensure that students already enrolled in the course are not disadvantaged.

(10) The full proposal must then be submitted for review and endorsement to:
   (a) the CCPC, and if endorsed
   (b) the Undergraduate or Graduate Studies Committee (as appropriate) of the Academic Board.

(11) Once the endorsement of the Undergraduate or Graduate Studies Committee has been obtained, the full proposal may be submitted to the Academic Board for approval.

(12) In considering proposals for new or amended courses, the chairs of committees whose endorsement is sought may form small working parties to consider proposals and report on them.

5 Matters to be considered in relation to proposals for new or changed courses

(1) Decision makers must take the following matters into consideration before endorsing or approving a new award course or changes to an existing award course:
   (a) the academic need for, and merit of, the proposed course or change;
   (b) the aims of the course, including how it will meet faculty and University goals;
   (c) whether, and how, the proposed course or change will maximise internal collaborations;
   (d) the learning outcomes, and the effectiveness of plans for their development and assessment;
(e) alignment of the learning outcomes with the graduate qualities, and the effectiveness of plans for developing and assessing achievement of the graduate qualities;

(f) the extent and effectiveness of consultation undertaken with relevant faculties and schools, and where appropriate, external accreditation bodies;

(g) consistency with University policies and procedures, and any applicable external requirements;

(h) potential resource impacts, including:
   (i) workload implications;
   (ii) financial sustainability;
   (iii) impact on University libraries;
   (iv) impact on information and communications technology;
   (v) impact on physical spaces and learning environments; and
   (vi) impact on resources of other faculties, schools and departments;

(i) the availability and appropriateness of mechanisms for evaluating and, if necessary improving:
   (i) quality;
   (ii) delivery; and
   (iii) academic outcomes.

6 Process for approving new or changed units of study

(1) No new or changed unit of study may be advertised or offered until approval has been obtained, as specified in this clause.

(a) It is the responsibility of the relevant Deans and faculty managers to ensure that necessary approvals are obtained in good time to meet any applicable external or internal deadlines. Meeting schedules are available on the relevant committee websites.

   Note: Academic Board meeting dates; Academic Board committee dates; - CCPC meeting dates; UE meeting dates.

(b) Key dates include:
   (i) deadline for the publication of the faculty handbook for the subsequent year;
   (ii) finalisation date for the units of study master file for the subsequent year; and
   (iii) deadlines set by faculties for the approval of units of study.
(2) Faculties, or where relevant the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), proposing new or changed units of study must:
   (a) provide advance notice of the proposed change to any faculty or school which might be affected, particularly those offering award courses in which the unit of study is listed in the unit of study table, before seeking approval; and
   (b) submit proposals for approval in the relevant faculty-approved template.

(3) Proposals for new or changed units of study which are, or are proposed to be, under the faculty’s academic direction in a degree of the faculty must be:
   (a) approved by the faculty; and
   (b) where the changes result in a change to award course requirements or the table of units of study for an award course, approved by the Academic Board.

(4) Proposals for new or changed units of study which are, or are proposed to be, under the faculty’s academic direction in the shared pool of units of study available across all Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees must be:
   (a) endorsed by the unit of study co-ordinator, or in the case of new units of study, the relevant head of school;
   (b) approved in terms of rationale, curriculum, assessment and learning outcomes by the faculty; and
   (c) approved for inclusion in the shared pool by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.

(5) Proposals for new or changed units of study which are not, or are proposed not to be, under a faculty’s academic direction but will be included in the shared pool of units of study available across all Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees must be:
   (a) endorsed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education); and
   (b) approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.

(6) Units of study which are, or are proposed to be, included in the open learning environment, Sydney Research Seminars, or interdisciplinary units of study available across all Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees, or offered to all students as specified in the degree resolutions, must be:
   (a) endorsed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) or the faculty; and
   (b) approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.

(7) Faculties and the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies (as appropriate) must report approved new or changed units of study to the Undergraduate or Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board (as appropriate) at least annually.

7 Award course resolutions

(1) Award course resolutions must specify, as a minimum:
   (a) the course code;
   (b) attendance patterns;
   (c) requirements for admission to candidature;
   (d) requirements for the award course including credit point values, units of study that may be taken for credit and mandatory units of study;
(e) streams available in the award course;
(f) programs available in the award course;
(g) majors available in the award course;
(h) minors available in the award course;
(i) requirements for streams, programs, majors, minors and, where appropriate, the degree core;
(j) progression rules;
(k) restrictions on enrolment;
(l) time limits, if different from those specified in the faculty resolutions or the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014;

Note: Course resolutions may not extend the maximum time for completion of a coursework degree, which is provided in the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014.

(m) cross institutional study and exchange, if not as specified in the faculty resolutions;
(n) requirements for admission to, and for the award of honours, if available;
(o) award of the degree including grades of the degree or grades of honours that may be awarded; and
(p) any transitional arrangements relating to the resolutions.

8 Faculty resolutions

(1) Faculty resolutions may include resolutions about:
(a) course enrolment, including enrolment restrictions, time limits, suspension, discontinuation and lapse of candidature and recognition of prior learning;
(b) unit of study enrolment, including cross-institutional study and international exchange;
(c) study and assessment, including attendance and participation, late submission, and arrangements, if any, for re-assessment;
(d) progression and award including satisfactory progress, awards, award and grades of honours, medals and weighted average marks used in addition to the provisions of the Coursework Policy 2014; and
(e) transitional arrangements.

9 Faculty handbooks

(1) Faculty handbooks must specify:
(a) a description of the faculty structure, including schools, disciplines and departments;
(b) the faculty teaching calendar for the year;
(c) any local provisions in the faculty;
(d) in relation to each award course offered by the faculty:
   (i) the award course resolutions;
   (ii) any applicable faculty resolutions;
   (iii) the intended learning outcomes and graduate qualities;
   (iv) the approved minimum learning commitments;
   (v) the approved learning experiences;
   (vi) the assessment process and standards; and
   (vii) expected prior learning;

(e) in relation to each unit of study offered by the faculty:
   (i) a brief description;
   (ii) assessment summary;
   (iii) pre- and co-requisites; and
   (iv) the relationship of the unit of study to the overall learning outcomes and experience for the award course.

10 Unit of study outlines

(1) Unit of study outlines must contain:
   (a) a concise statement of the learning outcomes;
   (b) a list of objectives, expressed in terms of how that knowledge will be assessed;
   (c) a concise statement of the links between the learning outcomes and the graduate qualities;
   (d) a brief description of the contribution of the unit to the different award courses in which the students may be enrolled;
   (e) information about academic integrity and the checking of written assignments through similarity detection software;
   (f) links to compulsory modules relating to academic honesty;
   (g) advice on:
      (i) attendance and class requirements;
      (ii) the methods of assessment to be used; and
      (iii) the weighting of each assessment;
   (h) names and contact details of relevant teaching and administrative staff.

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

(3) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) may prescribe a template for unit of study outlines, in which case the template must be used for all unit of study outlines.
11 Learning management systems

(1) An LMS website must contain:
   (a) an introduction and rationale for the unit of study;
   (b) the aims and learning outcomes;
   (c) the contribution that the aims and learning outcomes of the unit make to learning outcomes and graduate qualities for the award course;
   (d) an outline of the curriculum for the unit and a schedule of learning activities (lectures, seminars, tutorials, workshops, practicals, laboratories, online learning, field trips, work placement, independent study or other);
   (e) minimum learning commitments and attendance requirements for learning activities, and guidelines on time to be allowed for private study and assessment preparation;
   (f) the assessment process, standards and criteria, including a detailed breakdown of each assessment task, its contribution to the final mark, deadlines and closing dates for submission of work;
   (g) any relevant expectations relating to group work, professionalism in work-integrated learning situations and other matters;
   (h) any penalties that apply for poor attendance or late submission;
   (i) mandatory or recommended prior learning;
       Note: This information should also be provided to prospective students as early as possible, through the University’s “Find a Course” website.
   (j) reference and links to relevant University policies, including, as a minimum the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 and the requirements for special consideration in the Coursework Policy 2014 and Assessment Procedures 2011;
   (k) a notification to students indicating that participation in the unit of study permits de-identified information about their learning experience and interaction with learning resources to be used for the purpose of improving the student experience of learning;
   (l) information, where relevant, about the recording of lectures delivered and automatically captured in University-owned lecture theatres;
   (m) the use of the text-matching tool on the University’s LMS for student text-based assignments;
   (n) details of changes made to the unit as a result of student feedback and student experience from the previous time the unit was offered.

(2) Each LMS must be designed to include the capacity for:
   (a) submitting written assignments online; and
   (b) for text-based assignments, checking submitted work with similarity detection software.

(3) Read-only access to the LMS site for a unit of study must be provided to:
   (a) students;
   (b) unit of study co-ordinators;
   (c) all teachers and tutors in the award course;
(d) relevant library staff, for the purpose of facilitating availability of relevant library resources;
(e) relevant educational integrity co-ordinators, for the purposes of conducting an investigation into suspected academic dishonesty;
(f) relevant staff of the Disability Support Office, for the purposes of recommending adjustments for students registered with that office; and
(g) any other member of staff to whom the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) directs that such access should be provided.

(4) Editing access to the LMS site for a unit of study must be provided to the unit of study co-ordinator and any other person nominated by the unit of study co-ordinator.

12 Academic records on graduation

(1) An academic transcript is a complete record of the student’s studies at the University and must state:
   (a) the graduate’s name;
   (b) the award course;
   (c) any specialisation, stream, major or minor achieved;
   (d) each unit of study attempted with:
      (i) the semester and year of the attempt;
      (ii) the credit point value;
      (iii) the mark; and
      (iv) the grade.

(2) A certificate of graduate status must list the degree name and the graduation date but not the units of study.

(3) A degree statement (testamur), is the legal statement of the student’s attainment of the degree, and must state:
   (a) the degree awarded;
   (b) the authority under which it is awarded;
   (c) the title of the award;
   (d) the name of the student to whom it is awarded;
   (e) the date of conferral;
   (f) any stream, program or major; and
   (g) where relevant, the grade of the degree or honours awarded.

13 Quality assurance and evaluation

(1) Excellence of the student experience is evaluated through surveys of the student experience at two levels:
   (a) the degree or program level; and
   (b) the unit of study level.
(2) Degree or program level feedback is captured from both current students and recent graduates through external surveys. Educational data analytics from these surveys are reported by the Education Portfolio Quality and Analytics Team to the wider university community, including, but not limited to:
   (a) University Executive Education and Research Education Committees;
   (b) Academic Board;
   (c) Graduate Studies Committee of Academic Board;
   (d) Undergraduate Studies Committee of Academic Board;
   (e) Faculty Deans, Associate Deans and appropriate faculty boards and committees.

(3) Unit of study level feedback is captured through the Unit of Study Survey (USS).
   (a) The USS is administered online, using Sydney Student data to generate the list of units of study to be surveyed each teaching session, and to access the contact details of students enrolled in them.
   (b) The USS includes six common quantitative items, and two common qualitative items and up to four faculty specific quantitative items and one qualitative item.
   (c) For each unit of study, a faculty administrator is responsible for:
      (i) checking that the unit of study co-ordinator details are correct;
      (ii) setting appropriate open and close dates for the survey; and
      (iii) indicating which faculty specific variant of the USS is to be used.
   (d) Unit of study co-ordinators must check the details of the survey (sent as a pre-notification email two weeks prior to the survey open date). Changes should be requested through the faculty administrator.
   (e) Students are emailed an invitation to participate in the USS on the survey open date. A reminder email will be emailed to all students who have not already completed the survey one week after the survey opens.
   (f) Teachers may allow time in class for students to complete the survey on their smartphone, tablet or laptop.
   (g) Unit of study co-ordinators will receive an email notification on the survey open date, and then an update one week later.
   (h) Results are made available to the unit of study co-ordinators, the Dean, the Associate Dean, Education and other nominees of the Dean via the USS results portal.
   (i) Results are made available to students (quantitative results only) via an email notification containing a link to their personalised survey portal. Co-ordinators can write a comment in response to the ratings and comments given by their students before results are released to students.
   (j) Changes made to the unit of study as a result of student feedback and student experience from the previous time the unit of study was offered must be included in the LMS website for the unit of study.

(4) Quality assurance processes at all levels are summarised in Schedule One.

(5) Reviews of faculties and academic units will be jointly overseen by the Academic Board and University Executive, and will include a focus on teaching and learning, including curriculum development and research training.
The review process will consist of the following stages:

(a) initiation of the review;
(b) appointment of a review panel;
(c) review visit preparation;
(d) submission of faculty self-evaluation report;
(e) review panel meetings:
   (i) preliminary;
   (ii) consensus;
   (iii) review;
(f) preparation of review panel report by the office of the Provost, in consultation with the review panel;
(g) development of implementation plan.

Note: Further information about faculty review visits is available from the [Academic Board website](#).

The terms of reference for review panels are set out in Schedule Two.

### 14 Educational environments

**Note:** Standards (for learning environments) are monitored by the DVC (Education) Portfolio and are set by CIS in conjunction with ICT. The Learning Space Design Standard is available [here](#).

The quality of educational environments will be measured through student and teacher evaluations of learning spaces.
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## SCHEDULE ONE

### Standards and methods for evaluating educational excellence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Evaluation method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit of study</td>
<td>Educational outcomes</td>
<td>Educational outcomes</td>
<td>Educational outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Simple data</td>
<td>• Unit of study co-ordinator assesses that outcomes are meeting requirements, including academic integrity</td>
<td>• Student surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Easy visibility at faculty level</td>
<td>• Generated by results data</td>
<td>• University rubric to measure against graduate qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Generated by faculty</td>
<td>• Determined by faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alignment with award/ standard</td>
<td>• Graduate qualities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Graduate qualities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational experience</td>
<td>Student experience of learning and teaching</td>
<td>• Student experience of learning and teaching</td>
<td>Educational experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peer observation of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Student surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational environment</td>
<td>Learning space</td>
<td>• University sets agreed standards and targets</td>
<td>• Results are included in report to students/ faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Virtual environment</td>
<td>• Unit of study co-ordinators are responsible for providing students with feedback through the closing the loop process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Formal and informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational experience</td>
<td>University sets agreed standards and targets</td>
<td>• Standards for physical learning space</td>
<td>Educational environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluation of learning spaces</td>
<td>• Evaluation of learning spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Effective use of existing resources (to teach units of study)</td>
<td>• Effective use of existing resources (to teach units of study)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Evaluation method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum/</td>
<td>Educational outcomes</td>
<td>Educational outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualification</td>
<td>• Qualifications</td>
<td>• Standards and outcomes are determined by the faculty and managed by the Academic Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meet accreditation requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alignment with institutional, industry, professional and community expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational experience</td>
<td>Educational experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Thematically coherent program</td>
<td>• Student surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reported to faculty board; reports made public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational environment</td>
<td>Educational environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Formal and informal</td>
<td>• Standards for physical learning space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community of scholars within discipline/ degree program</td>
<td>• Evaluation of learning spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Effective use of existing resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Evaluation method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Educational outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational outcomes, experience and environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Graduate qualities</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Student survey results used to set targets and benchmark at faculty and University level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prepared for learning, life and work experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meets requirements for accreditation at discipline/professional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Success in accessing further study opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meets requirements for Australian Qualifications Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rewarding career paths</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meets requirements for Higher Education Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contributing to the community</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meets requirements for professional regulatory bodies e.g. Australian Health Practitioners Regulatory Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cycle of Academic Board/UE faculty reviews, including learning and teaching processes and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meets standards set by Group of Eight (Go8) universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Engagement and enquiry to challenge students with novel problems and issues at every stage of the educational process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Physical spaces and equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supports working together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Virtual learning environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supports working together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHEDULE TWO

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR ACADEMIC UNIT REVIEW PANELS

OBJECTIVES

Reviews of academic units aim to ensure their capacity to deliver teaching and learning, research and the best outcomes for society at the highest possible standard, and in a manner that is academically and financially sustainable and aligned with the University’s strategic goals.

ROLE OF PANEL

To achieve the objectives, the panel will:

(a) review and report on the academic unit’s goals, strategy and achievements in relation to:
   (i) teaching and learning, including curriculum development and research training;
   (ii) research and development;
   (iii) external relations;
   (iv) equity issues; and
   (v) internationalisation;
(b) assess and report on the alignment of the unit’s goals with the University’s strategic plan;
(c) assess and report on the allocation resources within the unit, and its strategies for managing and improving its financial performance in relation to:
   (i) teaching;
   (ii) research;
   (iii) other sources of income; and
   (iv) controls on expenditure;
(d) assess and report on the effectiveness of the unit’s organisational structure in delivery its strategy and achieving its goals;
(e) make recommendations for optimising teaching, research and benefit to society, in relation to the unit’s goals, strategy, resource allocation and sustainability;
(f) assess and make recommendations for the unit’s course profile, in terms of academic excellence, demand, quality and sustainability.

MEMBERSHIP OF PANEL

(1) Panel members are appointed jointly by the Provost and the Chair of the Academic Board, each of whom may choose to sit on a review committee or nominate a representative to do so.
(2) Review panels will consist of five members, plus a chair. If appropriate, an additional two members may be appointed.
(3) Review panels will be comprised of at least:

(a) three senior academics with disciplinary or management knowledge relevant to the unit under review, and at least two of whom should be external to the University;

(b) a senior academic from within the unit under review, who is neither a dean or associate dean; and

(c) a member of the Academic Board nominated by the Chair of the Academic Board.
An Australian Higher Education Graduation Statement, must contain information about:

the graduate;

the award, including any industry or professional accreditation for which graduates are eligible;

the University of Sydney;

the graduate’s academic achievements in the form of an academic transcript and/or other achievement;

the Australian Higher Education System.
The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) as delegate of the Senate of the University of Sydney, adopts the following policy.

Dated: 10 December 2015

Last amended: 8 June 2017 (administrative amendments only)

Signature: _____________________________________________________________________
Name: Professor Philippa Pattison
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1 Name of policy

This is the Student Placement and Projects 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 placements or projects; and

(b) sets out the University’s requirements for the development and management of such placement and project 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 them.

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.

delegate means an officer, employee or committee of the University to whom Senate has made a delegation of authority.

Note: See University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule 2016 and University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016.

faculty means a faculty or University school, 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 coordinator.

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 means a problem-based learning experience built around any of researching, proposing or implementing solutions to a real world case study presented by a project partner. A project may be undertaken individually or by a group, and may or may not require work to be undertaken at sites other than the University.

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

project partner means the person or organisation presenting a case study which forms the basis for a project. A project partner may be internal or external to the University.

7 Principles

(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 or undertaking a project 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) As from 31 December 2018, each student involved in group work on placement or in a project must be assessed according to their individual achievement of the learning outcomes and graduate qualities.

(i) Assessment may include consideration of contributions to effective group functioning and communication in intercultural and interdisciplinary settings.

(5) Note: See subclause 15(3). For each student placement or project there must be an identified placement or project co-ordinator.

(6) The relevant unit of study co-ordinator or agreement sponsor must register a copy of the final version of each agreement to which this policy applies in the University Contract register maintained by Archives and Records Management.

Note: See Education and Research Training Agreements Policy 2017

8 Engagement with placement providers and project partners

(1) Placement co-ordinators are responsible for informing placement providers of the objectives and learning outcomes, including the attendance requirements, of the placement.

(2) Placement and project co-ordinators are responsible for 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 their staff) and any proposed student participant.

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 with external parties

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

(a) the responsibilities of each of the University and the external party;
(b) the insurance requirements for each of the University and the external party;
(c) the level of supervision which will be provided to participating students; and
(d) the applicable intellectual property, confidentiality and privacy obligations.

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 projects. 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.

(2) Placement and project co-ordinators are responsible for ensuring placement providers and project partners are aware of any reasonable adjustments agreed between the University and the placement provider or project partner 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 13 of this policy.

Comment [KH1]: Consider if this principle should also be added to the Assessment Procedures?

Comment [KH2]: The draft limited these provisions to external project partners, however best practice would be to provide the same level of supervision and documentation even for internal ones. There is no reason why internal partners could not present the same or similar problems to external ones particularly where grant funds or other external inputs might be indirectly involved.

Comment [KH3]: For best practice we still need a provision about how the arrangements with internal project partners are documented. See new clause 10 below

Comment [KH4]: I have received some queries from my IP colleagues about what IP provisions are to be included in this policy. They in turn have received queries expressing concerns that students are not properly prepared for the confidentiality obligations they will incur in undertaking placements and projects, especially in relation to IP where blabbing details can cause major problems. See new proposed subclause 11(1)(d) below. 
(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 or project partner’s ability to meet the objectives of placements or projects, as applicable;
(b) the appropriateness of the learning environment and the proposed learning experience; and
(c) compliance with:
   (i) the Education and Research Training Agreements Policy 2017; and
   (ii) the Higher Education Standards Framework.

10 Projects with internal parties

(1) The terms of a project with an internal project partner must be recorded in writing and retained in a University file by the project co-ordinator.

   Note: See the University Recordkeeping Policy and Recordkeeping Manual.

(2) Students should not be assigned to a project with an internal partner until the following have been agreed between the project co-ordinator and the internal project partner, and recorded:
(a) the responsibilities of each of the project co-ordinator and the project partner;
(b) the level of supervision which will be provided to participating students; and
(c) the applicable intellectual property, confidentiality and privacy obligations.

11 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) any obligations of confidentiality which will apply to them during or after the placement or project;
(e) whom to contact in the faculty if the student should have any concerns while undertaking the placement or project, and how contact may be made; and

Comment [KHS]: My IP colleagues have received some expressions of concern that students are not properly briefed about their obligations to keep confidential any third party information, particularly relating to IP, which they come into contact with on placement or project.
(f) the circumstances under which a placement or project may be terminated by any of the placement supervisor, the project partner or the placement or project co-ordinator, and

(g) the circumstances under which a student would be considered to have failed any assessment relating to the placement or project.

Note: Requirements to complete placements or 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 or project co-ordinator, or the unit of study co-ordinator, must:

(a) arrange for the student to be assessed on the basis of the completed component; 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 provider, project partner or facilities provided are determined to be unsuitable, the relevant 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 provider or project partner (or relevant member of their 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.

12 Communication with students while undertaking placement or 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 experience;

(b) the student’s progress; and

(c) potential or actual problems.

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

13 Work health and safety

(1) Placement, project and unit of study co-ordinators must:

(a) take all reasonable steps to identify and record where students are undertaking placements or projects at any given time;
(b) for placements or projects where work is undertaken on non-University premises:

(i) inform placement providers or project partners of the requirement to provide a work health and safety induction to all participating students;

(ii) notify placement providers or project partners that the placement or project co-ordinator needs to be informed of any work health or safety concern;

(iii) inform students of relevant work health and safety issues before they commence the placement or project; and

(c) 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 or projects 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 commencing a placement or project, 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.

14 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;

(ii) their level of preparedness for the placement or project; and

(iii) the overall value of the placement or project as a learning experience;

and

(b) placement providers and project partners, 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 during the placement or project.

15 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.

(3) Subclause 7(4)(b) commences on 31 December 2018.
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1 Name of policy

This is the Educational Services 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:
(a) facilitates the expansion and dissemination of knowledge through academic collaboration; and
(b) provides for quality assurance of educational services provided in collaboration with, or on the University’s behalf by, other parties.

5 Application
(1) This policy applies to:
(a) the University, staff and affiliates; and
(b) except as provided in this policy, all educational services agreements, and proposals for such agreements.

(2) Except for clause 9, this policy applies to student placement and project agreements.

Note: See clause 12.

(3) Except as provided in clause 13, this policy does not apply to research agreements.

6 Definitions
agreement sponsor means a member of the University’s staff who is responsible for monitoring and maintaining the quality of the educational experience or research training provided pursuant to an educational services agreement.

award course has the meaning given in the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015, which at the date of this policy is:

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

educational services agreement means a binding agreement between the University and another party which requires either party to undertake provision of any educational services on behalf of, or in conjunction with, the other. Such agreements include, but are not limited to, research training agreements.

Comment [KH1]: The old Educational Services Agreement excluded student exchange and study abroad, but that was more of a political consideration at the time than a clearly justifiable exception. I couldn’t think of any solid reason why they shouldn’t be covered, so have left out the exclusion.

Comment [KH2]: I’ve discussed this approach with Andrew Tindell in Research Grants and Contracts and he’s happy with it.
dean includes Head of School and Dean of a University school.

educational services means any of:
• formulating the content or curriculum of an award course;
• facilitating, delivering or overseeing learning activities;
• assessing the performance of students.

faculty includes University school.

memorandum of understanding means a documented but non-binding arrangement between the University and a third party which sets out the parties’ intentions for their future relationship and interaction.

research agreement has the meaning given in the Research Agreements Policy 2011 which, as at the date of this document is:
• agreement under which the University will undertake original investigation with the aim of generating new knowledge as a principal or incidental activity.

research training means supervision or education provided to a student in order to meet the requirements for award of a higher degree by research.

Note: See clause 1.3 of the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011.

student placement agreement means any agreement between the University and a placement provider, which permits a student to be assigned to undertake supervised learning at a workplace controlled by the placement provider for the purpose of the student’s practical education.

Note: See clause 12 of this policy, and the Student Placement and Projects Policy 2015.

student project agreement means any agreement between the University and an external project partner, which provides for students to undertake a problem-based learning experience built around any of researching, proposing or implementing solutions to a real world case study presented by the project partner.

Note: See clause 12 of this policy, and the Student Placement and Projects Policy 2015.

7 Principles
(1) Where:
(a) another party provides education or research training for or on behalf of the University under an educational services agreement; and

Comment [KH3]: Taken from Richard Fisher’s advice on TEQSA third party requirements.

Comment [KH4]: No current definition in other policies. Please consider.
Yes fine. Higher Degree by Research is defined in the Higher Degree by Research Rule 2011. Do we need to cross reference?

Comment [KH5]: This isn’t the complete definition from the Student Placement Policy but the reference to the Fair Work Act there won’t add anything in this context except possibly some confusion.
(b) that education or research training contributes to an award issued by the University,
the University accepts full accountability for the standards and quality of the education or research training provided.

(2) Education and research training carried out pursuant to an educational services agreement must be governed by:
(a) University Rules, policies and procedures; or
(b) policies or requirements which the relevant delegate is satisfied have similar outcomes and intentions to those of the University, particularly in relation to research integrity and academic honesty.

(3) Education carried out under an educational services agreement must meet the educational excellence requirements specified in the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.
Note: See clause 8 of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

(4) Research training carried out under an educational services agreement must be consistent with the requirements of the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (as amended) and the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013.

(5) Educational services agreements entered into by the University should clearly and completely articulate the relationship between the University and the other party to the agreement.

(6) Each educational services agreement must have an agreement sponsor.

(7) The agreement sponsor must arrange for each educational services agreement to be:
(a) approved by the relevant delegate;
(b) documented in a form approved by the Office of General Counsel;
(c) executed by or on behalf of each party;
(d) consistent with all applicable University policies, including as appropriate:
   (i) the Intellectual Property Policy 2016;
   (ii) the Research Agreements Policy 2011;
   (iii) the Student Placement Policy 2015;
   (iv) the Research Code of Conduct 2013;
   (v) the Guidelines Concerning Commercial Activities;
   (vi) the Risk Management Policy 2017;
and
   (vii) registered in the University contracts register maintained by Archives and Records Management.

(8) Except in as provided in clauses 12 and 13 in relation to student placement agreements or research agreements, negotiations for establishment of potential educational services agreements must not begin before an expression of interest is approved as specified in clause 11.
8 Memoranda of understanding

(1) Memoranda of understanding do not constitute educational services agreements.

(2) Memoranda of understanding may be entered into in circumstances where it is not desirable or possible completely to articulate the scope and detail of the University’s relationship with another party.

(3) Memoranda of understanding must be:
   (a) approved by the relevant delegate;
   (b) documented in a form approved by the Office of General Counsel; and
   (c) expressed to be non-binding.

Note: See University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016 and University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule 2016.

(4) If activities proposed to be undertaken pursuant to a memorandum of understanding involve the provision of educational services by either party, the terms on which such activities are to be undertaken must be recorded in an educational services agreement, consistently with this policy, before being provided.

9 Expressions of interest for potential agreements

(1) Subject to clauses 12 and 13, no negotiations for any potential educational services agreement may be undertaken before an expression of interest has been approved by the relevant delegate (that is, the delegate who would be entitled to approve the final agreement).

(2) An expression of interest must be provided in writing and must:
   (a) specify:
      (i) the proposed parties;
      (ii) the proposed agreement sponsor;
      (iii) the activities to be covered by the agreement;
      (iv) the proposed duration of the agreement; and
      (v) key performance indicators for success;
   (b) explain:
      (i) the benefits of the proposed agreement;
      (ii) how the agreement would align with the University’s strategic priorities; and
      (iii) the likely cost of the proposed arrangement;
   and
   (c) attach a risk assessment prepared consistently with the requirements of the Risk Management Policy 2017 and the University’s Risk Management Framework. [INSERT LINK]

(3) In considering an expression of interest, a delegate must take the following into account:

Comment [KH6]: I have discussed this proposed approach with Nisha Graham and she was happy with it.
10 Establishing and renewing agreements

(1) Each educational services agreement must specify:
   (a) the nature of the legal relationship between the parties;
   (b) a duration, of no more than five years; and
   (c) the activities to be undertaken pursuant to the agreement.

(2) Agreements must not be renewed for terms longer than five years.

(3) A delegate must not approve the establishment or renewal of an educational services agreement unless satisfied that it:
   (a) is consistent with the principles set out in clause 7;
   (b) is consistent with the University’s obligations under the Higher Education Standards Framework;
   (c) is an appropriate use of the University’s resources;
   (d) provides an appropriate benefit to the University, compared to the cost involved;
   (e) involves an acceptable level of residual risk to the University, taking into account proposed risk mitigants; and
   (f) complies with applicable University Rules, policies and procedures.

(4) Copies of final executed agreements must be provided to:
   (a) the University contracts register;
   (b) the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education); and
   (c) if international parties are involved, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar).

11 Quality assurance and responsibilities

(1) The agreement sponsor is responsible for:
   (a) obtaining approval for the initial expression of interest, if required;
   (b) registering the agreement in the University contracts register;
   (c) monitoring the implementation of the agreement during its term, against the University’s standards and expectations for education and research;
   (d) reviewing the success of the agreement at its conclusion, against its stated purpose and benchmarks;
   (e) monitoring student experience during the term of the agreement;

Comment [KH7]: Also discussed with Nisha.

Comment [KH8]: Discussed with Nisha.
(f) arranging for student experience to be measured through surveys or other appropriate instruments each time a course is offered;

(g) reporting on the implementation of the agreement, including but not limited to student experience, as directed by the relevant dean; and

(h) in February each year, providing a written report to the relevant dean on activity undertaken under each agreement for which they are responsible.

(2) The relevant dean is responsible for:

(a) reviewing reports from agreement sponsors; and

(b) in March each year, providing a written report to the faculty leadership group and faculty board on activity undertaken pursuant to educational services agreements for which the faculty is responsible.

(3) The faculty board is responsible for:

(a) reviewing reports from the dean; and

(b) providing the reports, with appropriate comments, to each of the delegates who approved the agreements reported on.

(4) The relevant delegate is responsible for:

(a) satisfying themselves that the requirements of this policy have been met before approving an expression of interest, or the establishment or renewal of an agreement;

(b) reviewing reports from deans; and

(c) providing an annual summary report to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) on all agreements for which they were the approving delegate.

(5) The Director of Graduate Research is responsible for endorsing research training provisions in research agreements.

Note: See clause 13.

(6) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) is responsible for:

(a) reviewing reports from delegates;

(b) providing an annual summary report on the operation of educational services agreements, and issues arising from them, to the Academic Board; and

(c) in appropriate circumstances, endorsing research training provisions in research agreements.

(7) The Academic Board is responsible for:

(a) considering the report of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education); and

(b) if it considers it appropriate to do so, making recommendations to any of:

(i) the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education);

(ii) the University Executive;

(iii) any other relevant Deputy Vice-Chancellor;

(iv) any dean.
12 Student placement agreements

(1) Student placement agreements are not required to comply with the provisions of clause 9 of this policy.

(2) Student placement agreements must comply with all other provisions of this policy and with the Student Placement and Projects Policy 2015.

13 Research agreements

(1) Provided that they comply with the requirements of this clause, research agreements are not required to comply with the remainder of this policy.

(2) If a research agreement contains provisions relating to the provision of research training, the relevant delegate must not approve the agreement until the research training provisions have been endorsed by the Director of Graduate Research or the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).

(3) In endorsing provisions under this clause, the Director of Graduate Research or Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) must be satisfied that they:

   (a) are consistent with the principles set out in clause 7;
   (b) are consistent with the University’s obligations under the Higher Education Standards Framework;
   (c) involve an acceptable level of residual risk to the University, taking into account proposed risk mitigants;
   (d) provide for appropriate quality assurance mechanisms; and
   (e) comply with applicable University Rules, policies and procedures.

14 Transitional provision

This policy will not apply to agreements entered into on or before 1 January 2018 until 31 December 2018.

15 Rescissions and replacements

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

(1) Agreements for Educational Services Policy 2011, which commenced on 23 June 2011

(2) Agreements for Educational Services Procedures 2011, which commenced on 23 June 2011

NOTES

Educational Services Agreements Policy 2017

Comment [KH9]: What is to happen with the Cotutelle Policy? Can it get rescinded too?

Comment [KH10]: Usually we would rescind the procedures by means of replacement procedures, but I am not sure if we will have procedures for this policy up in time, and if we have this policy in place we can’t leave the old procedures because they will cause confusion.
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1 Name of policy
This is the Agreements for Educational Services Policy 2011

2 Commencement
This policy commences on 23 June 2011.
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 prescribes and limits the circumstances in which the University will make local and international agreements for the provision of educational services by the University.

5 Application

This policy applies to all agreements, and proposals for agreements, to which the University is or might be a party, and which involve the provision of educational services by the University.

6 Definitions

In this policy

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

advanced standing means acknowledgement by the University of prior academic achievement, usually in the form of credit points that count towards the requirements of an award course

agreement means any agreement or arrangement with the actual or potential effect of binding the University, including, but not limited to, contracts, deeds, memoranda of understanding, exchange of letters, and oral undertakings

CCPC means the Curriculum and Course Planning Committee of the UE

commercial activity as defined in Section 26A of the Act means:

(a) any activity engaged in by or on behalf of the University in the exercise of commercial functions of the University; and

(b) any other activity comprising the promotion of, establishment of or participation in any partnership, trust, company or other incorporated body, or joint venture, by or on behalf of the University, that is declared by the Commercial Activities Guidelines to be a commercial activity

Commercial Activities Guidelines means the Guidelines Concerning Commercial Activities determined by the Senate under Section 26B of the Act

controlled entity as defined in subsection 16A(6) of the Act means:

a person, group of persons or body of which the University or the Senate has control within the meaning of a standard referred to in sub-section 39(A) or 45(1A) of the Public Finance and Audit Act 1983
Dean means:
- in relation to a faculty, the Dean of the relevant faculty;
- in relation to a University school, the Head of School and Dean (University school) of the of the relevant University School.

delegate means a person, committee, authority or officer of the University or other body to whom the Senate delegates a function.

educational services includes the educational services described in subclause 7(1) of this policy.

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

object of the University as defined in subsection 6(1) of the Act means:
the promotion, within the limits of the University’s resources, of scholarship, research, free inquiry, interaction of research and teaching, and academic excellence.

private professional activity as defined in the Outside Earnings of Academic Staff Policy 2011 means:
outside earnings activity undertaken in a staff member’s private capacity, including an arrangement between the academic and an external client or other third party to which the University is not directly or indirectly a party.

proposal means a proposed agreement for educational services.

risk means any actual or contingent risk of:
- any financial loss or consequence, including taxation consequences;
- legal liability, including liability in relation to occupational health and safety;
- loss of or damage to the University’s reputation;
- impairment of the University’s ability to properly conduct its principal functions under the Act;
- real or apparent lack of probity, or of maladministration or corruption; and
- any other risk that the Senate or Vice-Chancellor determines is a risk for the purpose of this policy or the Commercial Activities Guidelines.

sponsor means a person or organisational unit within the University who or which proposes that the University or a controlled entity should enter into an agreement for the provision of educational services by the University.

UE means the University Executive.
7 What are educational services?

(1) Educational services are services delivered, for commercial gain or otherwise, by or on behalf of the University or a controlled entity that use or develop any educational facility, resource or property of the University or in which the University has a right or interest (such as curriculum, research, knowledge and intellectual property), including:

(a) non-award training;
(b) teaching and assessment;
(c) curriculum development, review and endorsement;
(d) curriculum transfer or licensing;
(e) co-delivery of courses;
(f) joint-venture campuses;

(2) Educational services for the purposes of this policy do not include student exchange, study abroad or cotutelle arrangements, or educational services delivered to the University by other parties, such as the provision of curriculum materials and teaching delivered by the staff of other institutions.

Note: Such matters are governed by other policies. See:
- Cotutelle Scheme Policy
- University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014
- Learning and Teaching Policy 2015
- Coursework Policy 2014

8 Limits on agreements for educational services

The University will not enter into an agreement for educational services unless:

(a) the feasibility and desirability of the proposal has been assessed in accordance with this policy;
(b) the proposal has been approved by the relevant delegate, and in accordance with any procedures associated with this policy;
(c) where a proposal constitutes a commercial activity, the proposal has been approved in accordance with the Commercial Activities Guidelines; and
(d) the proposal complies with the requirements of the Intellectual Property Policy 2016.

9 Feasibility and desirability

(1) The feasibility and desirability of any proposed agreement for educational services will be assessed, taking into account:

(a) the object of the University;
(b) the strategic objectives and policies of the relevant school, faculty or discipline;
(c) the rationale for the proposal;
(d) the reputation and standing of the proposed partner (preferably a government instrumentality or large and well-established private sector organisation);
(e) the benefits, costs and risks of the proposal to the school, faculty and the University (including any non-financial public benefit to the relevant local or international community);

(f) the impact of the proposal on existing or other proposed initiatives in like discipline areas and geographical regions (whether owned by the University or by other education providers);

(g) where relevant, the practicality and appropriateness of translating curriculum, teaching and assessment methodology from the Australian to the relevant international social and cultural context;

(h) the appropriateness of the IP arrangements associated with the proposal; and

(i) the appropriateness of proposed exit strategies, including termination conditions.

(2) Where a proposal involves the delivery of another university’s award programs or units of study that are, or may in the future, be given credit or recognised for advanced standing towards a University of Sydney award, the feasibility and desirability assessment will also take into account:

(a) the ability of the proposed or any existing quality assurance processes to ensure that the standards of the proposal are equal to those of the University in respect of student admission, teaching, assessment, access to facilities and resources (including library and e-learning resources), student rights and responsibilities, student feedback and program review; and

(b) the proposed administrative and support arrangements for the program.

(3) Where a proposal requires the involvement of University employees, the feasibility and desirability assessment will also take into account:

(a) a human resources plan that sets out the agreed levels of support and return to staff; and

(b) any applications for approval of outside earnings in accordance with the University’s Outside Earnings of Academic Staff Policy 2011.

10 Outside earnings of academic staff

Where a proposal is exclusively for a private professional activity, the sponsor is not required to comply with this policy or procedures associated with this policy. However, the requirements of the Outside Earnings of Academic Staff Policy 2011 must be met.

14 Initial endorsements of proposals

(1) Subject to clause 10, a sponsor may only develop a proposal after obtaining the endorsements required by this clause.

(2) If the sponsor is not a Dean, he or she must obtain the endorsement of:

(a) the relevant Head of School or equivalent, before seeking the endorsement of the Dean; and

(b) the relevant Dean.

(3) If the proposal involves the delivery of an award course or courses, the sponsor must also obtain the endorsement of:

(a) the CCPC; and

(b) UE.
(4) The Dean may endorse a proposal only if the Dean considers it, on a preliminary basis, to be feasible and desirable.

(5) If the relevant Dean determines that the proposal is not feasible or desirable on a preliminary basis, or if other required endorsements are not obtained, the sponsor must not further develop the proposal.

12 Proposals involving a commercial activity

If a proposal involves a commercial activity, it must also comply with the Commercial Activities Guidelines.

13 Development of proposals

(1) Once the necessary initial endorsements have been obtained, a sponsor may proceed to develop a proposal.

(2) Having developed the proposal, the sponsor must then prepare a business plan which provides sufficient information for the final assessment of feasibility and desirability of the proposal, and where appropriate, of compliance with the Commercial Activities Guidelines.

14 Approval of proposals

Proposals to enter into educational agreements may be approved by the Senate or a delegate.

15 Documentation of agreements

The documentary form of any agreement for educational services must:

(a) be appropriate in form and scope to the nature of the activity;
(b) reflect an assessment of the level of risk or uncertainty acceptable to the University;
(c) allow for appropriate exit strategies, to cater for all contingencies; and
(d) be consistent with advice received from the Office of General Counsel.

16 Determination of procedures

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) and Registrar may determine procedures for the implementation of this policy, including the specification of forms to be used.
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1 Purpose and application

These procedures give effect to the Agreements for Educational Services Policy 2011 (“the policy’’). They prescribe the process for obtaining approval to make a local or international agreement for the provision of educational services, and specify required forms.

2 Commencement

These procedures commence on 23 June 2011.

3 Interpretation

Words and phrases used in these procedures and not otherwise defined in this document have the meanings they have in the policy.
4 Initial endorsements of proposals

(1) Prior to seeking endorsements, and before developing a proposal or advancing negotiations with potential partners, a sponsor must consider:

(a) the rationale for the proposal;
(b) the reputation and standing of the proposed partner (preferably a government instrumentality or large and well-established private sector organisation);
(c) the apparent benefits, costs (including any opportunity costs, hidden costs and cross-subsidies) and risks of the proposal to the school, faculty and the University;
(d) how the proposal meets the strategic objectives and policies of the relevant school, faculty or the University; and
(e) how the proposal affects existing or other proposed initiatives in like discipline areas and geographical regions (whether owned by the University or any other education providers).

(2) If the sponsor is not the relevant Dean, the sponsor must prepare a briefing for the Dean that provides sufficient information for a preliminary assessment of the feasibility and desirability of the proposal to be made.

(3) If the proposal is for a commercial activity, the sponsor must prepare a proposal document using the template set out in Schedule 1.

(4) If the proposal is not for a commercial activity, the sponsor must prepare a proposal document using the template set out in Schedule 2.

(5) If the proposal requires the approval of the CCPC and UE for the delivery of an award course or courses, the sponsor must prepare and submit an Expression of Interest in the form set out in Schedule 3.

5 Proposals involving a commercial activity

(1) Once all endorsements required by this policy have been received, all documents relating to proposals involving a commercial activity must be provided to the Chief Financial Officer for assessment.

6 Developing proposals generally

(1) In developing a proposal, a sponsor must:

(a) consult with all relevant parts of the University;
(b) prepare and submit any further documentation required by CCPC or UE;
(c) prepare and submit any documentation required to be submitted to the Academic Board by the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015;
(d) consider how the proposal meets the object of the University;
(e) conduct any required analyses or assessments;
(f) outline the intellectual property arrangements associated with the proposal and confirm that they are consistent with the requirements of the Intellectual Property Policy 2016;
(g) prepare any required documents; and
(h) obtain the advice of the Office of General Counsel and where relevant, the Finance Office and International Office.

(2) Where a proposal involves the delivery of University award programs or units of study that are, or may in the future be, given credit or recognised for advanced standing, the sponsor must:

(a) establish or identify existing quality assurance processes to ensure that the standards of the proposal are equal to those of the University in respect of:
   (i) student admission;
   (ii) teaching;
   (iii) assessment;
   (iv) access to facilities and resources (including library and e-resources);
   (v) student rights and responsibilities; and
   (vi) student feedback and program review;

(b) identify any administrative and support arrangements required for the proposal.

(3) Where a proposal involves commercial activity, the sponsor must also develop such additional supporting information or documents as may be required.

(4) A sponsor must prepare a business plan that provides sufficient information for a final assessment of the feasibility and desirability of the proposal to be made by the relevant delegate, in accordance with the policy and, where relevant, the Guidelines Concerning Commercial Activities.

(5) Where relevant, a copy of the Academic Board resolution endorsing the proposal must be attached to the business plan.

(6) The business plan must be in the form of the template set out in Schedule 4 where the proposal has a total value in excess of $50,000.

(7) The sponsor must conduct the following detailed analyses:
   (a) analysis of the reputation and standing of the proposed partner, including its business and academic reputation, financial stability and backing and its history of participation in similar engagements;
   (b) identification of any intellectual property to be used or created;
   (c) analysis of costs (including any opportunity costs, hidden costs, and cross-subsidies), risks, income and other benefits of the proposal;
   (d) where relevant, assessment of the suitability of the relevant national and regional environment to the proposal, taking into account:
      (i) any political, financial or social instability; and
      (ii) any relevant legislative or regulatory requirements and restrictions;
   (e) where relevant, assessment of the practicability of translating curriculum, teaching and assessment methodology from the Australian to the relevant international social and cultural context; and
   (f) assessment of exit strategies, including termination conditions.

(8) The sponsor must prepare the following documents for attachment to the business plan:
   (a) a “needs analysis” jointly with the proposed partner, to ensure a clear mutual understanding of needs, expectations and capabilities; and
(b) where relevant, a human resources plan that prescribes agreed workloads and levels of support and return to staff (such as reimbursement of actual expenses, per diems as per Australian Taxation Office claimable expense for the relevant country, teaching load replacement, additional load paid at casual teaching rates, and payment of research incentives into consulting accounts).

(9) Where a proposal involves the delivery of University award programs or units of study that are, or may in the future be, given credit or recognised for advanced standing, the sponsor must:

(a) establish or identify existing quality assurance processes to ensure that the standards of the proposal are equal to those of the University in respect of student admission, teaching, assessment, access to facilities and resources (including library and e-learning resources), student rights and responsibilities, student feedback and program review; and

(b) identify any administrative and support arrangements required for the proposal.

7 Developing proposals involving commercial activities

(4) In addition to the requirements of clause 6, if the proposal is for a commercial activity, the sponsor must ensure that the proposal document includes sufficient information for the proposal to be adequately assessed in accordance with the following factors, to the extent that they are appropriate to the nature and level of risk of the activity and to the type of activity:

(a) consistency with:

(i) the object, and principal or other functions of the University; and

Note: The object of the University is defined in section 6(1) of the University of Sydney Act 1989 (as amended) as:

the promotion, within the limits of the University's resources, of scholarship, research, free inquiry, the interaction of research and teaching, and academic excellence.

(ii) the constitution of the responsible University-controlled entity (if applicable);

(b) the identifiable benefit to the University (irrespective of whether that is a direct financial or other benefit) based on sound business case evaluation principles and risk and return considerations;

(c) the source of funding (external, internal or a mixture of both) for the life of the proposal;

(d) appropriate procedures for management of the identified risks in accordance with their nature and level, including the potential for corruption;

(e) insurance of identified risk, on the basis that insurable risk exceeding $100,000 should be insured, where reasonable and obtainable;

(f) the suitability of the proposed structure for the commercial activity, from a legal, tax and accounting perspective;

(g) accounting, auditing and reporting mechanisms that may be appropriate to the type of activity; and

(h) compliance with any applicable:
(i) University policies relating to cost recovery; and
(ii) competitive neutrality principles as outlined by NSW Treasury from time to time.

Note: As at the date of these procedures these can be found at www.treasury.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/3868/tpp02-1.pdf

(2) The proposal document and copies of all necessary endorsements must be provided to the Chief Financial Officer for assessment in accordance with the Guidelines Concerning Commercial Activities.

8 Obtaining final approval

(1) The sponsor is responsible for providing the Senate or the delegate with the documentation necessary to give approval, including:

(a) the proposal documents;
(b) if relevant, the Expression of Interest;
(c) the business plan;
(d) any advice or comment received from the Chief Financial Officer;
(e) the proposed form of any agreement document; and
(f) copies of any necessary approvals, including Academic Board approvals.

(2) A delegate will only approve a proposal if satisfied that:

(a) it is feasible and desirable in accordance with terms of this policy;
(b) if applicable, the requirements of the Guidelines Concerning Commercial Activities have been met; and
(c) if the proposal involves the delivery of an award course or courses:
   (i) the CCPC has considered the strategic fit, business case and any written advice from the Chief Financial Officer and endorsed the proposal;
   (ii) UE has considered the feasibility and desirability of the proposal and recommended that it proceed; and
   (iii) all necessary Academic Board approvals have been obtained.
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SCHEDULE 1 - AGREEMENTS FOR EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

PROPOSAL DOCUMENT – COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY

Note: This form is to be completed for proposals that are ‘commercial activities’ as defined in section 26A of the University of Sydney Act 1989. Please see the Agreements for Educational Services Procedures 2011 for further information.

If the proposal is not a commercial activity, it is not necessary to complete this form. Please complete the Agreements for Educational Services: Proposal Document – Non-Commercial Activities form at Schedule 2.

PART A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head of School or Discipline Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty or School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

PART B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Description of the proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART C.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REQUIRED FOR COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(13) Explanation of the proposed structure for the proposal, from a legal, tax and accounting perspective

(14) Description of the accounting, auditing and reporting mechanisms that may be appropriate to the proposal

(15) Description of how the proposal complies with any applicable University policies relating to cost recovery, and competitive neutrality principles as outlined by NSW Treasury from time to time
PART D:

FOR COMPLETION BY THE DEAN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>I endorse the proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(IF RELEVANT)

It is not appropriate for the sponsor to develop the proposal because:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The proposal is not feasible or desirable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The proposal is for private professional activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Additional information is required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| D | The proposal is otherwise inappropriate to proceed  
  **Please provide details:** |

Signature of the Dean:

Date:
**SCHEDULE 2 - AGREEMENTS FOR EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

**PROPOSAL DOCUMENT – NON-COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY**

**Note:** This form is to be completed for proposals that are not ‘commercial activities’ as defined in section 26A of the University of Sydney Act 1989. Please see the Agreements for Educational Services Procedures 2011 for further information.

**PART A.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head of School or Discipline Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty or School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**PART B.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Description of the proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(3)</th>
<th><strong>Reputation and standing of the proposed partner (preferably a government instrumentality or large and well-established private sector organisation)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(4)</th>
<th><strong>Apparent benefits, costs (including any opportunity costs, hidden costs and cross-subsidies) and risks of the proposal to the School, Faculty and the University</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(5) Description of how the proposal meets the strategic objectives and policies of the relevant School, Faculty or Discipline

(6) Description of how the Proposal affects existing or other proposed initiatives in like discipline areas and geographical regions (whether owned by the University or by other education providers)

PART C.

FOR COMPLETION BY THE DEAN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. It is appropriate for the sponsor to develop the proposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(IF RELEVANT)

It is not appropriate for the Sponsor to develop the Proposal because:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The proposal is not feasible or desirable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The proposal is a commercial activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The proposal is for private professional activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Additional information is required.

E. The proposal is otherwise inappropriate to proceed

Please provide details:

Note: If the proposal is a commercial activity, this document must be expanded to include sufficient information for the proposal to be assessed in accordance with the additional factors listed at sub-clause 8(1) of the Agreements for Educational Services Procedures 2011. Please complete the Agreements for Educational Services: Proposal Document – Commercial Activities form at Schedule 1.

Signature of the Dean:

Date:
SCHEDULE 3 – AGREEMENTS FOR EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

EXPRESSION OF INTEREST (EOI)

Indicative length of EOI: 2 to 3 pages.

Name of proposed course: Course name
Faculty: Faculty name
Proposed year of introduction: Year
Submitted by: Name of program head or Dean
Date: Date submitted to CCPC

1. Background

Provide a brief background to the proposed course, including the deletion or amendment of any subsequent course.

2. Strategic fit

(1) Relevance of the new course

Provide detail on how the course is relevant to the faculty, industry and the university.

(2) Strategic direction

Outline how the course fits within the strategic direction of the faculty and the university, in particular in relation to initiatives in the 2011—2015 White Paper.

(3) Inter-faculty collaboration

Provide detail of potential engagement with other faculties to determine how the course can be developed to maximise the position of the faculty and university within the wider discipline/profession.

3. Market analysis

High level detail of the expected student demand for the course, support within the market for the course and graduate employment outcomes. Provide details of major local and international competitors (if applicable)
4. **Business case**

A high-level outline of how this new course will be financially viable and sustainable e.g. use of existing resources, development costs, proposed fee, proposed number of students. Full details should be provided in the full proposal.

5. **Proposed course structure**

How will this course be structured? Is it different to other courses already in the faculty or University? Does the course involve shared teaching with other faculties or institutions?

6. **Authorisation**

EOI is to be authorised by the Dean of the faculty.
SCHEDULE 4 - AGREEMENTS FOR EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

BUSINESS CASE

1. Description of initiative

Specify the high-level description of scope for this initiative (less than 150 words).

(1) Objective of initiative
Detail why the initiative is required. How it is linked to achieving organisational strategic objectives? Reference to the University's Strategic Plan 2011-2015.

(2) Deliverables
Detail what the proposed initiative is trying to achieve and/or what is the issue being addressed?

(3) Options and acceptance criteria
Include details of the other options considered and an evaluation of the opportunities, constraints and limitations of each option and how the preferred option was selected. The Base Case of “Do Nothing” should also be considered.

2. Initiative attributes

(1) Initiative timetable
Outline the estimated time required to complete the initiative and critical dates that need to be achieved. Describe the outcome or status expected at each critical date.

(2) Expected investment, ongoing costs, revenues and funding sources
Outline the estimated:

• Total investment requested for the initiative
• Show spread over time—phased annually (where proposal expands more than one year)
• Detail the proposed source, including User contributions and the amount of funds
• When initiative is completed, estimate annual ongoing costs and revenues
• How will annual ongoing operational costs be funded?

(3) Stakeholders and policies
Detail all the areas who are affected by the initiative or who may have an interest in this initiative. Include both internal and external stakeholders. Indicate whether consultation has taken place.

Refer also to the University’s policies for compliance and best practice, including:

• Guidelines for Inter-Institutional Agreements
• Centres: Policy for Establishment, Management and Review
(4) Intellectual property

List any existing intellectual property which is intended to be used in delivery of this proposal.

List any intellectual property which is intended to be created in delivery of this proposal.

Identify the owners (or proposed owners) of any such intellectual property, and describe provisions to be adopted for managing it during and after the project.

(5) Risk management

Identify the key risks associated with the delivery of the initiative and risks that may be mitigated through its implementation. Detail how these risks can be managed. Detail any functionality, information or reports that must be available or evident for the initiative to meet University requirements.

Refer also to the University’s Risk Management policies including property insurance, travel insurance, taking equipment overseas and fieldwork outside Australia; http://sydney.edu.au/audit_risk/insurance/index.shtml

(6) Dependencies

In this sub-section list those items, issues, events, other units, etc that the initiative is dependent on in order to achieve its objectives. In listing each item, please describe the item and explain reasons for the dependency.

As well as the core deliverables and resources required for them, include enabling aspects such as all HR considerations and Library consultation. Evidence of separate input from these sources may be required.

(7) Key financial assumptions

Please state the specific assumptions that are contained in the Business case analysis, for example:

- Basis of capital cost / investment estimates
- Basis of forecasts of operating costs and revenues
- Estimated residual asset values at the completion of the initiative

Standard assumptions:

- Costs and benefits have been analysed in “real terms” over the life of the initiative, i.e. expressed in current dollars, excluding expected nominal increases due to inflation
- The projections of costs and benefits have been discounted by a “real” discount rate of 7%
- The projections have been subject to sensitivity testing using “real” discount rates of 4% and 10%
• Unless otherwise stated, the Analysis excludes corporate tax and non-cash items such as accounting depreciation.

3. Benefit summary

In the table below, please list the quantitative benefits identified from your business case analysis. Please note:

- **Net Present Value (NPV):** an initiative is potentially worthwhile (subject to the availability of funds) if the NPV is greater than zero.
- **Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR):** an initiative is potentially worthwhile if the BCR is greater than 1, i.e., the present value of benefits exceeds the present value of costs.
- **Internal Rate of Return (IRR):** an initiative is potentially worthwhile when the IRR is greater than the discount rate.

Also, in the table below, please list the qualitative benefits identified from your business case analysis, for example:

- Social impacts
- Avoided costs or impacts, i.e., costs or impacts that may be avoided if the initiative proceeds
- Benefits to stakeholders not reflected in the revenue analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative benefits (at 7% discount rate)</th>
<th>Qualitative benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td><strong>Amount</strong> $m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Value of Costs</td>
<td>$m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Value of Benefits</td>
<td>$m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Present Value</td>
<td>$m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to Cost Ratio</td>
<td>times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Rate of Return</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Sensitivity analysis

In the table below please list the quantitative benefits identified from the sensitivity analysis of your business case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative benefits</th>
<th>Base case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present-Value-of-Costs</td>
<td>$_m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present-Value-of-Benefits</td>
<td>$_m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net-Present-Value</td>
<td>$_m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit-to-Cost-Ratio</td>
<td>times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal-Rate-of-Return</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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 23 October 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.

This proposal was endorsed by the Academic Standards and Policy Committee on 8 August 2017 and submitted to the Academic Board meeting of 29 August 2017. At this meeting, further amendments were suggested to the replacement examination provisions in the Procedures and it was agreed to refer the proposal back to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee for discussion. Since that meeting, the member of Academic Board who initiated the discussion provided further information and in light of that information, the Chair of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee has suggested that the proposed changes are not directly related to the proposed amendments as submitted to the 8 August 2017 meeting. The original proposal is therefore resubmitted for endorsement by the committee, for presentation to the Academic Board.
ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES 2011

Issued by: Academic Board
Dated: 9 November 2011
Last amended: 23 May 2017 (Administrative amendment only)
Signature:
Name: Associate Professor Tony Masters, Chair, Academic Board

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.
Dean

means:

- In relation to a faculty, the Dean of the relevant faculty;
- In relation to a University school, the Head of School and Dean of the relevant University school

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

Faculty

means a faculty or a University school.

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).

Note: See also the University Recordkeeping Manual

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.
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.

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.

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.

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.

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

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.

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

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.

Students’ examination scripts should be retained by the department-faculty 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.

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.
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.

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.

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-delegate 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.

(7) the appropriate associate or sub-dean;
(9)(6) the head of the relevant school or department.

(9)(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.

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

(a) none of the individuals the relevant delegate referred to in subclause 10(6) of these procedures is not available; or

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

(11)(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.

(12)(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.

(13)(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.

(14)(12) After an examination has been abandoned, the Examinations Office will consult with the examiners and departments faculties concerned and make arrangements for the affected students to re-sit the examination(s) as soon as possible.

(15)(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.

(16)(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.

(17)(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 schools, examiners and students should be notified immediately.

(18)(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) At the time the examination timetable is released, Disability Services will send registered students an email asking students to submit their examination adjustment requirements by a specific date for accessible examination and assessment conditions to be provided.

(3) Disability Services will notify Examinations – Student Centre of approved reasonable adjustments.

(2) University staff are generally required to implement the examination and assessment adjustments or arrangements 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.
In-department faculty-coordinated 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) ensuring that adjustments approved for providing adjustments or arrangements to the original formal examination or assessment period apply to and are delivered for any replacement assessment, unless the form of assessment has changed, in which case Disability Services must be informed notified.

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

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

Even if registered with Disability Services and reasonable accommodations or adjustments have been provided, a student with a disability may still make a claim for special consideration due to illness or misadventure.

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.

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.
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.

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

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

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.

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.

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

In this section, relevant delegate means Rescinded

(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 electronic 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. **Subject to the provisions of sub-clauses 13(a)(v) to (viii), 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 relevant delegate 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.

(v) A student may lodge a further request for special consideration if they are unable to attend or believe that their performance was impacted or they were unable to attend the first replacement assessment, due to injury, illness or misadventure.

(vi) If the further request for special consideration is successful, the faculty should where practicable arrange a second replacement assessment, which should be held within three weeks of the date of the first replacement assessment.

(vii) 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 this is not possible, the faculty will award a grade of DC (discontinue not to count as failure), previously approved exchange or study abroad commitments, or compulsory experiential placement, the relevant delegate will award the student a DC grade (i.e. discontinue not to count as failure).

(viii) If the faculty is unable to arrange any form of appropriate or appropriately timed second replacement assessment, the relevant delegate will award the student a DC grade (i.e. 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/delegate 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) Departmental Faculties 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></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>
</tbody>
</table>
### Principle and implementation statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Assessment Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<tr>
<td>(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.</td>
<td>11A-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Assessment Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Assessment tasks and outcomes are moderated through academic peer review and used to inform subsequent practice.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Assessment is regularly updated to ensure alignment with program learning outcomes or graduate attributes.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Professional development opportunities that are related to design, implementation and moderation of assessment are provided to staff.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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 time¹</th>
<th>Closing date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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.</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, 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, or department</th>
<th>UOS Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exams</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule and manage replacement exam</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manage and implement Disability Services adjustments</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</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, or 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, or 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, or school or department</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:</td>
<td>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>Download special consideration report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule and manage final and replacement exam;</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>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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manage and implement Disability Services adjustments; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inform student of the schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For final and replacement exams managed centrally, SAS will:

- Schedule and manage final and replacement exam;
- Manage and implement Disability Services adjustments; and
- Inform student of the schedule.
<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, or school or department</th>
<th>UOS Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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></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>Schedule and manage replacement exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide replacement exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inform student of replacement exam schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manage and implement Disability Services adjustments</td>
<td></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>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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule and inform student of new or varied placement details</td>
<td></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>New or varied evaluation Not on “non-repeatable” list</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule and inform student of new or varied evaluation details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Procedures 2011
<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, or school or department</th>
<th>UOS Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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, 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 alternative assessment</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule and inform student of alternative evaluation details</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, or 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>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) or grand</td>
<td></td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honours Thesis</td>
<td>Non-HDR thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. The new due date is prior to the return date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apply extension of time to due date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 New due date is the revised submission date for the assessment.
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 (refer to schedule 2 above)</th>
<th>Assessment type</th>
<th>Assessment description</th>
<th>Form of consideration</th>
<th>Conditions for standard decision</th>
<th>SAS</th>
<th>Faculty, University school, or department</th>
<th>UOS Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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 2. The new due date⁴ is after the return date⁵</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 grade of DC (discontinue not to count as failure) if appropriate</td>
<td>Determine appropriate form of consideration</td>
<td>Determine consideration longer than 20 working days or set an alternative assessment in cases where remaining student cohort would be disadvantaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Thesis</td>
<td>Non-HDR thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ New due date is the revised submission date for the assessment.  
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, or school or department</th>
<th>UOS Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-class assessments</td>
<td>Tutorial quiz, small test or online task</td>
<td>Worth less than 30%</td>
<td>Mark adjustment (refer to section 14.13(c) above)</td>
<td>Not on &quot;no mark adjustment allowed&quot; list</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Make mark adjustment (re-weight, average etc.) Provide an alternative assessment where a student has missed more than one third of the regular assessment components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small continuous assessment</td>
<td>Students will be encouraged to check with their unit of study coordinator if any repeat sessions will be available before submitting a special consideration application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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, or 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>Tutorial quiz, small test or online task</td>
<td>Worth less than 30% (refer to section 14.13(c)(iii) above)</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>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Determine new or varied assessment</td>
<td>Schedule and inform student of new or varied assessment details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small continuous assessment</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
<td>New or varied presentation</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 presentation details</td>
<td>Provide alternative assessment if new or varied presentation is unable to be provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>None</td>
<td>None</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, or 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>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board endorse the amendments to the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (as amended).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

There are consequential amendments to the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (as amended) (Attachment 1) arising from the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016, organisational design changes and other amendments.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

The currently registered version of the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (as amended) does not align with the delegations in the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016. The proposed amendments in Attachment 1 will ensure that roles and responsibilities in the policy align with the relevant delegations.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 - University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (as amended)
UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY (HIGHER DEGREE BY RESEARCH) RULE 2011

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

Adopted on: 21 March 2011
Amended on:
5 November 2012
3 December 2012
6 May 2013
2 June 2014
11 February 2015 (administrative amendments only)
14 December 2015
[insert date]
Amendment effective from:
9 November 2012
7 December 2012
10 May 2013
6 June 2014
11 February 2015
1 January 2016
[insert date]
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PART 1 PRELIMINARY

1.1 Name of Rule

This is the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011.

1.2 Commencement

This Rule commences on 25 March 2011.

1.3 Statement of intent

This Rule deals with all higher degrees by research offered at the University. These are:
(a) Master’s degrees by research;  
(b) Doctorates by research; and  
(c) Higher Doctorates by research. 

Note: This Rule should be read in conjunction with, but not subject to, any course resolutions applying to the degree.

1.4 Interpretation

(1) In this Rule:  
applicant means an applicant for admission as a candidate for a higher degree by research.  
Associate Dean means the Associate Dean of a Faculty with authority for matters relating to higher degrees by research within the Faculty or the Deputy Chairperson of a Board of Studies or a person appointed by the Dean to have authority for matters relating to higher degrees by research within the Faculty.  
Board of Studies means an academic body with the same authority in relation to the supervision of an award course or courses as a Faculty, except that it is headed by a Chair rather than a Dean.  
candidate means a candidate for a higher degree by research  
cotutelle agreement means 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.  
course resolutions means resolutions made by the Academic Board in accordance with clauses 2.1 and 3.1 

Note: The Doctor of Philosophy is offered by the University, not by individual faculties. Accordingly, there is no power for faculties or the Academic Board to make course resolutions for the Doctor of Philosophy.  
Dean means the Dean of a Faculty, the Head of School and Dean (University school) of a University school or the Chair of a Board of Studies.  
delegate means an officer, employee or committee of the University, or any other person or entity to whom or to which, Senate has made a delegation of power.
Doctorate by research means a degree with the word “doctor” in the title comprising a minimum of two-thirds research that is approved by the Academic Board.

**Note:** The Academic Board will not approve a Doctorate by research unless it complies with the Australian Qualifications Framework.

Faculty means the relevant Faculty, College Board, University school, or Board of Studies.

full-time candidature means a candidature in which the student works on the requirements for the degree for a minimum of 35 – 40 hours per week for 48 weeks per year or as stipulated by the Faculty.

good cause means circumstances beyond the reasonable control of a student, which may include serious ill health or misadventure.

Head of Department means the head of the relevant department.

**Note:** Functions performed by the Head of Department may be performed by the Head of School, Dean or Associate Dean, in accordance with paragraph 1.4(4) of this Rule, particularly in faculties that are not organized into departments or disciplines.

higher doctorate has the meaning given to it by clause 5.1 of this Rule.

Master’s by research means a degree with the word “Master” in the title comprising a minimum of two-thirds research that is approved by the Academic Board.

**Note:** The Academic Board will not approve a Master’s by research unless it complies with the Australian Qualifications Framework.

part-time candidature means a candidature in which the student works on the requirements for the degree for a proportion of the period specified for a full-time candidature over a proportionately longer time.

Postgraduate Coordinator means the member of academic staff within a department with authority for matters relating to higher degrees by research, with overall responsibility for the planning and coordination of postgraduate research studies within a faculty, school or University school.

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

progress plan means a progress plan developed in accordance with the Progress Policy.

research period means an enrolment period set by the University and published on its website.

**Note:** Research periods are published on the University’s website at: http://sydney.edu.au/study/study-dates.html

Review Panel means a panel established in accordance with the Progress Policy.
**department school** means the academic unit, however so called, responsible for a student’s higher degree by research candidature. It may be called a **department**, discipline or **school** within the University. **Departmental\School** delegations may be exercised by faculties.

**semester** means a duration of time equal to any two research periods.

**student** means a person who is currently admitted to candidature in an award course of the University.

**Supervisor** means, in relation to a higher degree by research student, a person appointed to discharge the responsibilities set out in the **Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013**. For the purpose of this Rule, the generic term supervisor(s) will be used to include research supervisors, co-ordinating supervisors, or auxiliary supervisors.

**thesis** means the whole of the assessable work submitted by a student for examination as required by the **Thesis & Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015**.

(2) Unless the contrary appears, a provision in this Rule that specifies matters that are to be or may be considered in relation to a determination or other decision does not imply that they are the only matters to be considered.

(3) A delegate of the Senate is not authorised to sub-delegate (by way of an agency or in any other way) any or all of the delegate’s delegated functions to another person or group of persons.

(4) Delegates more senior in the lines of accountability to a delegate named in this Rule, may exercise a delegation conferred on that named delegate.

Example: A Dean may exercise a delegation conferred on an Associate Dean. An Associate Dean may exercise a delegation conferred on a **Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator**.

(5) A heading to a Part or Schedule is a provision of this Rule. Other headings are not provisions of this Rule, but the number of a section or subsection is a provision of this Rule even if it is in a heading.

(6) A note, marginal note, footnote or endnote is not a provision of this Rule.

(7) A reference to a policy or procedures includes a reference to that policy or those procedures as amended from time to time, and to any replacement policy or procedures which may be adopted in substitution for them.

(8) A reference to a committee includes a reference to any restructured or replacement committee to which the functions or responsibilities of the original committee are reassigned.

**1.5 Authorities and responsibilities**

(1) Authorities and responsibilities for the functions set out in this Rule are also defined in the **document Academic Delegations of Authority University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016**.

(2) The procedures for consideration of, and deadlines for submission of, proposals for new and amended award courses will be determined by the Academic Board.
1.6 University may change courses and units of study

(1) Despite any policy, or the course resolutions and any other provision of the agreement between a student and the University, the University:

(a) is not obliged to offer a particular course or unit of study in any academic year; and

(b) is not liable to a student for not offering a particular course or unit of study in a particular academic year.

1.7 Overall requirements

(1) The University will not admit a person to a course unless the person:

(a) is eligible for admission to the course;

(b) applies for admission in accordance with this Rule and the course resolutions;

(c) accepts an offer made by the University for admission to the course;

(d) completes, to the satisfaction of the University, all requirements for enrolment in the course; and

(e) meets the University's English language requirements.

1.8 No right to admission

Nothing in this Rule confers a right on a person to be admitted to candidature for a higher degree by research or imposes a duty on the University to admit, or offer to admit, a person to candidature for a higher degree by research.

PART 2 MASTER’S BY RESEARCH

2.1 Course resolutions

(1) The Academic Board may, on the recommendation of the Faculty, prescribe for a Master’s degree by research, standards relating to:

(a) admission requirements;

(b) course requirements

(c) candidature; and

(d) examination.

2.2 Application of this Part

(1) This Part applies to:

(a) the Master of Philosophy; and
(b) other Master’s degrees with a research component of at least two thirds of the total student load for the degree.

2.3 Eligibility for admission to candidature

(1) Subject to sub-clause (2) and (3) and to admission requirements specified in the course resolutions, to be eligible for admission by a Dean or Associate Dean to candidature for a Master’s degree, an applicant must:

(a) hold or have completed all the academic requirements for:
   (i) a Master’s degree by coursework or research; or
   (ii) a Bachelor’s degree; or
   (iii) a qualification equivalent to a Bachelor’s degree; and

(b) meet other criteria for admission as specified in the course resolutions.

(2) A Dean or Associate Dean may admit to candidature an applicant who does not meet the requirements of sub-clause (1), provided that the applicant holds a qualification or qualifications that, in the opinion of the Faculty Graduate Studies Committee are equivalent to those prescribed in sub-clause (1).

(3) The Dean or Associate Dean may impose on a student admitted to candidature pursuant to sub-clause (2) such conditions as the Dean or Associate Dean considers appropriate.

2.4 Application for admission to candidature

(1) An applicant for admission to candidature for a Master's degree must submit to the relevant Faculty:

(a) if required by the course resolutions, a proposed course of advanced study
   and research, approved by the Head of the department Associate Dean of
   the school in which the work is to be undertaken;

(b) satisfactory evidence of the applicant’s eligibility for admission; and

(c) a statement certifying the applicant’s understanding that, subject to this
   Rule, if the candidature is successful, his or her thesis will be lodged with the
   Director, University Libraries and made available for use.

2.5 Probationary admission to candidature

(1) Where provision is made for probationary admission in the course resolutions, the Dean or Associate Dean may admit a student to candidature for a Master’s degree on a probationary basis for a period not exceeding four research periods.

(2) On completion by the student of any probationary period imposed pursuant to sub-clause (1), the Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator will review the student’s work and recommend to the Associate Dean that:

(a) the student’s candidature be confirmed; or

(b) the student be required to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.
(3) After considering a recommendation made by the Postgraduate Coordinator a Head of Department in accordance with sub-clause (2), the Associate Dean may:

(a) confirm the student’s candidature; or
(b) require the student to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

Note: See clause 2.13 for details of the ‘show cause’ process.

(4) The candidature of a student that is confirmed in accordance with paragraph (3)(a) will be considered by the University to have commenced on the date of the student's probationary admission to candidature.

2.6 Credit for previous studies

(1) Subject to sub-clause (2), a student who, at the date of admission to candidature, has completed at least two research periods as a candidate for a higher degree by research in any Faculty of the University may be permitted by the Dean or Associate Dean to receive credit for all or any part of the higher degree candidature.

(2) The Dean or Associate Dean may grant credit in accordance with sub-clause (1), provided that the student’s higher degree candidature was:

(a) a course of full-time or part-time advanced study and research;
(b) pursued by the student under the supervision of a supervisor appointed by the relevant Faculty, University school or Board of Studies;
(c) directly related to the student's proposed course of advanced study for the Master's degree; and
(d) the student has discontinued his or her candidature in the higher degree.

(3) Subject to sub-clause (4), and to the course resolutions, a student who, at the date of admission to candidature, has completed at least six months as a candidate for a higher degree at another university or institution may be permitted by the Dean or Associate Dean to receive credit for all or any part of the higher degree candidature.

(4) The Dean or Associate Dean may grant credit in accordance with sub-clause (3), provided that:

(a) at the time of admission to the higher degree by research at the other university or institution, the student held academic qualifications equivalent to those set out in clause 2.3;
(b) the higher degree candidature was:
   (i) a course of full-time or part-time advanced study and research;
   (ii) pursued by the student under the supervision of a supervisor appointed by the other university or institution; and
   (iii) directly related to the student's proposed course of advanced study for the Master's degree; and
(c) the student has discontinued his or her candidature in the higher degree at the other university or institution.

(5) Where the course resolutions specify the completion of coursework as part of the requirements of the award, and subject to the course resolutions and the
2.7 Limit on credit for previous studies

The amount of credit for previous studies that may be granted to a student in accordance with clause 2.6 is limited by the following requirements:

(a) the combined duration of the student’s previous higher degree candidature and the Master’s candidature must meet the requirements set out in clauses 2.19 and 2.20 of this Rule;

(b) any period of discontinued, suspended or lapsed candidature (as set out in clauses 2.14 to 2.16 of this Rule) must comply with this Rule and with standards set by the Academic Board; and

(c) no student who has been granted credit may present a thesis for examination less than:
   (i) six months, for a full-time student; or
   (ii) twelve months, for a part-time student;
    following admission to candidature at the University.

2.8 Control of candidature

(1) All candidates for a Master’s degree are required to undertake their candidature wholly under the control of the University.

(2) The Dean or Associate Dean may require a student to provide a statement from his or her employer acknowledging that the candidature is under the exclusive control of the University.

2.9 Other studies during candidature

(1) A student must satisfactorily complete any training required by the course resolutions, the Head of Department Associate Dean, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) or Supervisor, including units of study, lectures, seminars, workshops, online modules, non-award courses, or practical work.

   Note: In accordance with this Rule, a Master’s degree must comprise a minimum of two-thirds research.

(2) Failure to complete training documented in the student’s progress plan satisfactorily may be considered as evidence of unsatisfactory progress.

(3) A Faculty may decline to examine a thesis if the student has not satisfactorily completed training documented in the progress plan.

2.10 Supervision

The Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator will appoint suitably qualified supervisors for each student undertaking a Master’s degree by research, in accordance with policy for supervision determined by the Academic Board.
Note: See also *Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013*

### 2.11 Location of candidature

1. Subject to the annual approval of the supervisors and Head of DepartmentPostgraduate Coordinator, students will pursue their candidature:
   
   (a) within the University, including its research stations and teaching hospitals;
   
   (b) on fieldwork, including in the field or in libraries, museums or other repositories;
   
   (c) within industrial laboratories or research institutions or other institutions considered by the Head of DepartmentPostgraduate Coordinator to provide adequate facilities for that candidature; or
   
   (d) within a professional working environment.

2. Throughout the course of his or her candidature, a student will attend the University for such:
   
   (a) face-to-face consultation with his or her supervisors;
   
   (b) Departmental School and Faculty or College Board University school seminars; and
   
   (c) coursework or other studies required under 2.9 of this Rule;

   as specified annually by the Head of DepartmentPostgraduate Coordinator.

3. Subject to sub-clause (4), a student who pursues his or her candidature outside Australia must complete a minimum of two research periods of candidature within the University prior to submitting his or her thesis for examination.

4. For the purposes of sub-clause (3), the two research periods of candidature to be completed within the University may be completed:
   
   (a) at any time during the candidature; and
   
   (b) continuously or in several non-consecutive periods.

### 2.12 Progress

1. At intervals no longer than one year, Heads of DepartmentsPostgraduate Coordinators must require students to:
   
   (a) provide evidence of satisfactory progress in their candidature (including any required progress and review forms); and
   
   (b) participate in a progress review interview.

2. Satisfactory progress will be assessed by a Review Panel in accordance with the Progress Policy.

3. On the basis of any evidence provided by the student and any information obtained during the interview, the Head of DepartmentPostgraduate Coordinator may determine that the student:
   
   (a) has demonstrated satisfactory or marginal progress, and specify the conditions of candidature to apply the following year; or
   
   (b) has demonstrated unsatisfactory progress, and:
(i) allow the student to continue to be enrolled with conditions, including a supplementary progress review in accordance with the Progress Policy; or

(ii) recommend to the Associate Dean that the student be asked to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

(4) When determining the conditions of candidature to apply the following year, the Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator must indicate whether he or she is satisfied that the proposed supervision arrangements are satisfactory.

(5) After considering a recommendation made by the Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator in accordance with sub-paragraph (3)(b)(ii), the Associate Dean may:

(a) allow the student’s candidature to continue and specify the conditions of candidature to apply the following year; or

(b) require the student to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

2.13 Students may be required to show good cause

(1) An Associate Dean may require a student to show good cause:

(a) following a progress review, in accordance with paragraph 2.5(3)(b) or 2.12(5)(b);

(b) if the student has not submitted his or her thesis for examination by the latest date to do so as required by clause 2.20; or

(c) at any other time, on the recommendation of the Head of Department or Postgraduate Co-ordinator.

(2) A student who is required to show good cause will be sent a notice that:

(a) requires the student to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature, on or before a specified date;

(b) states why the student is being asked to show good cause;

(c) sets out the actions that may be taken in respect of the candidature; and

(d) advises the student of his or her right to seek independent advice and assistance in preparing his or her response.

(3) The Associate Dean must give the student a reasonable opportunity to make written submissions about the matter.

(4) If, after considering any submissions made by the student, progress reports, any reports by the supervisors or Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator, and any other relevant information, the Associate Dean forms the opinion that the student has shown good cause, the Associate Dean will permit the student to continue the candidature.

(5) If, after considering the information referred to in sub-clause (4), the Associate Dean forms the opinion that the student has not shown good cause, the Associate Dean must, by written notice setting out his or her reasons:

(a) terminate the student’s candidature; or
(b) impose conditions or restrictions on the continuation of the student's candidature.

Note. For review of these decisions see University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

(6) In addition to the decision made under 2.13(4) or 2.13(5), the Associate Dean might also offer the student the option to transfer to another course within the Faculty for which the student is eligible. The Associate Dean may impose conditions or restrictions on that offer transfer of course.

(7) A person whose candidature for a higher degree by research has been terminated by an Associate Dean in accordance with 2.13(5)(a) will not be permitted to re-enrol in that candidature.

(8) Where a person whose candidature for a higher degree by research has been terminated by an Associate Dean in accordance with 2.13(5)(a), that person may be excluded by the Associate Dean from applying for admission to a higher degree by research within the Faculty for the longer period of:

(a) at least two academic years; or

(b) if the person is applying for a Research Training Scheme Program place, the period of time until the person is entitled to the maximum period allowed for the course under the Research Training Scheme.

Note: As at the date of this rule, detailed information about entitlement for Research Training Scheme Program can be found in Research Training Scheme Program: Conditions of Grant, which can be found at https://www.education.gov.au/research-training-program https://www.education.gov.au/research-training-scheme

2.14 Discontinuation of candidature

(1) Subject to this clause and the course resolutions, a student in a course may, by notice to the Faculty, discontinue his or her enrolment in the course or in one or more units of study.

(2) The notice must be in a form approved or accepted by the Faculty.

(3) A student's enrolment in the course or the relevant units of study will be treated as discontinued from the date of the notice, unless he or she produces evidence that:

(a) the discontinuation occurred at an earlier date; and

(b) there was good reason why the application could not be made at an earlier time.

(4) A student who discontinues enrolment in a course during his or her first year of enrolment in the course will not be permitted to re-enrol in that course unless:

(a) the Associate Dean granted prior permission to re-enrol; or

(b) the student applies for and gains a new admission to the course.

(5) A student may not discontinue enrolment in a course or a unit of study after the end of classes in that course or unit of study, except in accordance with paragraphs (3)(a) and (b).
2.15 Suspension of candidature

(1) Subject to the course resolutions, a student in a course may, by notice to the Faculty, suspend his or her enrolment in the course:
   (a) for a maximum period of one year; or
   (b) with the approval of the Dean or Associate Dean, for a longer period.

(2) The notice must be in a form approved or accepted by the Faculty.

(3) At the end of the suspension period, the student must comply with any requirements notified by the Dean or Associate Dean for completing the course. Those requirements apply to the student, despite anything to the contrary in the course resolutions.

2.16 Lapse of candidature

(1) If a student does not enrol by the last census date for enrolment in each research period, and the student has not discontinued or sought approval to suspend enrolment, the student’s candidature lapses.

(2) If a student’s candidature in a course lapses, then, despite any contrary provision in this Rule, the student must apply for and gain a new admission to the course in order to re-enrol.

2.17 Return to candidature

(1) Subject to written advice from the Dean or Associate Dean, if a student returns to candidature after suspension the course requirements as in force at the time of the student’s return to candidature apply.

(2) The Dean or Associate Dean may, in writing, modify the application of the course resolutions with respect to a particular student’s return to candidature.

(3) A student whose candidature has been discontinued or lapsed must apply for and gain a new admission to the course in order to re-enrol. The course requirements in place at the time of the new admission apply.

2.18 Leave of absence

Subject to the course resolutions, a student may, with the approval of the Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator, take leave of absence from the course for a period less than one research period.

2.19 Earliest date for submission of thesis for examination

Subject to clause 2.7 and this clause 2.19:

   (a) a student may not submit a thesis for examination until he or she has completed at least four research periods of enrolled candidature; and

   (b) for the purposes of paragraph (a), a student’s candidature will be considered to include any periods of credit granted under clause 2.6.
(c) the student must be enrolled at the time that the thesis is submitted for examination.

2.20 Latest date for submission of thesis for examination

(1) Subject to clause 2.7 and this clause 2.20, a student who has undertaken all of his or her candidature on a full-time basis must submit his or her thesis for examination:

(a) after no more than eight research periods of enrolled candidature; and

(b) for the purposes of paragraph (a), a student's candidature will be considered by the University to include any periods of credit granted under clause 2.6.

(2) Subject to this clause, a student who has undertaken all of his or her candidature on a part-time basis must submit his or her thesis for examination after no more than 16 research periods of enrolled candidature.

(3) Where a student has undertaken his or her candidature as a mixture of part-time candidature and full-time candidature, a part-time research period will be counted as the equivalent of one half of a full-time research period, and the student must submit his or her thesis for examination after no more than the equivalent of eight full-time research periods of enrolled candidature.

(4) The Dean or Associate Dean may approve an extension of candidature with a latest date for submission of thesis for examination beyond the maximum period specified in this clause.

(5) The student must be enrolled at the time that the thesis is submitted for examination.

2.21 Content of thesis

(1) At the end of his or her course of advanced study and research, the student must submit a thesis for examination in the form required by Academic Board policy or procedures and any applicable course resolutions.

(2) Subject to sub-clause (3), a student may not submit as his or her thesis any work that has been presented for a degree or diploma at the University or at another university or institution.

(3) A student may submit work that has been presented for a degree or diploma at the University or at another university or institution where the work is submitted as part of the thesis, and the student has identified those parts of the thesis that have previously been presented for a degree or diploma.

(4) A student who undertook his or her candidature in a language department school in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences may:

(a) submit a thesis written in English or in the target language determined by the department school; or

(b) where a department school has specified by means of a Faculty resolution that it will consider applications to submit a thesis in a language other than English or the target language of the department school, submit a thesis in another language approved by the department school.

(5) Applications to submit a thesis in a language other than English or the target language of a department school must be:
(a) made by an applicant in writing; and
(b) considered and determined by the Head of Department, Associate Dean and the Dean (taking into account arrangements for supervision and examination);

prior to the commencement of candidature.

2.22 Form of thesis for examination

(1) A candidate must submit his or her thesis for examination in the form required by the Academic Board.

(2) The thesis must be accompanied by a certificate from the co-ordinating supervisor stating whether, in the supervisors’ opinion, the form of presentation of the thesis is satisfactory.

(3) The thesis must also be accompanied by an abstract in a form prescribed by resolution of the Academic Board.

(4) Subject to this Rule, the student must submit with the thesis a statement certifying his or her understanding that, if the candidature is successful, the thesis will be lodged with the University Librarian and made available for use.

2.23 Examination procedures

The examination of candidates for the degree of Master’s by research will be conducted in accordance with the course resolutions and with standards and guidelines determined by the Academic Board.

2.24 Aegrotat and posthumous awards

Aegrotat and posthumous awards may be made in circumstances involving serious illness or death.

PART 3 DOCTORATES BY RESEARCH OTHER THAN THE DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

3.1 Course resolutions

(1) The Academic Board may, on the recommendation of the Faculty, prescribe for a Doctorate by research other than the Doctor of Philosophy, standards relating to:

(a) admission requirements;
(b) degree requirements;
(c) candidature; and
(d) examination.
3.2 Application and meaning of this Part

This Part applies to Doctorates by research other than the Doctor of Philosophy and Higher Doctorates.

3.3 Eligibility for admission to candidature

(1) Subject to sub-clause (2) and (3) and to admission requirements specified in the course resolutions, to be eligible for admission by a Dean or an Associate Dean to candidature for a Doctorate by research other than a Doctor of Philosophy, an applicant must:

(a) hold or have completed all the academic requirements for:

(i) a Master’s degree by research or higher qualification; or

(ii) a Master’s degree by coursework including a research component equivalent to 25% of one year’s full-time enrolment; or

(iii) a Bachelor's degree with first or second class honours; or

(iv) a Bachelor's degree and either relevant professional experience or a portfolio of works as determined by the Faculty; and

(b) meet other criteria for admission as specified in the course resolutions.

(2) A Dean or an Associate Dean may admit to candidature an applicant who does not meet the requirements of sub-clause (1), provided that the applicant holds a qualification or qualifications that, in the opinion of the Faculty Graduate Studies Committee are equivalent to those prescribed in sub-clause (1).

(3) The Dean or Associate Dean may impose on a student admitted to candidature pursuant to sub-clause (2) such conditions as the Dean or Associate Dean considers appropriate.

3.4 Application for admission to candidature

(1) An applicant for admission to candidature for a Doctorate by research other than the Doctor of Philosophy must submit to the relevant Faculty:

(a) if required by the course resolutions, a proposed course of advanced study and research, approved by the Head of the department Associate Dean, in consultation with the Postgraduate Coordinator of the school in which the work is to be undertaken;

(b) satisfactory evidence of the applicant’s eligibility for admission; and.

(c) a statement certifying the applicant’s understanding that, subject to this Rule, if the candidature is successful, his or her thesis will be lodged with the University Librarian and made available for use.

3.5 Probationary admission to candidature

(1) Where provision is made for probationary admission in the course resolutions, the Dean or Associate Dean may admit a student to candidature for a Doctorate other than a PhD on a probationary basis for a period not exceeding four research periods.
(2) On completion by the student of any probationary period imposed pursuant to sub-clause (1), the Head of Department, relevant Head of School or Postgraduate Coordinator will review the student’s work and recommend to the Associate Dean that:

(a) the student’s candidature be confirmed; or

(b) the student be required to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

(3) After considering a recommendation made by a Head of Department, the relevant Head of School or Postgraduate Coordinator in accordance with sub-clause (2), the Associate Dean may:

(a) confirm the student’s candidature; or

(b) require the student to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

Note: See clause 3.13 for details of the ‘show cause’ process.

(4) The candidature of a student that is confirmed in accordance with paragraph (3)(a) will be considered by the University to have commenced on the date of the student’s probationary admission to candidature.

3.6 Credit for previous studies

(1) Subject to sub-clause (2), a student who, at the date of admission to candidature, has completed at least two research periods as a candidate for a higher degree by research in any Faculty of the University may be permitted by the Dean or Associate Dean to receive credit for all or any part of the higher degree candidature.

(2) The Dean or Associate Dean may grant credit in accordance with sub-clause (1), provided that the student’s previous higher degree candidature was:

(a) a course of full-time or part-time advanced study and research;

(b) pursued by the student under the supervision of a supervisor appointed by the relevant Faculty, University school or Board of Studies;

(c) directly related to the student’s proposed course of advanced study for the Doctoral degree; and

(d) the student has discontinued his or her candidature in the previous higher degree.

(3) Subject to sub-clause (4), a student who, at the date of admission to candidature, has completed at least six months as a candidate for a higher degree by research at another university or institution may be permitted by the Dean or Associate Dean to receive credit for all or any part of the previous higher degree candidature.

(4) The Dean or Associate Dean may grant credit in accordance with sub-clause (3), provided that:

(a) at the time of admission to the higher degree at the other university or institution, the student held academic qualifications equivalent to those set out in clause 3.3;

(b) the previous higher degree by research candidature was:

(i) a course of full-time or part-time advanced study and research;
(ii) pursued by the student under the supervision of a supervisor appointed by the other university or institution; and

(iii) directly related to the student’s proposed course of advanced study for the Doctoral degree by research; and

c) the student has discontinued his or her candidature in the previous higher degree by research at the other university or institution.

(5) Where the course resolutions specify the completion of coursework as part of the requirements of the award, and subject to the course resolutions and the Coursework Policy 2014, the Dean or Associate Dean may grant a student credit for previously completed coursework.

3.7 Limit on credit for previous studies

(1) The amount of credit for previous studies that may be granted to a student in accordance with clause 3.6 is limited by the following requirements:

(a) the combined duration of the student’s previous higher degree by research candidature and the Doctoral candidature must meet the requirements set out in clauses 3.19 and 3.20 of this Rule;

(b) any period of discontinued, suspended or lapsed candidature (as set out in 3.14 to 3.16 of this Rule) must comply with standards set by the Academic Board and this Rule; and

(c) no student who has been granted credit may present a thesis for examination less than:

(i) six months, for a full-time student; or

(ii) twelve months, for a part-time student;

following admission to candidature at the University.

3.8 Control of candidature

(1) All candidates for a Doctoral degree by research are required to undertake their candidature wholly under the control of the University.

(2) The Dean or Associate Dean may require a student who is employed by an institution to provide a statement by the relevant employer acknowledging that the candidature is under the exclusive control of the University.

3.9 Other studies during candidature

(1) A student must satisfactorily complete any training required by the course resolutions, the Head of Department, Associate Dean, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) or Supervisor, including units of study, lectures, seminars, workshops, online modules, non-award courses, or practical work.

Note: In accordance with this Rule, a Doctorate must comprise a minimum of two-thirds research.

(2) Failure to complete training documented in the student's progress plan satisfactorily may be considered as evidence of unsatisfactory progress.
(3) A Faculty may decline to examine a thesis if the student has not satisfactorily completed training documented in the progress plan.

3.10 Supervision

The relevant Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator will appoint suitably qualified supervisors for each student undertaking a Doctoral degree by research in accordance with policy for supervision determined by the Academic Board.

Note: See also Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013

3.11 Location of candidature

(1) Subject to the annual approval of the supervisors and Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator, students will pursue their candidature:
   (a) within the University, including its research stations and teaching hospitals;
   (b) on fieldwork, including in the field or in libraries, museums or other repositories;
   (c) within industrial laboratories or research institutions or other institutions considered by the Head of Department to provide adequate facilities for that candidature; or
   (d) within a professional working environment.

(2) Throughout the course of his or her candidature, a student will attend the University for such:
   (a) face-to-face consultation with his or her supervisors;
   (b) Departmental School and Faculty or College Board University school seminars; and
   (c) coursework or other studies required under clause 3.9 of this Rule; as specified annually by the Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator.

(3) Subject to sub-clause (4) and (5), a student who pursues his or her candidature outside Australia must complete a minimum of four research periods of candidature within the University prior to submitting his or her thesis for examination.

(4) For the purposes of sub-clause (3), the four research periods of candidature to be completed within the University may be completed:
   (a) at any time during the candidature; and
   (b) continuously or in several non-consecutive periods.

(5) A student granted credit under 3.6 must complete a minimum of two research periods of candidature within the University prior to submitting his or her thesis for examination.

3.12 Progress

(1) At intervals no greater than one year, Heads of Departments Postgraduate Coordinators must require students to:
(a) provide evidence of satisfactory progress in their candidature (including any required progress and review forms); and

(b) participate in a progress review interview.

(2) Satisfactory progress will be assessed by a Review Panel in accordance with the Progress Policy.

(3) On the basis of any evidence provided by the student and any information obtained during the interview, the Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator may determine that the student:

(a) has demonstrated satisfactory or marginal progress, and specify the conditions of candidature to apply the following year; or

(b) has demonstrated unsatisfactory progress, and:

   (i) allow the student to continue to be enrolled with conditions, including a supplementary progress review in accordance with the Progress Policy; or

   (ii) recommend to the Associate Dean that the student be asked to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

(4) When determining the conditions of candidature to apply the following year, the Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator must indicate whether he or she is satisfied that the proposed supervision arrangements are satisfactory.

(5) After considering a recommendation made by the Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator in accordance with sub-paragraph (3)(b)(ii), the Associate Dean may:

(a) allow the student’s candidature to continue and specify the conditions of candidature to apply the following year; or

(b) require the student to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

3.13 Students may be required to show good cause

(1) An Associate Dean may require a student to show good cause:

(a) following a progress review, in accordance with paragraph 3.5(3)(b) or 3.12(5)(b);

(b) if the student has not submitted his or her thesis for examination by the latest date to do so, as required by clause 3.20; or

(c) at any other time, on the recommendation of the Head of Department or Postgraduate Coordinator.

(2) A student who is required to show good cause will be sent a notice that:

(a) requires the student to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature, on or before a specified date;

(b) states why the student is being asked to show good cause;

(c) sets out the actions that may be taken in respect of the candidature; and

(d) advises the student of his or her right to seek independent advice and assistance in preparing his or her response.
(3) The Associate Dean must give the student a reasonable opportunity to make written submissions about the matter.

(4) If, after considering any submissions made by the student, progress reports, any reports by the supervisors or Head of Department the Postgraduate Coordinator, and any other relevant information, the Associate Dean forms the opinion that the student has shown good cause, the Associate Dean will permit the student to continue the candidature.

(5) If, after considering the information referred to in sub-clause (4), the Associate Dean forms the opinion that the student has not shown good cause, the Associate Dean must, by written notice setting out his or her reasons:

(a) terminate the student’s candidature; or
(b) impose conditions or restrictions on the continuation of the student’s candidature.

Note. For review of these decisions see University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

(6) In addition to the decision made under 3.13(4) or 3.13(5), the Associate Dean might also offer the student the option to transfer to another course within the Faculty for which the student is eligible. The Associate Dean may impose conditions or restrictions on that offer transfer of course.

(7) A person whose candidature for a higher degree by research has been terminated by an Associate Dean in accordance with 3.13(5)(a) will not be permitted to re-enrol in that candidature.

(8) Where a person whose candidature for a higher degree by research has been terminated by an Associate Dean in accordance with 3.13(5)(a), that person may be excluded by the Associate Dean from applying for admission to a higher degree by research within the Faculty for the longer period of:

(a) at least two academic years; or
(b) if the person is applying for a Research Training Scheme Program place, the period of time until the person is entitled to the maximum period allowed for the course under the Research Training Scheme Program.

Note: As at the date of this rule, detailed information about entitlement for Research Training Scheme Program can be found in Research Training Scheme Program: Conditions of Grant, which can be found at https://www.education.gov.au/research-training-program https://www.education.gov.au/research-training-scheme

3.14 Discontinuation of candidature

(1) Subject to this clause and the course resolutions, a student in a course may, by notice to the Faculty, discontinue his or her enrolment in the course or in one or more units of study.

(2) The notice must be in a form approved or accepted by the Faculty.

(3) A student’s enrolment in the course or the relevant units of study will be treated as discontinued from the date of the notice, unless he or she produces evidence that:

(a) the discontinuation occurred at an earlier date; and
(b) there was good reason why the application could not be made at an earlier time.
A student who discontinues enrolment in a course during his or her first year of enrolment in the course will not be permitted to re-enrol in that course unless:

(a) the Associate Dean granted prior permission to re-enrol; or
(b) the student applies for and gains a new admission to the course.

A student may not discontinue enrolment in a course or a unit of study after the end of classes in that course or unit of study, except in accordance with sub-clauses (3)(a) and (b).

### 3.15 Suspension of candidature

(1) Subject to the course resolutions, a student in a course may, by notice to the Faculty, suspend his or her enrolment in the course:

(a) for a maximum period of one year; or

(b) with the approval of the Dean or Associate Dean, for a longer period.

(2) The notice must be in a form approved or accepted by the Faculty.

(3) At the end of the suspension period, the student must comply with any requirements notified by the Dean or Associate Dean for completing the course. Those requirements apply to the student, despite anything to the contrary in the course resolutions.

### 3.16 Lapse of candidature

(1) If a student does not enrol by the last census date for enrolment in each research period, and the student has not discontinued or sought approval to suspend enrolment, the student’s candidature lapses.

(2) If a student’s candidature in a course lapses, then, despite any contrary provision in this Rule, the student must apply for and gain a new admission to the course in order to re-enrol.

### 3.17 Return to candidature

(1) Subject to written advice from the Dean or Associate Dean, if a student returns to candidature after suspension, the course requirements as in force at the time of the student’s return to candidature apply.

(2) The Dean or Associate Dean may, in writing, modify the application of the course resolutions with respect to a particular student’s return to candidature.

(3) A student whose candidature has been discontinued or lapsed must apply for and gain a new admission to the course in order to re-enrol. The course requirements in place at the time of the new admission apply.

### 3.18 Leave of absence

Subject to the course resolutions, a student may, with the approval of the Head of Department, Postgraduate Coordinator, take leave of absence from the course for a period less than one research period.
3.19 Earliest date for submission of thesis for examination

(1) For the purposes of this clause, a student’s candidature will be considered by the University to include any periods of credit granted under clause 3.6 of this Rule.

(2) Subject to clauses 3.6 and 3.7 and this clause 3.19 a student may not submit a thesis for examination until he or she has completed at least 12 research periods of enrolled candidature.

(3) The Associate Dean may permit a student to submit a thesis for examination up to two research periods earlier than the period prescribed in sub-clause (2), provided that the Associate Dean is satisfied that the student has made exceptional progress in his or her candidature.

(4) The Chair of the Academic Board may permit a student to submit a thesis earlier than the periods prescribed in sub-clauses (1)-(2), provided that the Chair of the Academic Board is satisfied that the student has made exceptional progress in his or her candidature.

(5) Prior to exercising his or her discretion under sub-clause (4), the Chair of the Academic Board may obtain advice from the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board, Dean or Associate Dean.

(6) The student must be enrolled at the time that the thesis is submitted for examination.

3.20 Latest date for submission of thesis for examination

(1) Subject to clause 3.6 and this clause 3.20, a student who has undertaken all of his or her candidature on a full-time basis must submit his or her thesis for examination:

(a) after no more than 16 research periods of enrolled candidature; and

(b) for the purposes of paragraph (a), a student’s candidature will be considered by the University to include any periods of credit granted under clause 3.6.

(2) Subject to this clause, a student who has undertaken all of his or her candidature on a part-time basis must submit his or her thesis for examination after no more than 32 research periods of enrolled candidature.

(3) Where a student has undertaken his or her candidature as a mixture of part-time candidature and full-time candidature, a part-time research period will be counted as the equivalent of one half of a full-time research period, and the student must submit his or her thesis for examination after no more than the equivalent of 16 full-time research periods of enrolled candidature.

(4) The Dean or Associate Dean may approve an extension of candidature with a new latest date for submission of thesis for examination beyond the maximum period specified in this clause.

(5) The student must be enrolled at the time that the thesis is submitted for examination.
3.21 Content of thesis

(1) At the end of his or her course of advanced study and research, the student must submit a thesis for examination in the form required by Academic Board policy or procedures and any applicable course resolutions.

(2) Subject to sub-clause (3), a student may not submit as his or her thesis any work that has been presented for a degree or diploma at the University or at another university or institution.

(3) A student may submit work that has been presented for a degree or diploma at the University or at another university or institution where the work is submitted as part of the thesis, and the student has identified those parts of the thesis that have previously been presented for a degree or diploma.

(4) A student who undertook his or her candidature in a language department school in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences may:
   (a) submit a thesis written in English or in the target language determined by the department school; or
   (b) where a department school has specified by means of a Faculty resolution that it will consider applications to submit a thesis in a language other than English or the target language of the department school, submit a thesis in another language approved by the department school.

(5) Subject to the course resolutions, applications to submit a thesis in a language other than English or the target language of a department school must be:
   (a) made by an applicant in writing; and
   (b) considered and determined by the Head of Department, Associate Dean and the Dean (taking into account arrangements for supervision and examination);

prior to the commencement of candidature.

3.22 Form of thesis for examination

(1) A candidate must submit his or her thesis for examination in the form required by the Academic Board.

(2) The thesis must be accompanied by a certificate from the co-ordinating supervisor stating whether, in the supervisors’ opinion, the form of presentation of the thesis is satisfactory.

(3) The thesis must also be accompanied by an abstract in a form required by the Academic Board.

(4) Subject to this Rule, the student must submit with the thesis a statement certifying his or her understanding that, if the candidature is successful, the thesis will be lodged with the University Librarian and made available for use.

3.23 Examination procedures

(1) The examination of candidates for a Doctorate by research will be conducted in accordance with the course resolutions and with standards and guidelines determined by the Academic Board.
(2) Where the course resolutions do not specify examination procedures, the examination of candidates for a Doctorate by research will be conducted in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Academic Board for the Doctor of Philosophy.

3.24 Aegrotat and posthumous awards

Aegrotat and posthumous awards may be made in circumstances involving serious illness or death.

PART 4 DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

4.1 Application of this part

This Part applies to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

4.2 Eligibility for admission to candidature

(1) Subject to sub-clauses (2) and (3), to be eligible for admission by the Dean or Associate Dean to candidature for the Doctor of Philosophy, an applicant must:

(a) hold or have completed all the academic requirements for:
   (i) a Master's degree by research or higher level degree; or
   (ii) a Master's degree by coursework including a research component equivalent to 25% of one year’s full-time enrolment; or
   (iii) a Bachelor's degree with first or second class honours; and

(b) meet additional criteria for admission to the degree as specified by the Faculty.

(2) A Dean or Associate Dean may admit to candidature an applicant who does not meet the requirements of sub-clause (1), provided that the applicant holds or has completed all the requirements for a Bachelor’s degree, and:

(a) has obtained a high distinction or distinction in the highest course available in the subject or subjects relevant to the proposed course of advanced study and research; or

(b) has completed a period of relevant full-time or part-time advanced study and research towards a Master's degree by research at the University, at such a standard as demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Dean or Associate Dean that the applicant is suitably prepared in the field of study to undertake the Doctor of Philosophy. Students admitted on this basis will be granted credit for their candidature in the Master’s degree, consistently with clause 4.5.

(3) The Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of Academic Board may admit to candidature an applicant who does not meet the requirements of sub-clause (1) or (2), provided that the applicant holds qualifications that, in the opinion of the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee on the recommendation of the Associate Dean, are equivalent to those prescribed in sub-clauses (1) or (2).
(4) The Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of Academic Board may impose on a student admitted to candidature pursuant to sub-clause (3) such conditions as the Chair considers appropriate.

4.3 Application for admission to candidature

(1) An applicant for admission to candidature for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy must submit to the relevant Faculty:

(a) a proposed course of advanced study and research, approved by the Head of the department/Associate Dean, in consultation with the Postgraduate Coordinator of the school in which the work is to be undertaken; and

(b) satisfactory evidence of the applicant’s eligibility for admission; and

(c) a statement certifying the applicant’s understanding that, subject to this Rule, if the candidature is successful, his or her thesis will be lodged with the University Librarian and made available for use.

4.4 Probationary admission to candidature

(1) The Dean or Associate Dean may admit a student to candidature for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy on a probationary basis for a period not exceeding four research periods.

(2) On completion by the student of any probationary period imposed pursuant to sub-clause (1), the Head of Department/Postgraduate Coordinator will review the student’s work and recommend to the Associate Dean that:

(a) the student’s candidature be confirmed; or

(b) the student be required to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

(3) After considering a recommendation made by a Head of Department/Postgraduate Coordinator in accordance with sub-clause (2), the Associate Dean may:

(a) confirm the student’s candidature; or

(b) require the student to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

Note: See clause 4.12 for details of the ‘show cause’ process.

(4) The candidature of a student that is confirmed in accordance with paragraph (3)(a) will be considered by the University to have commenced on the date of the student’s probationary admission to candidature.

4.5 Credit for previous studies

(1) Subject to sub-clause (2), a student who, at the date of admission to candidature, has completed at least two research periods as a candidate for a higher degree by research in any Faculty of the University may be permitted by the relevant Dean or Associate Dean to receive credit for all or any part of the higher degree candidature.
(2) The Dean or Associate Dean may grant credit in accordance with sub-clause (1), provided that the student’s higher degree candidature was:

(a) a course of full-time or part-time advanced study and research;
(b) pursued by the student under the supervision of a supervisor appointed by the relevant Faculty, University school or Board of Studies;
(c) directly related to the student’s proposed course of advanced study for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy; and
(d) the student has discontinued his or her candidature in the previous higher degree.

(3) Subject to sub-clause (4), a student who, at the date of admission to candidature, has completed at least six months as a candidate for a higher degree at another university or institution may be permitted by the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board/Associate Dean to receive credit for all or any part of the higher degree candidature.

(4) The Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board/Associate Dean may grant credit in accordance with sub-clause (3), provided that:

(a) at the time of admission to the higher degree by research at the other university or institution, the student held academic qualifications equivalent to those set out in clause 4.2;
(b) the higher degree candidature was:
   (i) a course of full-time or part-time advanced study and research;
   (ii) pursued by the student under the supervision of a supervisor appointed by the other university or institution; and
   (iii) directly related to the student’s proposed course of advanced study for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy; and
(c) the student has discontinued his or her candidature in the higher degree at the other university or institution.

4.6 Limit on credit for previous studies

(1) The amount of credit for previous studies that may be granted to a student in accordance with clause 4.5 is limited by the following requirements:

(a) the combined duration of the student’s previous higher degree candidature and the Doctor of Philosophy candidature must meet the requirements set out in clauses 4.18 and 4.19 of this Rule;
(b) any period of discontinued, suspended or lapsed candidature (as set out in 4.13 to 4.15 of this Rule) must comply with standards set by the Academic Board and this Rule; and
(c) no student who has been granted credit may present a thesis for examination less than:
   (i) six months, for a full-time student; or
   (ii) twelve months, for a part-time student;
   following admission to candidature at the University.
4.7 **Control of candidature**

(1) All candidates for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy are required to undertake their candidature wholly under the control of the University.

(2) The Dean or Associate Dean may require a student to provide a statement from his or her employer acknowledging that the candidature is under the exclusive control of the University.

4.8 **Other studies during candidature**

(1) A student must satisfactorily complete any training required by the course resolutions, the Head of Department, Associate Dean, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) or Supervisor, including units of study, lectures, seminars, workshops, online modules, non-award courses, or practical work.

**Note:** In accordance with this Rule, a Doctorate must comprise a minimum of two-thirds research.

(2) Failure to complete training documented in the student’s progress plan satisfactorily may be considered as evidence of unsatisfactory progress.

(3) A Faculty may decline to examine a thesis if the student has not satisfactorily completed training documented in the progress plan.

4.9 **Supervision**

The Head of Department, Postgraduate Coordinator will appoint suitably qualified supervisors for each candidate for the Doctor of Philosophy in accordance with policy for supervision determined by the Academic Board.

**Note:** See also [Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013](#).

4.10 **Location of candidature**

(1) Subject to the annual approval of the supervisors and Head of Department, Postgraduate Coordinator, students will pursue their candidature:

(a) within the University, including its research stations and teaching hospitals;

(b) on fieldwork, including in the field or in libraries, museums or other repositories;

(i) within industrial laboratories or research institutions or other institutions considered by the Head of Department to provide adequate facilities for that candidature; or

(ii) within a professional working environment.

(2) Throughout the course of his or her candidature, a student will attend the University for such:

(a) consultation with his or her supervisors; and

(b) Departmental School and Faculty or College Board University school seminars; and

(c) coursework or other studies required under clause 4.08 of this Rule;
as specified annually by the Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator.

(3) Subject to sub-clauses (4) (5) and (6), a student who pursues his or her candidature outside Australia must complete a minimum of four research periods of candidature within the University prior to submitting his or her thesis for examination.

(4) A student whose minimum length of candidature is eight research periods (rather than the usual 12 research periods), and who pursues his or her candidature outside Australia, must complete a minimum of two research periods of candidature within the University prior to submitting his or her thesis for examination.

(5) For the purposes of sub-clauses (3) and (4), the period required to be completed within the University may be completed:
   (a) at any time during the candidature; and
   (b) continuously or in several non-consecutive periods.

(6) A student granted credit under 4.5 must complete a minimum of two research periods of candidature within the University prior to submitting his or her thesis for examination.

4.11 Progress

(1) At intervals no greater than one year, Heads of Departments Postgraduate Coordinators must require students to:
   (a) provide evidence of satisfactory progress in their candidature (including any required progress and review forms); and
   (b) participate in a progress review interview.

(2) Satisfactory progress will be assessed by a Review Panel in accordance with the Progress Policy.

(3) On the basis of any evidence provided by the student and any information obtained during the interview, the Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator may determine that the student:
   (a) has demonstrated satisfactory or marginal progress, and specify the conditions of candidature to apply the following year; or
   (b) has demonstrated unsatisfactory progress, and:
      (i) allow the student to continue to be enrolled with conditions, including a supplementary progress review in accordance with the Progress Policy; or
      (ii) recommend to the Associate Dean that the student be asked to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

(4) When determining the conditions of candidature to apply the following year, the Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator must indicate whether he or she is satisfied that the proposed supervision arrangements are satisfactory.

(5) After considering a recommendation made by the Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator in accordance with sub-paragraph (3)(b)(ii), the Associate Dean may:
(a) allow the student’s candidature to continue and specify the conditions of candidature to apply the following year; or

(b) require the student to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

4.12 Students may be required to show good cause

(1) An Associate Dean may require a student to show good cause:

(a) following a progress review, in accordance with paragraph 4.4(3)(b) or 4.11(5)(b);

(b) if the student has not submitted his or her thesis for examination by the latest date to do so, as required by clause 4.19; or

(c) at any other time, on the recommendation of the Head of Department or Postgraduate Co-ordinator.

(2) A student who is required to show good cause will be sent a notice that:

(a) requires the student to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature, on or before a specified date;

(b) states why the student is being asked to show good cause;

(c) sets out the actions that may be taken in respect of the candidature; and

(d) advises the student of his or her right to seek independent advice and assistance in preparing his or her response.

(3) The Associate Dean must give the student a reasonable opportunity to make written submissions about the matter.

(4) If, after considering any submissions made by the student, progress reports, any reports by the supervisors or Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator, and any other relevant information, the Associate Dean forms the opinion that the student has shown good cause, the Associate Dean will permit the student to continue the candidature.

(5) If, after considering the information referred to in sub-clause (4), the Associate Dean forms the opinion that the student has not shown good cause, the Associate Dean must, by written notice setting out his or her reasons:

(a) terminate the student’s candidature; or

(b) impose conditions or restrictions on the continuation of the student’s candidature.

Note For review of these decisions see University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

(6) In addition to the decision made under 4.12(4) or 4.12(5), the Associate Dean might also offer the student the option to transfer to another course within the Faculty for which the student is eligible. The Associate Dean may impose conditions or restrictions on that offer transfer of course.

(7) A person whose candidature for a higher degree by research has been terminated by an Associate Dean in accordance with 4.12(5)(a) will not be permitted to re-enrol in that candidature.

(8) Where a person whose candidature for a higher degree by research has been terminated by an Associate Dean in accordance with 4.12(5)(a), that person may
be excluded by the Associate Dean from applying for admission to a higher degree within the Faculty for the longer period of:

(a) at least two academic years; or

(b) if the person is applying for a Research Training Scheme Program place, the period of time until the person is entitled to the maximum period allowed for the course under the Research Training Scheme Program.

Note: As at the date of this rule, detailed information about entitlement for Research Training Scheme Program can be found in Research Training Scheme Program: Conditions of Grant, which can be found at https://www.education.gov.au/research-training-program https://www.education.gov.au/research-training-scheme

4.13 Discontinuation of candidature

(1) A student in a course may, by notice to the Faculty, discontinue his or her enrolment in the course or in one or more units of study.

(2) The notice must be in a form approved or accepted by the Faculty.

(3) A student’s enrolment in the course or the relevant units of study will be treated as discontinued from the date of the notice, unless he or she produces evidence that:

   (a) the discontinuation occurred at an earlier date; and

   (b) there was good reason why the application could not be made at an earlier time.

(4) A student who discontinues enrolment in a course during his or her first year of enrolment in the course will not be permitted to re-enrol in that course unless:

   (a) the Associate Dean granted prior permission to re-enrol; or

   (b) the student applies for and gains a new admission to the course.

(5) A student may not discontinue enrolment in a course or a unit of study after the end of classes in that course or unit of study, except in accordance with sub-clause (3)(a) and (b).

4.14 Suspension of candidature

(1) A student in a course may, by notice to the Faculty, suspend his or her enrolment in the course:

   (a) for a maximum period of one year; or

   (b) with the approval of the Dean or Associate Dean, for a longer period.

(2) The notice must be in a form approved or accepted by the Faculty.

(3) At the end of the suspension period, the student must comply with any requirements notified by the Dean or Associate Dean for completing the course.

4.15 Lapse of candidature

(1) If a student does not enrol by the last census date for enrolment in each research period, and the student has not discontinued or sought approval to suspend enrolment, the student’s candidature lapses.
(2) If a student's candidature in a course lapses, then, despite any contrary provision in this Rule, the student must apply for and gain a new admission to the course in order to re-enrol.

### 4.16 Return to candidature

1. Subject to written advice from the Dean or Associate Dean, if a student returns to candidature after suspension in candidature, the requirements as in force at the time of the student's return to candidature apply.

2. A student whose candidature has been discontinued or lapsed must apply for and gain a new admission to the course in order to re-enrol. The course requirements in place at the time of the new admission apply.

### 4.17 Leave of absence

Subject to the course resolutions, a student may, with the approval of the Head of DepartmentPostgraduate Coordinator, take leave of absence from the course for a period of less than one research period.

### 4.18 Earliest date for submission of thesis for examination

1. For the purposes of this clause, a student's candidature will be considered by the University to include any periods of credit granted under clause 4.6 of this Rule.

2. Subject to clause 4.6 and this clause 4.18 a student may not submit a thesis for examination until he or she has completed at least 12 research periods of enrolled candidature.

3. The Dean or Associate Dean may permit a student to submit a thesis for examination up to two research periods earlier than the period prescribed in sub-clause (2), provided that, in the opinion of the DeanAssociate Dean, evidence has been produced that the student has made exceptional progress in his or her candidature.

4. The Chair of the Academic Board may permit a student to submit a thesis earlier than the periods prescribed in sub-clauses (2)-(3), provided that, in the opinion of the Chair of the Academic Board, evidence has been produced that the student has made exceptional progress in his or her candidature.

5. Prior to exercising his or her discretion under sub-clause (4), the Chair of the Academic Board may obtain advice from the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board, Dean or Associate Dean.

6. The student must be enrolled at the time that the thesis is submitted for examination.

### 4.19 Latest date for submission of thesis for examination

1. For the purposes of this clause, a student's candidature will be considered by the University to include any periods of credit granted under clause 4.5 of this Rule.

2. Subject to this clause 4.19, a student who has undertaken all of his or her candidature on a full-time basis must submit his or her thesis for examination after no more than 16 research periods of enrolled candidature.
(3) A student who has undertaken all of his or her candidature on a part-time basis must submit his or her thesis for examination after no more than 32 research periods of enrolled candidature.

(4) Where a student has undertaken his or her candidature as a mixture of part-time candidature and full-time candidature, a part-time research period will be counted as the equivalent of one half of a full-time research period, and the student must submit his or her thesis for examination after no more than the full-time equivalent of 16 research periods of enrolled candidature.

(5) The Dean or Associate Dean may approve an extension of candidature with a new latest date for submission of thesis for examination beyond the maximum period specified in this clause.

(6) The student must be enrolled at the time that the thesis is submitted for examination.

4.20 Content of thesis

(1) At the end of his or her course of advanced study and research, the student must submit a thesis for examination in the form required by Academic Board policy or procedures.

(2) Subject to sub-clause (3), a student may not submit as his or her thesis any work that has been presented for a degree or diploma at the University or at another university or institution.

(3) A student may submit work that has been presented for a degree or diploma at the University or at another university or institution where:

(a) his or her candidature has been governed by an approved cotutelle agreement; or

(b) the work is submitted as part of the thesis, and the student has identified those parts of the thesis that have previously been presented for a degree or diploma.

(4) A student whose candidature is governed by an approved cotutelle agreement may submit a thesis written in English or in another language.

(5) A student who undertook his or her candidature in a language department school in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences may:

(a) submit a thesis written in English or in the target language determined by the department school; or

(b) where a department school has specified by means of a Faculty resolution that it will consider applications to submit a thesis in a language other than English or the target language of the department school, submit a thesis in another language approved by the department school.

(6) Applications to submit a thesis in a language other than English or the target language of a department school must be:

(a) made by an applicant in writing; and

(b) considered and determined by the Head of Department and the Dean Associate Dean (taking into account arrangements for supervision and examination);

prior to the commencement of candidature.
4.21 Form of thesis for examination

(1) A candidate must submit his or her thesis for examination in the form required by the Academic Board.

(2) The thesis must be accompanied by a certificate from the coordinating supervisor stating whether, in the supervisors’ opinion, the form of presentation of the thesis is satisfactory.

(3) The thesis must also be accompanied by an abstract in the form required by the Academic Board.

(4) Subject to this Rule, the student must submit with the thesis a statement certifying his or her understanding that, if the candidature is successful, the thesis will be lodged with the University Librarian and made available for immediate public use.

4.22 Examination procedures

The procedures for examination of candidates for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy will be prescribed by the Academic Board.

4.23 Aegrotat and posthumous awards

Aegrotat and posthumous awards may be made in circumstances involving serious illness or death.

PART 5 HIGHER DOCTORATES

5.1 Meaning of this Part

(1) In this Part:

(a) assessment committee means the committee appointed by the Dean in accordance with clause 5.5.

(b) higher doctorate means any of the following:

(i) Doctor of Agricultural Economics;

(ii) Doctor of Dental Science;

(iii) Doctor of Engineering;

(iv) Doctor of Laws;

(v) Doctor of Letters;

(vi) Doctor of Letters in Education;

(vii) Doctor of Letters in Social Work;

(viii) Doctor of Medicine/Medical Science;

(ix) Doctor of Music;

(x) Doctor of Science;
(xi) Doctor of Science in Agriculture;
(xii) Doctor of Science in Architecture;
(xiii) Doctor of Science in Economics;
(xiv) Doctor of Veterinary Science.

(c) published work meets the higher doctorate standard if it is generally recognised by scholars in the relevant field of study as a distinguished contribution to knowledge or creative achievement.

5.2 Award of Higher Doctorates

(1) The Academic Board may, on the recommendation of the relevant Faculty Dean, award a higher doctorate for published work that, in the opinion of the examiners:
   (a) constitutes a distinguished contribution to knowledge or creative achievement; and
   (b) is recognised by scholars in the relevant field as constituting a distinguished contribution to knowledge or creative achievement in that field.

(2) Without limiting sub-clause (1), a published work may be regarded as a distinguished contribution to knowledge if:
   (a) it represents a significant advance in knowledge in the relevant field;
   (b) it has caused, or become a major part of, a significant debate among scholars in the relevant field (including in books and journals); or
   (c) it has caused significant changes in the direction of research or in the practice of recognised scholars in the relevant field.

5.3 Eligibility for admission to candidature

(1) Subject to this clause 5.3, to be eligible for admission to candidature for a higher doctorate, an applicant must:
   (a) hold a degree from the University that was conferred five or more years prior to the application date;
   (b) hold a degree from another university or institution that was conferred five or more years prior to the application date; or
   (c) have qualifications that were conferred five or more years prior to the application date and standing that are determined by the Faculty and by the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board to be equivalent to holding a degree from the University; and
   (d) for the Doctor of Dental Science, hold or have completed all the academic requirements for the award of the Bachelor of Dental Surgery;
   (e) for the Doctor of Medicine, hold or have completed all the academic requirements for the Bachelor of Medicine;
   (f) for the Doctor of Music hold or have completed all the academic requirements for:
      (i) the Bachelor of Music; or
(ii) the Bachelor of Arts including a three year sequence of courses in Music;

(g) for the Doctor of Veterinary Science hold or have completed all the academic requirements for the Bachelor of Veterinary Science.

(2) To be eligible for admission to candidature, an applicant who does not meet the requirements of paragraph (1)(a) must:

(a) have been a full-time member of the academic staff of the University for at least three years (or pro-rata part-time); or

(b) be recognised by the Academic Board, on the recommendation of the Dean, to have been involved in the teaching and research of the University to an equivalent level.

(3) To be eligible for admission to candidature, an applicant for a degree referred to in paragraphs 1(d)-(g) who does not meet the requirements of those paragraphs must be recognised by the Faculty Dean and the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of Academic Board to have equivalent academic standing.

5.4 Application for admission to candidature

(1) An application for admission to a higher doctorate must:

(a) state the name of the higher doctorate to which the application relates;

(b) specify the applicant’s academic qualifications; and

(c) describe the applicant’s association with the University.

(2) The application must be accompanied by:

(a) a list of the published works that the candidate proposes to submit for examination;

(b) a description of the themes of the published works; and

(c) where there are a large number of publications whose dates range over a period of time and cover a range of subjects, a statement of how these publications are related to one another and to the theme.

5.5 Preliminary assessment of application for admission

(1) The Dean will appoint a committee to consider and determine, in respect of each application for admission, whether:

(a) the applicant is eligible for admission to candidature;

(b) the published work is in a field appropriate to the nominated degree;

(c) the Faculty is competent to examine the published work at the required level; and

(d) whether the applicant should be admitted to candidature.

(2) The committee may not determine that the applicant should be admitted to candidature unless the requirements of each of paragraphs (1)(a)-(c) are met.

(3) If the committee determines that the applicant should be admitted to candidature, the committee will recommend to the Dean that he or she recommends to the Academic Board:
(a) that the applicant be admitted to candidature; and
(b) the appointment of at least three named examiners, of whom at least two will be external examiners.

(4) The assessment committee will comprise:
   (a) the Dean;
   (b) the Head of Department/Postgraduate Coordinator most closely associated with the relevant field of work;
   (c) the academic staff member most closely associated with the relevant field of work; and
   (d) other persons appointed by the Dean.

5.6 Admission to candidature

The Academic Board may, on the recommendation of the Dean, admit to candidature for a higher doctorate an applicant who meets the requirements for admission in this Part.

5.7 Enrolment

A successful applicant must enrol as a candidate for the higher doctorate in the first enrolment period following receipt of his or her offer of admission.

5.8 Submission of work for examination

(1) The candidate must submit to the Dean five copies of the published work.
(2) The work submitted must include:
   (a) a description of the theme of the published work;
   (b) a record of original research undertaken by the candidate;
   (c) a statement by the candidate of:
      (i) the sources from which the information in the work was derived;
      (ii) the extent to which the work draws on the work of others; and
      (iii) the portion of the work that the candidate claims as original;
(3) if the work submitted contains research that was carried out conjointly, a statement by the candidate of the extent to which the candidate was responsible for the initiation, conduct or direction of the research; and
(4) if the principal publications, as distinct from any supporting papers, incorporate work previously submitted for a degree or diploma at the University or at any other university or institution, a statement by the candidate of those parts of the publications that have previously been submitted.
(5) A candidate for the Doctor of Letters must submit work that includes at least one substantial work.
(6) A candidate for the Doctor of Music may submit one or more major musical works of the candidate’s own composition.
5.9 Appointment of examiners

(1) The Academic Board will, on the recommendation of the Dean, appoint at least three examiners, of whom at least two will be external examiners.

(2) The Academic Board may appoint examiners in addition to those recommended by the Dean.

5.10 Examination

(1) Each examiner for a candidature must:
   (a) examine the published work; and
   (b) make a separate report on whether, in the examiner’s opinion, the work meets the requirements for higher doctorates set out in clause 5.2.

(2) The assessment committee will consider the examiners reports, having regard to the requirements of clause 5.2, and recommend to the Dean that:
   (a) that the higher doctorate be awarded; or
   (b) that the higher doctorate not be awarded.

(3) After considering the recommendation of the assessment committee, the Dean:
   (a) will provide to the Academic Board:
      (i) the names and qualifications of the examiners; and
      (ii) the substance of the examiners’ reports; and
   (b) will recommend to the Academic Board that:
      (i) the higher doctorate be awarded;
      (ii) the higher doctorate not be awarded; or
      (iii) the Academic Board appoint a further examiner or examiners.

(4) The Academic Board will determine the result of the examination.

5.11 Lodging the published work

If the Academic Board decides to award a higher doctorate to the candidate, the Faculty must lodge with the University Librarian one electronic or bound copy of the published work in the form required by the Academic Board.

PART 6 HIGHER DEGREE BY RESEARCH THESES

6.1 Meaning of this Part

(1) In this Part:
   (a) restricted appendix means a section of a thesis to which public access has been restricted in accordance with clause 6.3.
thesis refers to the complete final thesis, including any corrections or emendations to the satisfaction of the Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator.

6.2 Lodgement

(1) Subject to this Part, a candidate for a higher degree by research will not be permitted to undertake a program of advanced study and research that is likely to result in the lodgement of a thesis that cannot be made available for public use.

(2) Subject to this Part, all successful candidates for a higher degree must lodge a copy of their final thesis with the University Librarian.

(3) Subject to clause 6.3, 6.5 and 6.6, a thesis lodged with the University Librarian will be made available for use consistently with this Rule and Academic Board policy and procedures.

Note 1: Applicants are required to certify their awareness of this requirement prior to admission to candidature. See paragraphs 2.4(1)(c), 3.4(1)(c) and 4.3(1)(c).

Note 2: Candidates are required to certify their awareness of this requirement at the time their thesis is submitted for examination. See sub-clauses 2.22(4), 3.22(4) and 4.21(4).

(4) Immediately following lodgement, the University Librarian will arrange for a statement of the author’s rights under copyright law to be affixed or appended to the thesis.

6.3 Use of confidential material

(1) If, at any time between application for admission to candidature and the lodgement of the thesis, it appears to the candidate’s supervisors or Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator that:

(a) successful completion of the candidature will require the use of confidential material; and

(b) the candidate would not be at liberty to fully disclose this confidential material in the thesis;

the matter will be reported as soon as possible to the Faculty Graduate Studies Committee.

(2) The Faculty Graduate Studies Committee may, if it considers it appropriate to do so, recommend to the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board that the candidate be granted:

(a) permission to include in an appendix to the thesis any material that is essential to the thesis but which, for a limited period, may not be available for public inspection;

(b) permission to restrict access to the whole thesis for a limited period, with a redacted version of the thesis available for public inspection; or

(c) exemption, in respect of the appendix, from the requirement to give the undertaking prescribed by sub-clauses 2.22(4), 3.22(4) and 4.21(4).

(3) If, after considering the recommendation of the Faculty Graduate Studies Committee, the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board
decides to give the permission and exemption referred to in sub-clause (2), the University Librarian will restrict public access to the appendix for a period specified by the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board.

(4) Other than in exceptional circumstances, any period of restriction to a restricted appendix will not exceed five years.

6.4 Access to confidential material in a restricted appendix

(1) The University Librarian may grant access by a scholar to a restricted appendix, provided that the scholar:
   (a) demonstrates genuine concern with the material in the appendix; and
   (b) has the written consent of either:
       (i) the author of the thesis; or
       (ii) the Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator.

(2) The Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator may not consent to access by a scholar to a restricted appendix unless:
   (a) all reasonable steps have been taken to contact the author; and
   (b) the author cannot be contacted.

6.5 Restricted access to protect intellectual property

(1) Where:
   (a) the subject of an applicant or candidate’s higher degree thesis is work conducted collaboratively with industry; and
   (b) there is a reasonable basis for concern that intellectual property contained in the thesis will be improperly exploited by others;

the Dean may recommend to the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board that access to the thesis be restricted for a limited period of time.

(2) After considering the Dean’s recommendation, the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee may determine that access to the thesis should be restricted for a limited period of time.

(3) Other than in exceptional circumstances, any period of restricted access to the thesis will not exceed 18 months from the date of the award of the degree.

6.6 Restricted access to protect the interests of the author

(1) If, at any time between application for admission to candidature and the lodgement of the thesis, it appears to the candidate that there is a reasonable basis for believing that his or her interests would be at risk if the thesis were made immediately available to the public, the candidate may apply in writing to the Associate Dean for access to the thesis to be restricted for a limited period of time.

(2) The candidate’s application to the Associate Dean should:
   (a) clearly set out the reasons for the application;
(b) clearly state the length of the requested restriction on access; and
(c) include supporting evidence, as appropriate.

(3) If, after considering the candidate’s application, the Associate Dean is satisfied that restricting access to the thesis is necessary to protect the candidate’s interests, the Associate Dean may:

(a) restrict access to the thesis for a period not exceeding six months from the date of the award of the degree; or
(b) recommend to the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board that:
   (i) a longer period of restriction; or
   (ii) an extension of an earlier period of restriction;
   be approved.

(4) The Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee may determine to restrict access to the thesis for a limited period of time.

(5) Other than in exceptional circumstances, any period of restricted access to the thesis will not exceed 18 months from the date of the award of the degree.

6.7 Right of examiners to access

(1) Notwithstanding any other clause in this Rule, the thesis and any restricted appendix will be available to the examiners of the thesis, including:
   (a) any Faculty committee or board of postgraduate studies; and
   (b) any committee of the Academic Board;
for the purposes of examination or re-examination.

PART 7  ENGLISH LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS

7.1 All applicants whose first language is not English

(1) All applicants whose first language is not English must meet the University’s English language requirements to be eligible for admission to a higher degree by research course.

(2) Subject to this Part, any applicant for admission to a higher degree by research course whose first language is not English, must have:
   (a) in the five years prior to their application, successfully completed tertiary studies in which the language of the institution, instruction, examination and assessment was English; or
   (b) in the two years prior to their application, successfully completed an appropriate course at the University’s Centre for English Teaching, with results at a standard required for the award course that the applicant is applying for; or
   (c) in the two years prior to their application, achieved:
an IELTS overall band score of 6.5 with a minimum of 6.0 in each band; or
(ii) a paper based TOEFL score of 577 plus a Test of Written English (TWE) score of 4.5; or
(iii) an internet based TOEFL (IBT) score of 90 plus a minimum score of 23 for Writing and 22 for Reading, Speaking and Listening; or
(iv) a Pearson Test of English (Academic) (PTE) score of 61; or
(v) a Cambridge English: Advanced (CAE) score of 58.

(3) An applicant for admission to a higher degree by research course in a Faculty that has, with the approval of the Academic Board, set English language requirements above the minimum requirements set out in paragraph (2) must meet the Faculty’s requirements.

7.2 Exemption from English language requirements in certain circumstances

(1) The Dean may, in writing, grant an exemption from the English language requirements for admission to a higher degree by research course if:

(a) the applicant has an IELTS score and:
   (i) the overall or average band score is no more than 0.5 below the overall or average band score otherwise required by this Rule; and
   (ii) any individual band score is no more than 1.0 below the individual band score otherwise required by this Rule; or
(b) the applicant has a score on another test permitted by this Rule and the applicant’s score was no more than a corresponding amount below the score otherwise required by this Rule; and
(c) the Dean is satisfied that the applicant has enough competence in written and spoken English to complete the course successfully.

(2) The Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board may, in exceptional circumstances, modify the limits prescribed in subparagraph (1)(a) or (b), as they apply in a particular case.

(3) In considering whether an applicant has enough competence in written and spoken English to complete the course successfully, the Dean:

(a) must take into account any advice of the Head of Department Postgraduate Coordinator; and
(b) may consider any other relevant matter, including:
   (i) the applicant’s ability to communicate in an academic environment;
   (ii) whether the applicant has been known to the Faculty for at least two years;
   (iii) whether the candidature is to be governed by an approved cotutelle agreement;
   (iv) any appropriate work experience that the applicant has had in an English language environment; and
   (v) any oral discussions between Faculty members and the applicant.
(4) The Dean must record in writing on the student file any grant of exemption from English language requirements, including:
   (a) the proof of proficiency in English provided by the applicant; and
   (b) the reasons, in accordance with this Policy, that the Dean approved the waiver.

PART 8   UNDERTAKING COURSEWORK UNITS OF STUDY

8.1 Enrolment in and assessment of coursework units of study

A higher degree by research student who is enrolled in a coursework unit of study will be subject to the provisions of Part 12 and Part 14 of the Coursework Policy 2014, including in respect of enrolment and assessment.

PART 9   SPECIAL CONSIDERATION

9.1 Coursework units of study

(1) A higher degree by research student who is enrolled in a coursework unit of study will be subject to the provisions of the Coursework Policy 2014 in respect of special consideration due to illness or misadventure.

9.2 Progress and examination

(1) Special consideration is not available for illness or misadventure in:
   (a) the assessment of a student’s progress in a progress review; or
   (b) the examination process.

(2) A student required to show cause may request special consideration for illness, misadventure or exceptional circumstances outside of their control.

9.3 Variation of candidature

(1) A student may request special consideration due to illness, misadventure or circumstances outside of their control when seeking to vary candidature, including in respect of requests for:
   (a) suspension;
   (b) a change from full-time to part-time enrolment (or vice-versa);
   (c) extension of the latest date to submit for examination.
PART 10 MISCELLANEOUS

10.1 Rules, resolutions and policies that cease to have effect

(1) The following rules, resolutions and policies, as amended and in force immediately before the commencement of this Rule, cease to have effect to the extent set out in the table below:

(a) University of Sydney (Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)) Rule 2004
(b) University of Sydney (Amendment Act) Rule 2000:
   (i) Part 9: Division 10 and Division 11
   (ii) Part 10: Division 3 and Division 5
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**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board approve the amendment of the *Progress Planning and Review of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015* and the *Progress Planning and Review of Higher Degree by Research Students Procedures 2015*, as presented.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

There are consequential amendments to the *Progress Planning and Review of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015* (Attachment 1) and the *Progress Planning and Review of Higher Degree by Research Students Procedures 2015* (Attachment 2) arising from the *University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016* and organisational design changes that the Graduate Studies Committee is asked to endorse.

**BACKGROUND / CONTEXT**

The currently registered versions of the *Progress Planning and Review of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015* and the *Progress Planning and Review of Higher Degree by Research Students Procedures 2015* do not align with the delegations in the *University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016*. The proposed amendments in Attachment 1 and Attachment 2 will ensure that roles and responsibilities in the policy and procedures align with the relevant delegations.

**ATTACHMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment 1:</strong></td>
<td>Draft amendments to <em>Progress Planning and Review of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment 2:</strong></td>
<td>Draft amendments to <em>Progress Planning and Review of Higher Degree by Research Students Procedures 2015</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRESS PLANNING AND REVIEW FOR HIGHER DEGREE BY RESEARCH STUDENTS POLICY 2015

The Academic Board, as delegate of the Senate of the University of Sydney, adopts the following policy.

Dated: 2 December 2015

Last amended: 1 May 2017, commencing 23 May 2017

Signature: Chair, Academic Board
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PART 1 PRELIMINARY

1 Name of policy

This is the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015.

2 Commencement

This policy commences on 1 January 2016.

3 Policy is binding

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

4 Statement of intent

(1) The University aspires for all higher degree by research students to have a quality research training experience and to produce research of the highest calibre. This includes the development of skills and knowledge necessary to be a successful researcher in the chosen discipline and the timely completion and successful examination of their research projects and theses.

(2) The University will partner with students to plan their progression throughout their candidature and set clear expectations of satisfactory progress. The University will provide appropriate institutional support and resources, regular reviewing, including a written submission and meeting, and support students to maintain research integrity and quality.

(3) This policy details the elements of the higher degree by research progress planning and review process. It should be read in conjunction with the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (‘the Rule’), the Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions, University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016 and the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Procedures 2015 (‘the Procedures’).

(4) This policy supports the conduct of research training in a safe manner which is conducive to student wellbeing.

5 Application

(1) Except to the extent that a contrary intention is expressed, this policy applies to higher degree by research students, staff and affiliates.

Note: See clause 20 for transitional provisions.

(2) It is a condition of each student’s admission to candidature that the student complies with his or her obligations under this policy.
6 Definitions

(1) In this policy:

**activity** means a specific requirement in a student’s candidature that contributes to the completion of a milestone.

**Associate Dean** means the Associate Dean responsible for overseeing higher degrees by research in the relevant faculty.

**Dean** means the Dean of the relevant faculty, or Head of School and Dean of the relevant University school.

**Coordinating supervisor** means the supervisor in a supervisory team who has designated academic delegations and responsibility for administrative requirements.

**degree** means the relevant higher degree by research.

**department** means the academic unit responsible for a student’s higher degree by research candidature. It may be called a department, discipline or school within the University.

**disability support academic plan** means the statement of support and adjustments for educational needs provided for students registered with the Disability Support service of the University.

**faculty** means a faculty or University school, and refers to the student’s faculty or University school of enrolment.

**head of department** means the head of the relevant department.

**higher degree by research** means a doctorate by research or masters by research, as defined in the Rule.

**milestone** means a significant event in a student’s candidature that is useful in monitoring and guiding the student’s progress to successful completion. Milestones may comprise a number of activities.

**postgraduate coordinator** means the postgraduate coordinator for the relevant department: academic staff member with overall responsibility for the planning and coordination of postgraduate research studies within a faculty, school or University School.

**progress** means the student’s progress against the requirements specified in subclause 13(1).

**progress plan** means a progress plan developed in accordance with Part 2.

**progress review** means a progress review conducted in accordance with Part 3.
research period means a research period set by the University and published on its website.

Note: Research periods are published at: http://sydney.edu.au/study/study-dates.html

Review Panel means a panel established to conduct a progress review in accordance with clause 11.

Rule means the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011.

school means the academic unit responsible for a student's higher degree by research candidature. It may be called a discipline within the University.

student means a person who is currently admitted to candidature in a higher degree by research award course of the University.

supervisor means a person appointed to discharge the responsibilities set out in the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013, including research supervisors, coordinating supervisors and auxiliary supervisors.

supplementary progress review means a progress review conducted in accordance with clause 17.

PART 2 PROGRESS PLANNING

7 Progress plans

(1) Students and supervisors must begin progress planning at an early stage in each student’s higher degree by research candidature.

(2) All students must have a progress plan within three months from the date of commencement of candidature, or within six months for part-time students.

(3) The purpose of a progress plan is to align and manage student, University and faculty expectations about what is required to achieve the award of the degree.

(4) A student's progress plan must include all activities and milestones required to achieve the award of the degree, including:
   (a) formulation and approval of research proposal;
   (b) formulation and approval of research projects;
   (c) thesis development and examination;
   (d) research training activities;
   (e) coursework requirements;
   (f) compliance and risk management activities.

Note: See Part 4 for information on activities and milestones.
8 Creating progress plans

(1) Students are responsible for creating their progress plan, based on current University templates, with the participation and support of their coordinating supervisor.

(2) Progress plans must be:
   (a) endorsed by the student’s coordinating supervisor; and
   (b) approved by the head of department or postgraduate coordinator; and
   (c) for students with disabilities, compliant with the needs identified on the Disability Services Academic Plan.

Note: Progress plan templates are available on the University’s website at: myuni.sydney.edu.au.

9 Maintaining and varying progress plans

(1) Students are responsible for maintaining their progress plan, and for identifying any variations required, with the participation and support of their coordinating supervisor.

(2) Students must review their progress plan, in consultation with their coordinating supervisor, at least twice per year, with at least one review being conducted as part of the student’s preparation for a progress review.

(3) A variation to a progress plan may be required for many reasons, including:
   (a) where a student:
      (i) changes attendance mode;
      (ii) requests a leave of absence or suspends candidature;
      (iii) transfers to another course or program;
      (iv) achieves a milestone;
      (v) fails to achieve or is delayed in achieving a milestone;
      (vi) submits a request for an extension of candidature;
      (vii) has encountered unanticipated barriers to progress; or
   (b) where it becomes clear that the student’s research project needs improvement or is not viable, or

(4) Changes in a student’s health or disability state require different project approaches and support.

(5) Variations to progress plans may be material or non-material.

(6) Material variations are variations that:
   (a) extend the date for achievement of a University, faculty or department milestone by more than three months from the original date;
   (b) require a change to the thesis submission date to:
      (i) a new research period; or
      (ii) a date that is beyond the latest date for submission, as defined in sections 2.20, 3.20 and 4.19 of the Rule;
(c) substantially change the nature of the research.

**Note:** Sections 2.20, 3.20 and 4.19 of the Rule authorise a Dean or an Associate Dean to permit a student to submit his or her thesis after a period of time greater than the maximum periods specified in that clause.

(7) Material variations to progress plans must be:

(a) endorsed by the student’s coordinating supervisor; and

(b) approved by the head of department or postgraduate coordinator.

(8) Students should discuss non-material variations to progress plans with their coordinating supervisor.

### PART 3 PROGRESS REVIEW

#### 10 Progress reviews

(1) Progress reviews (including supplementary progress reviews) must be conducted in accordance with this policy and the procedures.

(2) The purpose of a progress review is to:

(a) assess whether the student has adequate support and resources to complete his or her research project and thesis in accordance with the progress plan;

(b) assess whether the current supervisory arrangements are satisfactory;

(c) assess the feasibility of the progress plan; and

(d) assess and rate the student’s progress.

(3) A copy of the student’s progress plan will be provided to all parties involved in the progress review.

(4) A progress review must be conducted for each student as required by the head of department or postgraduate coordinator and at least once per year.

(5) Students re-enrolling for a period of more than six months as a result of a requirement to revise and resubmit in a previous thesis examination, must participate in a progress review between three and six months from the date of re-enrolment.

(6) Progress reviews should be supported by continuous evaluation of progress and regular meetings between students and supervisors.

#### 11 Review Panel

(1) The head of department or postgraduate coordinator must appoint two or more academic staff members to form a review panel for each student’s review, and nominate one of the panel members to act as chair.

(2) Each Review Panel member must have one or more of:

(a) relevant disciplinary expertise;

(b) experience in supervising and managing higher degree by research candidatures; or

(c) other relevant specialist knowledge.
In appointing members of a Review Panel, the head of department or postgraduate coordinator:

(a) may appoint from outside the department or faculty;
(b) must not appoint any of a student’s supervisors; and
(c) must consider and manage any actual, potential or perceived conflicts of interests.

Note 6: For information on evaluating and managing conflicts of interest, see the External Interests Policy 2010.

12 Progress review meetings

(1) Students must participate in a progress review meeting as required by the head of department or postgraduate coordinator and at least once per year.

(2) Students may be accompanied at the progress review meeting by a support person, such as a colleague, friend, family member or student representative.

(3) Progress review meetings will be conducted by the Review Panel.

(4) The Review Panel:
   (a) may invite any or all of the student’s supervisors to attend part of the progress review meeting;
   (b) must discuss the progress plan, and any required variations to the progress plan, with the student and (when in attendance) his or her supervisors; and
   (d) must provide the student with an opportunity to speak to the Review Panel without any of the student’s supervisors present.

13 Progress review outcomes

(1) The student’s progress will be measured against:
   (a) University, faculty, department school and student milestones and activities that are within the student’s control;
   (b) action items identified in the student’s previous progress reviews; and
   (c) compliance with student responsibilities set out in relevant University policies and procedures.

(2) Students must meet the requirements specified in subclause 13(1) to the required standard or quality.

(3) The progress review ratings are:
   (a) meets or exceeds objectives;
   (b) marginal progress;
   (c) unsatisfactory progress.

(4) The Review Panel must prepare a written report for the head of department or postgraduate coordinator:
   (a) giving its assessment of the feasibility of the progress plan;
   (b) setting out any required variations to the progress plan;
(c) identifying any actions to be taken as a result of the progress review, and who will be responsible for them;
(d) recommending whether a supplementary progress review is required;
(e) indicating, where relevant, whether the student’s scholarship is at risk, and the time frame for any potential termination of scholarship; and
(f) recommending a progress review rating based upon its assessment of the student’s progress.

(5) The Review Panel may prepare a report and recommend a progress review rating in the student’s absence, if:
   (a) the student fails to attend the progress review meeting without notice or good cause; or
   (b) the student is unable to attend and the Review Panel forms the reasonable view that the progress review meeting can properly be conducted in the student’s absence.

(6) The student will have an opportunity to respond to the Review Panel’s report.

(7) The head of department or postgraduate coordinator must:
   (a) determine a progress review rating, taking into account:
       (i) the recommendation of the Review Panel;
       (ii) the student’s response; and
       (iii) any exceptional circumstances related to the candidature and beyond the reasonable control of the student;
   (b) specify any actions to be taken as a result of the progress review, including who will be responsible for them and timeframes for their completion;
   (c) state whether the proposed supervision arrangements are satisfactory;
   (d) determine whether a supplementary progress review is required; and
   (e) monitor the implementation of any action items for the departmentschool, faculty or University identified by the Review Panel. Such items should be completed within three months of the date of the progress review.

14 ‘Meets or exceeds objectives’

(1) A rating of ‘meets or exceeds objectives’ means that the student’s progress since the last progress review, or since commencement of candidature, has been satisfactory or exceeded expectations.

(2) To achieve a rating of ‘meets or exceeds expectations’ the student must:
   (a) have satisfactorily met all requirements (as specified in subclause 13(1)) since the last progress review;
   (b) for a first progress review, have submitted a major piece of writing for similarity checking; and
   (a) be expected to submit the thesis for examination on time, or in a timely fashion, allowing for any previous delays.
15 ‘Marginal progress’

(1) A rating of ‘marginal progress’ indicates that:
   (a) the student has not satisfactorily met all requirements (as specified in
       subclause 13(1)) since the last progress review;
   (b) there is some risk that the student’s thesis will not be submitted for
       examination on time, or in a timely fashion, allowing for any previous delays;
   or
   (c) there has been a finding of inappropriate academic practice, academic
       dishonesty, research misconduct or a breach of the Research Code of
       Conduct or Research Data Management Policy.

Note: See Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015; Research Code of
Conduct 2013, Research Data Management Policy 2014 and Academic
Honesty Procedures 2016.

(2) If a student receives a rating of ‘marginal progress’, the head of department or
postgraduate coordinator:
   (a) must specify a set of required actions and due dates; and
   (b) must set a date for a supplementary progress review; and
   (c) may:
      (i) refer the Review Panel’s report to the postgraduate coordinator or
          Associate Dean; and
      (ii) take such other action as they consider appropriate, consistent with
           the Rule and this policy.

(3) A rating of ‘marginal progress’ will be considered satisfactory for the purposes of
a student’s scholarship, where the terms and conditions of the scholarship are under
the University’s control.

(4) A rating of ‘marginal progress’ cannot be used as a trigger for the requirement for a
student to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the
 candidature.

(5) If a student is required to meet a required set of actions and due dates, the
coordinating supervisor is responsible for overseeing their completion.

16 ‘Unsatisfactory progress’

(1) A rating of ‘unsatisfactory progress’ indicates that:
   (a) the student has not satisfactorily met all requirements (as specified in
       subclause 13(1)) since the last progress review; or
   (b) there is a significant risk that the thesis:
      (i) will not be submitted for examination on time, or in a timely fashion,
          allowing for any previous delays; or
      (ii) will not be completed at all; or
   (c) there has been a finding of inappropriate academic practice, academic
       dishonesty, research misconduct or a breach of the Research Code of
       Conduct or Research Data Management Policy.
(2) If a student receives a rating of ‘unsatisfactory progress’, the head of department or postgraduate coordinator:

(a) must, except where the student is asked to show good cause:
   (i) specify a set of required actions and due dates;
   (ii) set a date for a supplementary progress review;
   (iii) refer the Review Panel’s report to the postgraduate coordinator or Associate Dean; and
   (iv) take such other action as they consider appropriate, consistent with the Rule and this policy.

(b) may:
   (i) where relevant, recommend to the University that the student’s research scholarship be terminated;
   (ii) recommend to the Associate Dean that the student be asked to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

(3) In determining what action to take in accordance with subclause (2), the head of department or postgraduate coordinator will take into account:

(a) any injury, illness or misadventure experienced by the student that has had an impact on progress since the last progress review;
(b) any difficulties caused by, or fault on the part of, the University; and
(c) any exceptional circumstances related to the candidature and beyond the reasonable control of the student.

(4) If a student receives a rating of ‘unsatisfactory progress’ at two consecutive progress reviews, the head of department or postgraduate coordinator must recommend to the Associate Dean that the student be asked to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

(5) If a student must meet a required set of actions and due dates, the coordinating supervisor is responsible for overseeing their completion.

17 Supplementary progress reviews

(1) If the head of department or postgraduate coordinator requires a student to undertake a supplementary progress review, that supplementary progress review:

(a) should take place in one of the scheduled review cycles;
(b) must take place no sooner than two months and no later than six months from the date of the previous review; and
(c) must be conducted in accordance with this policy.

(2) Subject to sub-clause (3), if a student receives a rating of ‘marginal progress’ at a supplementary progress review, clause 15 of this policy will apply.

(3) If after two consecutive supplementary progress reviews the student fails to achieve a rating of ‘meets or exceeds expectations’, the student must receive a
rating of ‘unsatisfactory progress’ for the second supplementary progress review, and clause 16 of this policy will apply.

PART 4 MILESTONES AND ACTIVITIES

18 Milestones and activities

(1) There are three types of milestones and activities:
   (a) University;
   (b) faculty and department school;
   (c) student.

(2) University milestones and activities are:
   (a) set out in Schedule 1 of this policy;
   (b) mandatory (including the items listed in bullet-points); and
   (c) common for all candidates.

(3) Faculty and department school milestones and activities:
   (a) are additional to University milestones and activities;
   (b) are mandatory specialist requirements specific to the faculty or department school;
   (c) are common for all candidates in the faculty or department;
   (d) may include department school specific activities required to achieve University milestones; and
   (e) must be approved by the UE Research Education Committee.

(4) Student milestones and activities are:
   (a) specific to the student's candidature;
   (b) set in consultation with the student, and endorsed by the coordinating supervisor.

(5) Progress plans must include at least one faculty or department school milestone between the University milestones ‘Confirmation’ and ‘Intent to Submit’.

19 Rescissions and replacements

This document replaces the Progress Review of Higher Degree by Research Students Guidelines, which commenced on 21 August 2014, which is rescinded as from the date of commencement of this document.

20 Transitional provisions

Rescinded
## SCHEDULE 1: UNIVERSITY MILESTONES AND ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Research Project &amp; Thesis</th>
<th>Research Training</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Outcome Checklist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary appraisal</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>• Review research idea.</td>
<td>• Complete training needs analysis.</td>
<td>• Complete Responsible Research Practice module.</td>
<td>• Have all relevant action items been identified and included in the progress plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Draft research plan.</td>
<td>• Schedule relevant training activities.</td>
<td>• Complete induction(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Draft data management plan.</td>
<td>• Review communication skills (especially writing).</td>
<td>• Identify any need for ethics approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify subsequent actions in progress plan.</td>
<td>• Conduct intellectual property review, and consider need for IP agreements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct autonomous sanctions check.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider potential for restricted information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHS (Activity, within Preliminary Proposal Milestone)</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WHS training completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>• Finalise research proposal/plan.</td>
<td>• Ensure student has adequate written English to write thesis, or that measures are in place to assist the student to meet this requirement within a specified timeframe.</td>
<td>• Confirm ethics plan and commence ethics application process (where relevant).</td>
<td>Is the research project feasible? If not, consider next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Finalise data management plan.</td>
<td>• Submit a substantial piece of written work (e.g. proposal or literature review) for similarity checking, and discuss outcome with supervisor</td>
<td>• Ensure autonomous sanctions check completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**WHS**

*Within Preliminary Proposal Milestone*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Research Project &amp; Thesis</th>
<th>Research Training</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Outcome Checklist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalise Research Proposal (Activity, within Confirmation Milestone)</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>• Agree a final research proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Is the research proposal feasible? • Is the research proposal agreed by all parties?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent to submit</td>
<td>3 months from projected submission</td>
<td>• Check thesis draft. • Student to provide input on potential examiners.</td>
<td>• Ensure all training activities from training needs analysis are complete.</td>
<td>• Check compliance with ethics approvals, data management plan, IP agreements. • Consider whether the thesis contains restricted information.</td>
<td>• Will the thesis be ready for examination? • If no, does the progress plan need to be updated and an extension sought?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit for examination</td>
<td>Submission date</td>
<td>• Coordinating supervisor confirms thesis is in a form suitable for examination. • Faculty decides to proceed with examination.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider whether confidentiality agreements are required for examiners.</td>
<td>• Is the thesis examinable? • If yes, have examiners been appointed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>Complete within 4 months of submission</td>
<td>• Determine outcome of examination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the thesis satisfy the requirements for award? • If yes, are there any conditions that must be satisfied? • If no, can the student revise and resubmit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award</td>
<td>Within 4 months of award notification</td>
<td>• Complete requirements for award, including emendations. • Lodge final version of thesis.</td>
<td>• Comply with data management plan. • Comply with any ethics approval and protocol.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can the degree be conferred?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confer degree
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1 Purpose and application

(1) These procedures are to give effect to the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy (“the policy”).

(2) Except to the extent that a contrary intention is expressed, these procedures apply to higher degree by research students, staff and affiliates.

2 Commencement

These procedures commence on 1 January 2016.

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.

4 Progress plan management

(1) All students must submit:

(a) their approved progress plan:

(i) within six months from the date of commencement of their candidature;

(ii) within one month from the date of re-enrolment, where re-enrolling as a result of a requirement to revise and resubmit in a previous thesis examination; and

(b) any material variations to their approved progress plan, within one month from the date of the variation.

(2) Progress plans must be stored on the student file.
5 Progress reviews

(1) Prior to each progress review, students must:
   (a) ensure that their progress plan is up to date;
   (b) complete all scheduled compliance activities, including work health and safety and research integrity requirements;
   (c) comply with the requirement for a research data management plan; and
   (d) provide a written submission in a form determined by the University (“the progress review form”).


(2) Students must provide their progress review form no less than 10 working days prior to the progress review meeting.

(3) Coordinating supervisors must comment on the progress review form no less than five working days prior to the progress review meeting.

(4) In their progress review form, students should:
   (a) describe their progress, with reference to milestones and any action items, since their last progress review;
   (b) describe milestones for the period up to the next progress review or completion of candidature;
   (c) assess the effectiveness of their supervisory arrangements;
   (d) identify whether they require any additional training or development;
   (e) outline any challenges to progress, including any technical, academic, infrastructure or resourcing difficulties; and
   (f) detail any issues that have adversely impacted on progress.

(5) During the progress review, Review Panel members, students and supervisors will consider:
   (a) the student’s current and, where relevant, previous progress review forms;
   (b) where relevant, the written record of the outcome of the student’s last progress review; and
   (c) any other relevant information provided by the student.

6 Progress review meetings

(1) Where possible, progress review meetings will be conducted in person.

(2) Where a student is unable to attend a meeting in person, the Review Panel will make reasonable arrangements to facilitate the student’s participation, including:
   (a) video conferencing or telephone;
   (b) rescheduling the meeting to a date within 10 working days of the original date for the meeting, or within such reasonable extended time as the Chair of the Review Panel approves, in his or her absolute discretion.
The Review Panel will prepare its written report to the head of department or postgraduate coordinator within:

(a) five working days from the date of the meeting; or
(b) where the student is unable to attend the meeting, five working days from the original date for the meeting; or
(c) such extended time as the head of department or postgraduate coordinator approves.

Note: The Review Panel may prepare a report and recommend a progress review rating in the student’s absence, in certain circumstances. See clause 13(5) of the policy.

Progress review interview discussions should be constructive, and aimed at identifying pathways to successful completion of candidature.

The Chair of the Review Panel may suspend a progress review meeting where he or she forms the view that:

(a) an issue or concern raised during the meeting should be referred to another University process; and
(b) it would be inappropriate to rate the student’s progress until the issue or concern has been addressed.

Note: Students are encouraged to take the initiative in raising problems or difficulties and seeking solutions to them as soon as possible. Problems may be raised during the progress review process or at any other time. See paragraph 15(6)(a) of the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013.

**7 Progress review outcomes**

(1) Students will have ten working days from receipt of the Review Panel’s report to:

(a) respond to the report;
(b) raise any issues concerning the conduct of the progress review meeting.

(2) Taking into account the Review Panel’s report and any response from the student, the head of department or postgraduate coordinator will prepare a written record of the outcome of a progress review:

(a) stating the progress review rating;
(b) specifying any actions to be taken as a result of the progress review, including who will be responsible for them and timeframes for their completion;
(c) stating whether the proposed supervision arrangements are satisfactory and, where appropriate, advising the student on any recommended changes;
(d) stating whether a supplementary review is required and, if so, the date of the supplementary progress review; and
(e) listing any action items for the departmentschool, faculty, University school or University, to be completed within three months of the date of the progress review.

(3) The final progress review report must be:

(a) made available to the student and the supervisors; and
(b) stored on the student file.
8 Suspension of candidature

(1) Students may, but are not required to, maintain and vary their progress plan during periods of suspension.

(2) Students returning from a suspension of candidature are required to review their progress plan within one month of return.

Note: See University Recordkeeping Policy and Recordkeeping Manual.
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That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board approve the amendments to the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013, as presented, and adopt the amended policy.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

There are consequential amendments to the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013 (Attachment 1) arising from the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016 and organisational design changes that the Graduate Studies Committee is asked to endorse.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

The currently registered iteration of the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013 does not align with the delegations in the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016. The proposed amendments in Attachment 1 will ensure that roles and responsibilities in the policy align with the relevant delegations.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Draft amendments to Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013
SUPERVISION OF HIGHER DEGREE BY RESEARCH STUDENTS POLICY 2013

The Academic Board as delegate of the Senate of the University of Sydney, adopts the following policy.

Dated: 22 February 2013

Last amended: 5 June 2017 (administrative amendment only)

Signature:

Position: Chair, Academic Board
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1 Name of policy

This is the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013.

2 Commencement

This policy commences on 22 February 2013

3 Policy is binding

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

This policy:

(a) ensures that higher degree by research students are supported to produce research of the highest national and international quality;

(b) enables students involved in a higher degree by research to be part of an intellectually stimulating academic environment and receive effective supervision during their studies;

(c) provides for a positive and proactive approach to research supervision; and

(d) requires provision of foundational guidance, support, recognition, development and leadership opportunities for supervisors; and

(e) supports the conduct of research training in a safe manner which is conducive to student wellbeing.

5 Application

This policy applies to:

(a) staff, students and affiliates; and

(b) any formal research supervision program provided to students in either of the following degrees:
   (i) Doctorate by research; or
   (ii) Master’s by research.

6 Definitions and interpretation

(1) In this policy:

academic dishonesty means seeking to obtain or obtaining academic advantage (including in the assessment or publication of work) by dishonest or unfair means or knowingly assisting another to do so.

Note: See also Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015

affiliate has the meaning provided in the Code of Conduct – Staff and Affiliates, which at the date of this policy is:

clinical title holders; adjunct, conjoint and honorary appointees; consultants and contractors to the University; holders of offices in University entities, members of Boards of University Foundations, members of University Committees; and any other persons appointed or engaged by the University to perform duties or functions on its behalf.

AQF means the Australian Qualifications Framework (http://www.aqf.edu.au/)

associate dean means the associate dean with authority for overseeing higher degrees by research in the relevant faculty.
auxiliary supervisor has the meaning provided in clause 8 of this policy.

candidature means the period commencing when a person accepts the University's offer of admission to an award course, in accordance with University and government requirements as amended from time to time, and ending when the degree is conferred or the candidature otherwise ceases.

go-co-ordinating supervisor means the research supervisor in a supervisory team who has designated academic delegations and responsibility for administrative requirements.

c-co-supervision means the situation where two or more research supervisors are appointed to supervise a student.

dean means the dean of the relevant faculty or the Head of School and Dean of the relevant University school

delegate means a person authorised by the Senate to act on behalf of the University in specified situations, as provided in the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule 2016 or the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016

department means the academic unit responsible for a student's higher degree by research candidature. It may be called department, discipline or school within the University.

doctorate by research has the meaning provided in the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (as amended) which at the date of this policy is:

a degree with the word ‘Doctor’ in the title comprising a minimum of two-thirds research that is approved by the Academic Board.

Note: The Academic Board will not approve a Doctorate by research unless it complies with the Australian Qualifications Framework at AQF level 10.

Educational Innovation means the Educational Innovation unit within the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) portfolio.

ESOS National Code means the standards governing the protection of overseas students and the delivery of courses to such students, established under the Education Services for Overseas Students (ESOS) Act 2000 (Cth).

faculty means a faculty or University school, and refers to the student’s faculty or University school of enrolment.

Graduate Studies Committee means the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>head of department or head</td>
<td>means the head of the relevant department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Functions performed by the head of</td>
<td>Functions performed by the head of department may be performed by the head of school, dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department may be performed by the head</td>
<td>or associate dean, in accordance with paragraph 1.02(5) of the University of Sydney (Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of school, dean or associate dean, in</td>
<td>Degree by Research) Rule 2011, particularly in faculties that are not organized into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accordance with paragraph 1.02(5) of</td>
<td>departments or disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the University of Sydney (Higher Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Research) Rule 2011, particularly in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculties that are not organized into</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>departments or disciplines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR Administrative Centre</td>
<td>means the Higher Degree by Research Administrative Centre within the Deputy Vice-Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international student advisers</td>
<td>means staff within the International Student Office who provide support to international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students on issues related to student visa, scholarship and general academic progression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master’s by research</td>
<td>has the meaning provided in the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research Rule) 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(as amended) which at the date of this policy is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a degree with the word ‘Master’ in the title comprising a minimum of two thirds research that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is approved by the Academic Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td>The Academic Board will not approve a Master’s by research unless it complies with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australian Qualifications Framework at AQF Level 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plagiarism</td>
<td>means presenting another person’s work as one’s own work by presenting, copying or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reproducing it without appropriate acknowledgement of the source. Plagiarism is a form of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td>academic dishonesty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See also Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postgraduate coordinator</td>
<td>means the postgraduate coordinator for the relevant department, academic staff member with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>overall responsibility for the planning and coordination of postgraduate research students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within a faculty, University school or school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probationary period</td>
<td>has the meaning as described in clauses 2.05, 3.05, and 4.04 of the University of Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progress review</td>
<td>means a progress review conducted in accordance with Part 3 of the Progress Planning and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research supervisor</td>
<td>means the meaning provided in clause 8 of this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school</td>
<td>means the academic unit responsible for a student’s higher degree by research candidature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student</td>
<td>means a person who is currently admitted to candidature in an award course at the University.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
supervisor means, in relation to a higher degree by research student, a person appointed to discharge the responsibilities set out in clause 14 of this policy. For the purpose of this policy, the generic term supervisor(s) will be used to include research supervisors, co-ordinating supervisors, and auxiliary supervisors.

Supervisor Register means the University-wide register of individuals approved as supervisors for higher degree by research students, established under clause 13 of this policy.

supervisory team means a group team of supervisors appointed to supervise a student in accordance with the provisions of clause 13 of this policy.

7 Principles of supervision

(1) Roles and responsibilities
(a) Higher degree by research students are ultimately responsible for their own work.
(b) Supervisors are responsible for offering tailored guidance and constructive feedback.
(c) Supervisors and students must discuss their respective roles, and the expectations and requirements of the degree. They must reach a common understanding of:
   (i) key project aims;
   (ii) key milestones;
   (iii) proposed timetable; and
   (iv) methods of working together,
and must revisit these regularly to ensure that the project stays on track.

(2) Quality of relationships
(a) Supervisors and students must establish and maintain clear communication, which means actively clarifying any misunderstandings or divergent expectations as they arise.
(b) Giving and receiving critical feedback, and learning how to use it effectively, are integral aspects of the research process. Supervisors and students should undertake these activities with a spirit of goodwill and a common focus on producing quality learning as well as quality work.
(c) Supervisors should be responsive to students’ changing needs at different stages of the degree.

(3) Diversity
(a) Supervisors and students must treat each other fairly and reasonably and should respect the social and intellectual diversity of the University community.
(b) Supervisors and students must not engage in, or tolerate, harassment and discrimination.

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

(c) Supervisors and students must recognise that every supervisory relationship is unique and will reflect the particular needs, preferences and work styles of those involved.

(d) Supervisors and students must recognise that intellectual and practical input from other supervisors is necessary and desirable, and is to be encouraged.

(e) Supervisors and students must exercise professional discretion in their relationship, maintaining confidentiality where appropriate.

(4) Life-long learning

(a) Students are encouraged to take part in opportunities at the University to develop skills and knowledge that complement their research.

(b) The University recognises its responsibility to foster research communities that welcome and engage research students as active participants.

Note: See also Learning and Teaching Policy 2015

8 Supervisors

(1) All supervisors must be current staff or affiliates of the University and will be categorised as either:

(a) research supervisors; or

(b) auxiliary supervisors.

(2) Supervisors may come from the same faculty or department as the one in which the student is enrolled or from different faculties or departments as appropriate to the research project.

(3) Supervisors are appointed to a particular candidature by the relevant head of department postgraduate coordinator.

(4) Research supervisors:

(a) have the primary responsibility for the conduct of the candidature in accordance with guidelines determined by the Academic Board;

(b) are responsible for monitoring the provision of appropriate support, resources, information and guidance to the student; and

(c) are responsible for reporting the progress of the candidature to the relevant head of department and the relevant dean or associate dean.

(5) Auxiliary supervisors are appointed to assist in the supervision of the candidature.

(6) The practice of auxiliary supervision is flexible to allow for a variety of models as may be appropriate for individual candidatures. Appropriate models include:

(a) a person with considerable experience as a research supervisor serving as an advisor or mentor to a research supervisor who is new to that role;

(b) a person with the appropriate knowledge required for part of the student’s candidature;

(c) a person whose links with industry enable a student to have access to specialised equipment and facilities; or
(d) a person in an external institution or university who is an expert on the subject matter.

9 Supervisory teams

(1) All higher degree by research students will be supervised by a supervisory team consisting of at least two supervisors, of whom at least one will be a research supervisor.

(2) The relevant head of department/postgraduate coordinator must determine appropriate supervisory arrangements for each student based on skills, experience, workload, projected availability of staff and other requirements appropriate to the candidate, degree and research project.

(3) The head of department/postgraduate coordinator may review and change supervisory arrangements as required throughout the course of the candidature.

(4) Supervisory teams must include at least one member of the academic staff with the requisite skills, knowledge and experience for supervision of the particular student.

(5) Each individual member of a supervisory team must:

(a) be eligible to supervise higher degree by research students;
(b) be familiar with the University’s policies, procedures and resources, and applicable faculty requirements.

(6) Together the team must:

(a) have content expertise in the area of the student’s research;
(b) be structured in such a way that no individual supervisor is a research supervisor for more than 5 full time candidates except as permitted according to Clause 13 of this policy; and
(c) be able to provide continuous supervision for the likely duration of the student’s candidature, allowing for changes in any individual supervisor’s availability.

(7) One research supervisor in the team must be nominated as the co-ordinating supervisor.

(a) The co-ordinating supervisor is responsible for:

(i) meeting administrative requirements; and
(ii) reporting the aggregated views of team members to the head of department/postgraduate coordinator or dean or associate dean.

(b) An auxiliary supervisor may not act as co-ordinating supervisor except when appointed in the temporary absence of a research supervisor as set out in clause 14(10)(c) of this policy.

(8) Supervision of higher degree by research students must follow one of the models specified below.

(9) Default model of supervision

(a) For an individual student the relevant head of department or postgraduate coordinator will appoint:

(i) one research supervisor; and
(ii) one auxiliary supervisor.

(b) The research supervisor will be the co-ordinating supervisor.
Co-supervision model

(a) The relevant head of department or postgraduate coordinator will appoint two research supervisors to supervise an individual student, each of whom will have equal responsibility for the candidature.

(b) The relevant head of department or postgraduate coordinator will designate one research supervisor to be the co-ordinating supervisor. Where a student is being supervised by supervisors from different faculties, the co-ordinating supervisor will normally be from the faculty in which the student is enrolled.

(c) The academic workload for each supervisor will be determined by the dean or associate dean of the supervisors’ faculties.

Supervisory panel model

(a) The relevant head of department or postgraduate coordinator may decide that any individual candidature requires the appointment of a supervisory panel of more than two supervisors.

(b) Such panels will consist of a mix of research and auxiliary supervisors, according to the requirements of individual candidatures.

(c) The relevant head of department or postgraduate coordinator will nominate one research supervisor as co-ordinating supervisor. Where a student is being supervised by supervisors from different faculties, this will normally be a research supervisor from the faculty in which the student is enrolled.

(d) The academic workload for each supervisor will be determined by the dean or associate dean of the supervisors’ faculties.

10 Supervisor development

(1) All academic staff with supervisory responsibilities must undertake development activities relating to the supervision of higher degree by research students. This may involve taking part in formal and informal opportunities for exchanging expertise on research supervision, research learning and research processes - whether at a department, faculty, division or University-wide level.

(2) Academic staff new to supervision should undertake University staff development programs for research supervision.

(3) If a potential supervisor has already undertaken an equivalent course or has substantial suitable experience in supervising students to completion, the relevant dean or associate dean may exempt them from taking the Educational Innovation course. However, it is strongly recommended that such staff participate in the Educational Innovation development course or other workshops to ensure familiarity with current supervisory practices and expectations.

11 Supervisor eligibility

(1) Subject to clause 10(2) above, to be eligible to be approved as a supervisor, a person will:

(a) be a member of the academic staff at Level B or above; or

(b) have a current affiliation with the University approved by the relevant faculty or department/school; and
(c) have participated in ongoing and appropriate development activities including but not limited to:
   (i) the Foundations of Research Supervision course run by Educational Innovation; or
   (ii) other relevant workshops and programs; or
   (iii) demonstrated experience at supervising at another university; and

(d) be research active; and

Note: Standards for research activity are set by each faculty and are available through Career Path.

See also: Performance Planning and Development Policy 2012; Academic Planning and Development Guidelines

(e) be qualified to undertake research supervision appropriate to the discipline by:
   (i) holding a qualification at AQF Level 10; or
   (ii) having equivalent professional or research experience.

Note: This may include a higher doctorate other than a PhD; a research Masters plus experience in research and research training supervision; or a significant publishing record in peer-reviewed journals. See TEQSA Higher Education Standards panel on technical amendments to Provider Course Accreditation Standards.

12 The Supervisor Register

(1) The HDR Administrative Centre will maintain a register of all individuals approved as supervisors for higher degree by research students.

(2) The register will distinguish between those people who are approved to act as:
   (a) research or auxiliary supervisors; and
   (b) auxiliary supervisors only.

(3) Academic staff at Level B or above who have completed the Foundations of Research Supervision course run by Educational Innovation will automatically be approved and registered as a research supervisor.

(4) Affiliates and academic staff below Level B who have completed the Foundations of Research Supervision course run by Educational Innovation will automatically be approved and registered as an auxiliary supervisor.

(5) Academic staff and affiliates who have not completed the Foundations of Research Supervision course run by Educational Innovation require approval for registration from the dean or associate dean of the relevant faculty.

(6) Routine deregistration
   (a) A person will be routinely removed from the Supervisor Register when that person:
      (i) is no longer actively affiliated with the University;
      (ii) no longer meets the supervision criteria as specified in clause 11 of this policy; or
(iii) has not supervised an enrolled student for a period of three continuous years.

(7) **Performance related deregistration**

(a) The relevant dean or associate dean must request removal of an approved supervisor from the Supervisor Register when that person is identified in their academic performance and development review as failing to perform their duties to a satisfactory standard.

*Note:* See *Performance Planning and Development Policy 2012* and *Academic Planning and Development Guidelines*.

(b) The relevant dean or associate dean must notify any person who is deregistered on this basis, in writing.

(c) The relevant dean, associate dean or academic advisor may recommend suitable development activities for such people.

(8) **Misconduct related deregistration**

(a) When a person is found to have committed research misconduct or other professional misconduct, the Provost, in consultation with the relevant delegate (or their designated nominee) responsible for managing the misconduct proceedings and the dean of the relevant faculty, may request removal of the person from the Supervisor Register.

(b) The Provost must notify any person who is deregistered on this basis, in writing.

*Note:* See: *Research Code of Conduct 2013*  
*Enterprise Agreement 2013-2017*.

(9) **Appeals against deregistration**

(a) A person may appeal against routine deregistration to the HDR Administrative Centre.

(b) A person may appeal against performance related deregistration to the relevant dean or associate dean.

(10) **Reactivating registration**

(a) The relevant dean or associate dean may request the re-registration of supervisors who have been previously deregistered.

(11) **Reporting**

(a) The HDR Administrative Centre will report annually to the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board on issues relating to the Supervisor Register.

(b) Reports must include a summary of actions taken and any recommendations relating to operation of the Supervisor Register.

13 **Supervisor workload**

(1) A research supervisor will not normally supervise more than 5 full-time equivalent postgraduate research students at one time, or pro rata for a supervisor employed on a fractional basis.

(2) A research supervisor may only exceed the normal load with approval from the relevant associate dean, which may only be provided after consideration of a
recommendation, including reasons, from the relevant head of department or postgraduate coordinator.

(3) The relevant associate dean must report all such approvals to the HDR Administrative Centre as soon as possible after they are given.

(4) The associate dean may assign a student to an auxiliary supervisor if the associate dean is satisfied that the auxiliary supervisor can provide the necessary skills and expertise, without compromising their existing students’ candidatures. Academic workload should also be taken into consideration.

Note: See the Enterprise Agreement 2013-2017, Section G.

14 Responsibilities of supervisors

(1) Unless otherwise specified, the responsibilities described in this clause apply equally to each supervisor of a student.

(2) Where the supervisory team contains more than one research supervisor, each research supervisor must fulfil all of the responsibilities of research supervisors described in this clause.

(3) Supervisors must maintain a professional relationship with their students, other supervisors and other University staff.

(4) The supervisor’s primary role is to provide academic support and guidance throughout a candidature with the objective of enabling the student to achieve a high standard of research activity and output.

(5) In agreeing to registration on the Supervisor Register, the supervisor accepts the responsibilities set out in this clause.

(6) Selection of student and or project

(a) The research supervisor will consider a prospective student’s relevant research background, interests and abilities to complete a proposed research project, and decide whether the proposed topic is manageable. If the supervisor is not confident at the application stage that the research proposal is likely to be manageable and consistent with the aims of the doctoral degree, they must raise their concerns with the head of department/postgraduate coordinator.

(b) The supervisor will ensure that they have the ability, capacity and related research interest in the project to carry out the supervision. If a supervisor has any doubts about their capacity to supervise a student for any reason, they must raise their concerns with the head of department/postgraduate coordinator.

(7) Conflicts of interests

(a) Where the supervisor becomes aware of an actual, potential or perceived conflict of interests in relation to a particular project or student, the supervisor must immediately declare the conflict of interests in accordance with the External Interests Policy 2010.

(b) The head of department/postgraduate coordinator may vary the supervisory arrangements as a result of a conflict of interests declaration.

(8) At the commencement of the candidature

(a) The research supervisor will:
(i) notify the student about orientation and induction events run by the University, faculty or department; 
(ii) ensure that the student participates in induction programs and workshops as directed by the faculty or department; 
(iii) ensure that the student participates in programs and workshops in accordance with University, faculty or department work health and safety requirements.

(b) The research supervisor must be aware of the attributes qualities that the University expects its graduates to have and, in consultation with the student, prepare a plan for future skill acquisition as the student proceeds through their degree program.

Note: See Learning and Teaching Policy 2015

(c) The research supervisor is responsible for identifying, with the student, the most appropriate data-gathering and analysing techniques.

(d) All supervisors must familiarise themselves with the Essential Resources for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2016, and use it to inform their discussions with the student and the department about the resources that may be available to support each particular candidature.

(e) The research supervisor is responsible for ensuring that the facilities which are identified as necessary for the project to succeed are available.

(f) If the research supervisor is not confident that the required facilities are or will be available they must raise this with the head of department, postgraduate coordinator or faculty.

(g) The research supervisor may be expected to help their student develop a research budget, and advise them on how to acquire information about relevant research funding schemes.

(9) During the candidature: supervisory teams and relationships

(a) The composition of a supervisory team will depend on faculty arrangements, the interdisciplinary nature of the research project, or other criteria as determined by the faculty, project, and as appropriate to the project, the candidate and the degree.

Note: See clause 9 of this policy for models for supervisory teams.

(b) The head of department postgraduate coordinator must approve all supervisory arrangements.

(c) Members of a supervisory team should clarify the responsibilities of each person in the team, and coordinate advice and guidance appropriately. The research supervisor, or where there is more than one research supervisor, the co-ordinating supervisor, is responsible for advising the student of these arrangements.

(d) All supervisors must:
   (i) build and maintain supervisory relationships with their students;
   (ii) clarify with their students what is expected of each other within this relationship;
   (iii) establish agreed methods of working with their students; and
   (iv) fulfil their side of any agreement.
(e) The research supervisor should be available to meet with their student at least once per fortnight during the probationary period.

(f) After the completion of the probationary period, the research supervisor and their student are jointly responsible for negotiating ongoing and appropriate contact arrangements. This may include face to face or electronic forms of communication.

(g) Supervisory arrangements should be adapted according to the nature of the candidature (full-time or part-time) and make due allowance for approved absences by the student.

(h) If it is not possible for the supervisor and student to meet regularly, then the head of department postgraduate coordinator should be consulted by either the student or the supervisor regarding appropriate alternative arrangements.

(i) The auxiliary supervisor should negotiate ongoing and appropriate contact arrangements with their student.

(j) Where a change in research direction occurs, appropriate supervisory arrangements should be negotiated by the student, supervisor, and head of department postgraduate coordinator as required. Changes in supervision as a result of these negotiations must be approved by the head of department postgraduate coordinator.

(10) During the candidature: administrative requirements

(a) The research supervisor must identify applicable degree and other administrative requirements and advise the student as necessary, although the student is responsible for ensuring that these requirements are met. This includes but is not limited to planned leave or time away, re-enrolment, and progress reviews.

(b) Where there are two supervisors with equal responsibility for the candidature, the co-ordinating supervisor is responsible for ensuring that all administrative requirements are met. This includes but is not limited to: re-enrolment advice, progress review reporting, and leave arrangements.

(11) During the candidature: absence of supervisor

(a) Supervision must be provided for the duration of a candidature. It is not acceptable for a student to have their candidature disrupted by supervisor absence.

(b) The research supervisor who is intending an absence of one month or more must ensure that the head of department postgraduate coordinator is informed so that appropriate alternative supervisory arrangements should be put in place.

(c) Alternate supervisory arrangements may comprise remote supervision (e.g. email, phone, video link), or increased direct supervision from another member of the supervisory team (e.g. the auxiliary supervisor).

(d) If the supervisor appointed to cover a research supervisor’s absence has not previously been involved in the supervision of the student, it is the responsibility of the current research supervisor to inform the acting supervisor about the progress of the candidature.

(e) Where an absence is foreseeable, the supervisor must notify the head of department postgraduate coordinator, the student and any other supervisor at least one month before the intended departure date so that appropriate supervisory arrangements can be put in place.
(f) If the supervisor is leaving the University, the head of department postgraduate coordinator must notify the student as soon as is practical. In that event:
(i) the departing supervisor must discuss ongoing supervisory arrangements with the student and the head of department postgraduate coordinator; and
(ii) the head of department postgraduate coordinator may vary the supervision arrangements, including appointing a new research supervisor, as required.

(12) During the candidature: managing progress

(a) The research supervisor should ensure that the student works within a planned framework which marks out the milestones expected to be completed at various stages.

(b) Planning and time management should begin at an early stage and the research supervisor must encourage the student to make productive use of their time.

(c) Where the supervisory team consists of a research supervisor and an external auxiliary supervisor, the research supervisor must ensure that the direction of the work is entirely under the control of the University and the student.

(d) The research supervisor is responsible for reaching agreement with the student about:
(i) indicators of progress being made; and
(ii) submission of appropriate written work, interim reports or research results.

(e) The supervisor must return written work to the student, with constructive feedback, in a timely fashion. Unless other time frames are agreed between the supervisor and the student:
(i) written work up to the equivalent in length to a chapter must be returned within one month; and
(ii) written work up to the equivalent in length to two chapters must be returned within two months.

(f) The research supervisor must provide feedback on progress to the student and make progress reports to the faculty and any scholarship authority.

(g) The research supervisor must monitor progress within the context of the overall research plan, ensuring that sufficient time is left for writing up the thesis and, if necessary, that the scope of the project is reduced to meet the time available.

(h) The research supervisor must inform the student about inadequate progress or standards of work that are below that generally expected, identify problems and suggest ways of addressing them.

(i) The research supervisor should work with the student to ensure that, by the end of the probationary period, the student's research topic and aims are clearly defined.

(j) At the end of the probationary period, the research supervisor must determine whether the student is able to identify, access, organise and communicate knowledge in both written and oral English to a standard
generally acceptable to the discipline. If necessary, the supervisor will direct the student to relevant courses available at the University.

**Note:** See [Learning and Teaching Policy 2015](#).

(k) The research supervisor must advise the student in writing when progress is unsatisfactory and identify improvements which are necessary for continuation of the candidature.

**Note:** See [University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011](#) for further requirements relating to progress and progress reviews.

(13) **During the candidature: duty of care**

(a) The research supervisor must be aware of, and inform the student about, the range of support services which exist to help them while they are studying at the University, including University Health Services, Counselling and Psychological Services, other student support services, and SUPRA.

**Note:** see Student Support services website for a list of available services [http://sydney.edu.au/current_students/student_services/index.shtml](http://sydney.edu.au/current_students/student_services/index.shtml)

**Note:** Students can seek professional advice through the University Health Service ([http://sydney.edu.au/health-service/services/index.php](http://sydney.edu.au/health-service/services/index.php)) and the Counselling and Psychological services ([http://sydney.edu.au/current_students/counselling/](http://sydney.edu.au/current_students/counselling/)).

(b) Supervisors must recognise and respond to varying student circumstances such as illness or personal issues which may arise and be able to establish processes to manage these issues.

(c) The research supervisor must encourage a student with health concerns to seek professional assistance and must be prepared to discuss the various candidature options available, such as sick leave, approved leave of absence or a move to part time study.

(d) The research supervisor must ensure that the head of department/postgraduate coordinator and the dean are informed in writing if concerns regarding the candidature arise.

(e) The research supervisor must be aware of the particular challenges that may be faced by an international student and be sensitive to the social, academic and intellectual transition issues that an international student moving to Australia for the first time may experience.

(f) The supervisor should be aware of the services available to an international student, particularly in relation to the provisions of the ESOS National Code, and refer the student to appropriate sources of information as required.

**Note:** Information relevant to the support of international students is available from the International Office, international student advisors and SUPRA.

(14) **The research community**

(a) The research supervisor must arrange for the student to participate in the work of the department/school, including attendance and presentation at departmental/school seminars.

(b) The supervisor must encourage the student to extend their contacts within the academic community e.g. in the department/school, faculty, University and external to the University. This may include academic staff, postgraduate fellows, and other higher degree by research students.
(c) The supervisor must encourage the student to take the opportunity to discuss their research with other staff and students in the relevant subject area and to communicate their research findings to others in the wider academic community.

(15) **Thesis content, writing and submission**

(a) The research supervisor must give appropriate and timely advice on the requirements regarding content, style, presentation and production of theses.

(b) As far as possible, the research supervisor should ensure that the work submitted is the student’s own and that data are valid.

(c) When required by the course resolutions of the degree, the research supervisor will:

   (i) consider the suitability and availability of potential examiners; and

   (ii) make recommendations to the **head of department postgraduate coordinator** regarding potential examiners in good time before the thesis is submitted.

(d) The **research coordinating** supervisor is responsible for certifying that a thesis is in a form suitable for examination at the time of submission.

(16) **Compliance requirements**

(a) The research supervisor must ensure that students are aware of, and abide by, all applicable laws, University policies and procedures, including those applicable to research integrity.

   **Note:** All current University policies and procedures are available from the **Policy Register**.

(b) The research supervisor must advise the student of the requirement to obtain ethics approval for studies on animal and human subjects (including the use of questionnaires) prior to undertaking research to which such requirements may apply.

(c) As chief investigators on student ethics applications, the research supervisor is responsible for submission of the application, including review of content and accuracy.

   **Note:** Ethics approval cannot be provided retrospectively.

(d) The research supervisor must advise the student about academic honesty, and in particular the avoidance of plagiarism.

(e) The research supervisor must ensure that the student is aware of their rights with respect to intellectual property and encourage, where appropriate, the exploitation of such intellectual property through the University. The student may be encouraged to seek independent advice regarding their intellectual property.

   **Note:** See **Intellectual Property Policy 2016**

(f) The **research** supervisor must reach agreement with the student concerning authorship of publications and acknowledgement of contributions during and after the candidature. It is recommended that, wherever necessary, the agreement be re-evaluated just prior to publication in case of any significant shifts to workload allocations and intellectual input since the agreement was initially made.
(g) There should be open and mutual recognition of the student’s and the supervisor’s contributions on all published works arising from the project.

(h) A research supervisor must ensure that student is aware of all applicable requirements for retention of data, and requirements for members of staff to complete a statement of authorship for each paper submitted for publication.

(i) The supervisor must ensure that safe working practices are developed and maintained at all times. This includes:
   (i) ensuring that the student is aware of the University’s work and health safety requirements; and
   (ii) recommending that the student participates in appropriate work health and safety training.

Note: See Work Health and Safety Policy 2012.

(j) Supervisors must be aware of, and abide by, their obligations under the Autonomous Sanctions Act 2011 (Cth).

Note: As at the date of this policy, Commonwealth legislation is available at http://www.comlaw.gov.au/Home

(k) The research supervisor is responsible for ensuring that the student is aware that a copy of their thesis will be lodged with the University Librarian, and should guide the writing of the thesis to ensure that they fulfil the necessary requirements.

Note: See University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research Rule) 2011.

15 Responsibilities of students

(1) It is the responsibility of students to maintain a professional relationship at all times with supervisors and other University staff.

(2) At the commencement of the candidature

   (a) Students must play an informed part in the process of the selection and appointment of supervisors.

   Note: See University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011

   (b) Students must ensure that they are correctly enrolled according to faculty and University requirements prior to commencing their degree program and throughout their candidature.

   (c) Students must comply with the requirements of any scholarship, external funding, sponsorship or other monetary provisions.

   (d) Students should take part in University or faculty or department-school orientation programs, and must take part in induction programs and workshops if directed by the supervisor, faculty or department-school. This may include attendance at workshops on safety and health procedures.

   Note: See also Essential Resources for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2016

   (e) Students should familiarise themselves with the qualities and skills the University expects its graduates to have and must, with the assistance of
their supervisors, prepare a plan for future skill acquisition as they proceed through their degree program. This will include undertaking a research training needs analysis at the beginning of, and during, their candidature, to identify specific areas in which development is required.

**Note:** See [Learning and Teaching Policy 2015](#).

(f) Students must undertake any coursework or other activities required by the University.

(g) Students must familiarise themselves with the [Essential Resources for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2016](#), to inform their discussions with their supervisors, department, faculty and the University about the resources that may be available to support their candidature.

(h) Students may be expected to develop a research budget in consultation with their supervisors, and to seek information about relevant research funding schemes.

(3) **During the candidature**

(a) Students are responsible for meeting the administrative requirements of their candidature. This includes but is not limited to planned leave, time away and re-enrolment.

(b) Students must ensure that all administrative requirements of the faculty and the University, such as re-enrolment and progress reviews are met.

(c) Students must notify and negotiate any planned leave, time away or change in enrolment status with their supervisors, and follow appropriate faculty or University approval processes.

(d) Students should make every effort to build and maintain satisfactory supervisory relationships. This includes:

   (i) establishing with their supervisors agreed methods of working;

   (ii) fulfilling their side of any agreement; and

   (iii) meeting regularly with their supervisors. In the probationary period of their candidature this should be at least fortnightly. As the candidature progresses different contact arrangements may be negotiated as appropriate.

(e) Students must devote sufficient time to their research. Full time candidature requires at least the same time commitment as would full time professional employment in Australia.

(f) Students should plan and execute the project within the time limits defined, taking into account the nature of the program (full time or part-time) and the milestones agreed with supervisors.

(g) Students are expected to attend as agreed for consultation and provide evidence of progress made.

(4) **The research community**

(a) Students should be aware of opportunities for meeting other researchers in the field and attend internal and external seminars, meetings and conferences.

(b) Students should participate in the opportunities offered by the department to be part of that intellectual community. This includes taking part in
activities of the faculty or department school such as presentation of research at University seminars and conferences.

(5) **Compliance requirements**

(a) Students must be aware of, and abide by, all applicable laws, University policies and procedures including those applicable to research integrity.

**Note:** All current University policies and procedures are available from the Policy Register.

(b) Students must familiarise themselves with the resolutions governing the degree course in which they are enrolled.

(c) Students must consult their supervisors about applications for ethics approval where their project involves the study of animal or human subjects (including the use of questionnaires).

(d) Ethics approval must be applied for prior to the commencement of the project and cannot be provided retrospectively.

(e) Students must ensure that they avoid all forms of academic dishonesty, including plagiarism.

(f) Students must familiarise themselves with the requirements of the Research Code of Conduct 2013.

   (i) If students are concerned about possible research misconduct, they should seek advice from their supervisors.

   (ii) If a student does not feel comfortable doing this, or if the supervisor is involved in the issue of concern, the student should approach the postgraduate co-ordinator or associate dean for the faculty.

(g) Students should read the Intellectual Property Policy 2016 and explore with their supervisor and the University the possible exploitation of any invention or other intellectual property arising from their research.

(h) Students must at all times adopt safe working practices relevant to the field of research and comply with the University’s work health and requirements.

(i) Students must attend any workshops on safety and health procedures required by the faculty or department school in which the student is undertaking research.

**Note:** See Work Health and Safety Policy 2012

(6) **Grievances**

(a) Students are encouraged to take the initiative in raising problems or difficulties and seeking solutions to them as soon as possible. Problems may be raised during the progress review process or at any other time.

(b) Students are encouraged to inform supervisors or postgraduate co-ordinators about difficulties being experienced as soon as possible.

(c) In the first instance, locally negotiated solutions should be sought before recourse to formal processes.

(d) Students must be aware of, and implement as required, the University’s grievance resolution policies and procedures, including:

   (i) Research Code of Conduct 2013;

   (ii) Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Policy 2015;

   (iii) Reporting Wrongdoing Policy 2012;

(e) Students are encouraged to familiarise themselves with the mechanisms available for helping with supervisor-student difficulties and to take advantage of them if necessary.

(f) Students may seek independent advice or representation, including from the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association (SUPRA).

16 Responsibilities of departments

(1) Departmental School responsibilities for higher degree by research students will be discharged by the head of department/postgraduate coordinators.

(2) Departments are responsible for:

(a) determining appropriate supervisory arrangements for each student based on skills, experience, workload, projected availability and other requirements appropriate to the candidate, degree and research project;

(b) varying supervisory arrangements as required;

(c) requiring, when necessary, all supervisors to participate in University supervision development courses and workshops;

(d) explaining their respective roles to all members of a supervisory team;

(e) making recommendations to the associate dean for approval of proposed increases in the supervisory workload of research supervisors;

(i) A normal supervisory workload is the equivalent of supervising five full time higher degree by research students.

(ii) The associate dean is responsible for approving all such arrangements.

(f) determining appropriate alternative supervision arrangements if a research supervisor is absent for one month or more, and is unable to adequately supervise their students remotely;

(g) notifying all affected students and making sure the University and discussing ongoing supervisory arrangements with both the student and the departing supervisor;

(h) clearly defining the duties and responsibilities of postgraduate co-ordinators providing adequate resources to assist in the performance of those duties and properly recognising the workload these duties entail;

(i) determining coursework or alternative development activities required by individual students, after consultation with the relevant research supervisors and consideration of the applicable research training needs analysis;

(j) ensuring that review procedures, including progress reviews, are carried out in accordance with University policies and procedures;

(k) ensuring that necessary approvals for conditions of candidatures are obtained from the faculty, and that scholarship reporting requirements are met;

(l) determining, in consultation with the research supervisors, the facilities likely to be required for any particular candidature, and ascertaining their availability;
advising applicants and students about the availability of facilities, including access to physical space and other resources, and the financial support that is likely to be available to them;

reporting to the dean or associate dean if the required facilities are not available;

encouraging interaction and the development of beneficial intellectual relationships amongst students and staff and encouraging students to participate in appropriate departmental or faculty activities;

providing students with the names of individuals to whom they can turn to for advice;

the proper and expeditious conduct of the examination process, including the timely selection of appropriate examiners in accordance with University policies and procedures; and

informing students and supervisors of the University’s policies and procedures with respect to ethics, intellectual property, academic dishonesty and plagiarism, research integrity, and grievance procedures.

17 Responsibilities of faculties

(1) Faculty responsibilities for higher degree by research students will be discharged by the relevant dean or associate dean.

(2) Faculties are responsible for:

(a) ensuring that applicants for admission to candidature meet the minimum requirements for admission to the relevant degree and the proposed course of study;

(b) ensuring that all supervisors in their faculty are included in the Supervisor Register;

(c) establishing and explaining appropriate review mechanisms, including the progress reviews, within departments;

(d) explaining students’ rights and obligations;

(e) providing necessary resources in accordance with the Essential Resources for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2016, and discussing the availability of necessary resources, appropriate to the candidature, with students and their supervisors as required;

(f) monitoring students during their candidature through reports from departments, and intervening where necessary;

(g) providing students with the names of individuals to whom they can turn to for advice;

(h) ensuring that examiners recommended are appropriately qualified and that the examination process maintains the standards required for the degree concerned; and

(i) lodging of an awarded thesis to the University Library. This is to ensure that the Library receives the properly awarded thesis and an assurance that all compliance requirements under the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research Rule) 2011 have been met.
18 Responsibilities of the University

(1) The University will ensure that higher degree by research students are provided with an acceptable level of access to physical space and other facilities, including library facilities, and that departments schools are required to advise applicants about the facilities that are available.

(2) The University is responsible for maintaining the Supervisor Register and providing:

(a) support services in areas such as learning assistance;
(b) development activities for supervisors of postgraduate students;
(c) effective reporting and review mechanisms throughout the candidature;
(d) procedures which allow students to seek assistance in the resolving difficulties; and
(e) appropriate appeal mechanisms.

19 Rescissions

This policy replaces the Code of Practice for Supervision of Postgraduate Research Students, the Postgraduate Research Higher Degree Training Supervision at the University of Sydney Policy, and the Probationary candidature and English expression policy, all of which are rescinded as from the effective date of this policy.
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**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board approve the amendments to the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015, as presented.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

There are consequential amendments to the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015 (Attachment 1) arising from the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016 and organisational design changes that the Graduate Studies Committee is asked to endorse.

**BACKGROUND / CONTEXT**

The currently registered iteration of the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015 does not align with the delegations in the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016. The proposed amendments in Attachment 1 will ensure that roles and responsibilities in the policy align with the relevant delegations.

**ATTACHMENTS**

**Attachment 1** – Draft amendments to the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015
THESIS AND EXAMINATION OF HIGHER DEGREES BY RESEARCH POLICY 2015
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1 Name of policy
This is the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015.
2 Commencement
This policy commences on 1 January 2015.

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

4 Statement of intent
This policy:
(a) describes the nature of the thesis for a higher degree by research; and
(b) prescribes the requirements for the examination of a higher degree by research.

5 Application
(1) This policy applies to the thesis for, and examination of, all higher degrees by research, including:
(a) masters degrees by research;
(b) the Doctor of Philosophy; and
(c) doctorates by research other than the Doctor of Philosophy.
(2) This policy does not apply to higher doctorates as defined in section 5 of the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011.

6 Definitions and interpretation
(1) In this policy:
AQF means the Australian Qualifications Framework (see http://www.aqf.edu.au/)
administrative unit means the central University administrative unit responsible for the processes of candidature management
Associate Dean means the Associate Dean of a faculty with authority for matters relating to higher degrees by research within the faculty, or the Deputy Chairperson of a Board of Studies, or a person appointed by the Dean to have authority for matters relating to higher degrees by research within the faculty.
chair of examination means the person appointed by the associate dean to co-ordinate the examination, as defined in clause 15A of this policy.
cotutelle agreement means an agreement between the University and another university or institution that permits joint candidature in the Doctor of Philosophy consistently with the Cotutelle Scheme Policy.
course resolutions means resolutions made by the Academic Board in accordance with sections 2.1 and 3.1 of the *University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011*.

Dean means the Dean of a faculty, the Head of School and Dean (University school) or the chairperson of a board of studies.

doctorate by research includes the PhD and all faculty doctorates and has the meaning provided in the *University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (as amended)* which at the date of this policy is:

a degree with the word ‘Doctor’ in the title comprising a minimum of two-thirds research that is approved by the Academic Board.

Note: The Academic Board will not approve a Doctorate by research unless it complies with the Australian Qualifications Framework at AQF level 10.

examination means the examination of a thesis as the basis for the award of a higher degree by research.

examiner means a person appointed to examine a higher degree by research thesis. An examiner may be an internal or an external examiner.

external examiner means a suitably qualified person who is neither an employee or an honorary title holder (as defined by the *Honorary Titles Policy 2013*) of the University. Persons who have previously been employed by the University, and who have not been involved in the candidature, may be approved as external examiners.

faculty means the faculty or University School in which the student is enrolled.

faculty committee means the committee that is responsible for the examination of a higher degree by research student for the faculty in which the student is enrolled. This may be a faculty, divisional University school or other relevant committee or board.

HDR Examinations Sub-Committee means the HDR Examinations Sub-Committee of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board.

Note: The terms of reference of these committees are available from the Graduate Studies Committee website.

internal examiner means a suitably qualified person who is an employee or honorary title holder (as defined by the *Honorary Titles Policy 2013*) of the University.

joint award means an agreement between the University and another university or institution pursuant to an agreement that permits such awards.

Note: See also *Cotutelle Scheme Policy*
masters degree by research has the meaning provided in the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 which at the date of this policy is:

a degree with the word ‘Master’ in the title comprising a minimum of two thirds research that is approved by the Academic Board.

Note: The Academic Board will not approve a masters degree by research unless it complies with the Australian Qualifications Framework at AQF Level 9.

outcome means the outcome of an examination for a higher degree by research as defined in clause 23 of this policy.

plagiarism has the meaning provided in the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 which at the date of this policy is

presenting another person’s work as one’s own work by presenting, copying or reproducing it without appropriate acknowledgement of the source. Plagiarism is a form of academic dishonesty.

postgraduate co-ordinator means the member of academic staff within a school with responsibility for matters relating to higher degrees by research.

relevant committee means the committee deciding the outcome of the examination, as defined in clause 23(1) of this policy.

school means the academic unit or disciplinary grouping (however named) within a faculty primarily responsible for the teaching and examining of higher degree by research students. If a faculty does not have an internal school structure, a reference to a school is a reference to the faculty.

student has the meaning provided in the University of Sydney By-law 1999 (as amended) which at the date of this policy is:

a person who is currently admitted to candidature in an award course at the University.

submission check means a review of a higher degree by research thesis undertaken at the point of submission by the central University administrative unit responsible for the processes of candidature management, as specified in subclause 13(1).

Note: See also Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Procedures 2015 and Academic Honesty Procedures 2016.

supervisor has the meaning provided for co-ordinating supervisor in the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013 which at the date of this policy is:

the research supervisor in a supervisory team who has designated academic delegations and responsibility for administrative requirements.

thesis means the whole of the assessable work submitted for examination. This may include previously published material, creative or artistic components, software, codes, models, and appendices.
Subject to the requirements of the applicable faculty constitution, an action to be undertaken by a faculty pursuant to this policy may be undertaken by a staff member, academic or professional, to whom the Dean has allocated responsibility for the relevant activity.

7 Roles of thesis and examination

(1) The thesis is the complete body of assessable work submitted by a student for examination for a higher degree by research.

(2) The examination of the thesis is the basis for the award of a higher degree by research (subject to the completion of coursework where required by degree resolutions).

**Note:** Some masters degrees by research and doctorates may include coursework requirements.

(3) The examination determines whether a higher degree by research is awarded or not awarded.

(4) Subject to Section 6 of the *University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research Rule) 2011*, a candidate for a higher degree by research will not be permitted to undertake a program of advanced study and research that is likely to result in the lodgement in the University Library of a thesis that cannot be made available for public use.

8 The thesis

(1) The thesis must:
   
   (a) be the student’s own work;
   
   (b) embody the results of the work undertaken by the student during candidature;
   
   (c) form a substantially original contribution to the area of knowledge concerned;
   
   (d) afford evidence of originality by the:
      
      (i) discovery of new knowledge; and
      
      (ii) exercise of independent critical ability;
   
   (e) form a cohesive and unified whole;
   
   (f) include a substantial amount of material that may be suitable for publication;
   
   (g) satisfactorily demonstrate that the student is able to identify, access, organise and communicate new and established knowledge;
   
   (h) be written to a standard generally acceptable to the discipline; and
   
   (i) be written in English except where permitted under the *University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research Rule) 2011*.

(2) The thesis must document, generally in the preface, or in the notes, or elsewhere as appropriate:

   (a) the animal and human ethics approval obtained;
   
   (b) the sources from which the information in the thesis is derived;
   
   (c) the nature of collaborations, or assistance, with the work described in the thesis, including:
(i) any assistance provided during the research phase; and
(ii) any editorial assistance in the writing of the thesis.

Note: In relation to editorial assistance see clause 3 of the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015.

(3) The thesis must contain a written component generally in the form of one or more critical hypotheses that investigate the subject of the thesis in the relevant body of knowledge.

(4) The thesis may contain:

(a) artistic or creative works, software, computer code, or models which must be documented or recorded in a way sufficient for the purpose of assessment;
(b) material that has been published during candidature with the student as either sole or joint author, provided that the supervisor or corresponding author submits evidence identifying the student’s contribution to the published material;
(c) appendices.

(5) The role of an appendix is to provide a place for the inclusion of supplementary material that is related to the research but not directly relevant to the argument of the thesis.

(a) Material in appendices is assessable except where written entirely by authors other than the candidate.
(b) Appendices may include:

(i) data sets; or
(ii) software code; or
(iii) examples of surveys or instruments used to gather research data; or
(iv) handbooks and manuals; or
(v) publications arising from the research but not directly relevant to the arguments included in the thesis; or
(vi) documentary recordings of exhibitions or installations mounted during the candidature but not part of the thesis; or
(vii) archival and primary texts; or
(viii) other material as deemed necessary by the student and supervisor.

(6) The required length of the thesis depends on the degree for which it is submitted.

(a) For doctoral degrees:

(i) the total upper limit is 80,000 words which may be exceeded by no more than 20,000 words with the written permission of the Dean, Associate Dean, or the Chair of the faculty committee;
(ii) subject to clause 8(6)(a)(i), a shorter required length may be specified by course resolutions, or in the case of the PhD, by local provisions;
(iii) this word limit does not include appendices.

(b) For masters degrees by research:

(i) The total upper limit is 50,000 words which may be exceeded by no more than 10,000 words with the written permission of the Dean, Associate Dean, or the Chair of the faculty committee.
(ii) Subject to Clause 8(6)(b)(i), a shorter required length may be specified in course resolutions.

(iii) The word limit does not include appendices.

9 The examination generally

(1) The examination is an assessment of the total thesis presented.

(2) The examination process proceeds on the basis that:
   (a) the thesis consists of advanced research which makes an original contribution to knowledge; and
   (b) the awarded thesis will be lodged in the University library in electronic format.

   Note: See also University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 and Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures.

(3) The outcome of the examination is an academic decision by the relevant committee based on a body of evidence which includes:
   (a) mandatory items:
      (i) the thesis;
      (ii) examiners' reports specified in clause 21 of this policy;
      (iii) a recommendation from the relevant chair of examination, which is based on the examiners' reports; and
      (iv) where applicable, any reports of investigations under the Academic Honesty Procedures 2016 or its related policies;

      Note: See Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 and Research Code of Conduct 2013.

   and

   (b) as deemed necessary by the relevant committee:
      (i) reports from supervisor(s), postgraduate co-ordinator, head of school and the Associate Dean;
      (ii) comments from the student; or
      (iii) any other information deemed necessary.

   Note: See also clauses 5 – 14 of the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015.

10 Oral examinations

(1) Oral examinations may be:
   (a) recommended by the chair of examination; or
   (b) requested by a student, except in relation to a resubmitted thesis.

   Note: See also clauses 15 – 16 of the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015.

(2) Oral examinations will only be undertaken if approved by the chair of examination.

(3) Oral examinations may be conducted:
(a) as an integral part of the whole examination process; or
(b) as an in-person consultation with the student at the conclusion of the standard examination.

(4) The purpose of an oral examination is to:
(a) reduce the potential length of the examination process;
(b) fit the convention of the discipline;
(c) test the student’s understanding of the knowledge described within the thesis;
(d) clarify points of principle or detail within the thesis; or
(e) assess the contribution made by the student to the content and presentation of the thesis.

(5) Oral examinations may only examine material that would be examined under a thesis-only examination i.e. the complete thesis as specified in clause 8 of this policy.

11 Examination of cotutelle and joint award degrees

(1) For joint degrees, including cotutelle degrees, the examination processes to be used must be specified in the individual student agreement at the beginning of the candidature.

(2) The examination of such degrees must be conducted:
(a) by the University, in accordance with this policy; or
(b) by the partner institution, consistently with the terms of the applicable individual student agreement.

(3) If the examination is to be conducted by the partner institution:
(a) the proposed examination process must be approved before the agreement is executed, by one of:
   (i) the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board; or
   (ii) the HDR Examinations Sub-Committee of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board; and
(b) the relevant individual student agreement should require consistency with the following clauses of this policy:
   (i) the qualifications of examiners (clause 15)
   (ii) the examiners’ reports (clause 21); and
   (iii) the outcome of the award (clause 23).

Note: See also Cotutelle Scheme Policy and clause 18 of the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015.

12 Thesis with publications

(1) The University will accept for examination a thesis which contains previously published material provided that:
(a) the thesis makes an original and substantial contribution to the field of knowledge;
(b) the thesis forms a consistent, coherent and unified whole;
(c) the previously published material relates to research undertaken during the candidature and was published during the candidature; and
(d) in addition to the published material, the student provides, at the minimum:
   (i) an introduction which argues for the aim(s) of the thesis and contextualises the research problems it purports to address; and
   (ii) a conclusion which draws together the findings of the studies in the context of the stated aims of the thesis.

(2) The student may also provide other separate chapters to supplement the published papers such as a literature review, background information, or description of the methodology used.

(3) Acceptable publications (including material already published, accepted for publication, or submitted for publication) include:
   (a) papers in refereed journals;
   (b) book chapters;
   (c) conference papers;
   (d) a documentary record of an exhibition or installation mounted during candidature which is not part of the creative or artistic component of a thesis.

(4) A blog is not an acceptable publication.

(5) A collection of disparate publications, no matter what their quality, must not be approved for the award of a higher degree by research if they do not meet the criteria for the award.

(6) A thesis containing published material must be examined using the same criteria, and by the same process, as one which does not.

13 Form of thesis for examination

(1) The student must submit their thesis for examination as an electronic document.
   (a) A thesis in paper format may be accepted in addition to the electronic document, with the prior approval of the head of the administrative unit.
   (b) If an examiner expresses a preference for examining a paper copy of the thesis, then this must be supplied by the administrative unit.
   (c) The administrative unit must conduct the submission check, including applying similarity detecting software and making other appropriate checks to all theses submitted for examination.

(2) The following information must appear on the title page:
   (a) the full title of the thesis;
   (b) the student’s name;
   (c) the words “A thesis submitted in fulfilment [or “partial fulfilment”, if determined by the degree resolutions] of the requirements for the degree of [degree name, e.g. Doctor of Philosophy]”;
   (d) the faculty in which the student is enrolled;
(e) the name of the University of Sydney.

(3) If a thesis includes an artistic or creative component such as an exhibition, performance, model, software or data, a documentary record of this component of sufficient quality for assessment must be included as part of the submitted thesis.

(4) The thesis must be accompanied by an abstract in the format prescribed by the Academic Board. Some faculties may require the abstract in advance of submission of the thesis for examination.


(5) Students must submit a statement with the thesis certifying their understanding that, if their candidature is successful, their thesis will be lodged with the Director of University Libraries and made available for immediate use.

**Note:** See also *University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011* for requirements for lodging theses.

(6) The thesis must be accompanied by a statement from the supervisor stating whether, in the supervisor’s opinion, the thesis:

(a) is sufficiently well presented to be examined; and

(b) does not exceed the prescribed word limit or any extended word limit for which prior approval has been granted.

(7) If a thesis is submitted for examination without the supervisor’s statement, the faculty committee will decide whether it will be accepted for examination.

(8) The faculty committee may decline to examine a thesis if:

(a) the supervisor does not certify that it is ready for examination;

(b) it exceeds the prescribed word limits without prior approval to do so;

(c) suitable examiners, as determined by the faculty committee, cannot be found;

(d) the student requests withdrawal from the examination and the faculty committee determines there is good reason to do so;

(e) the student has not successfully completed required research training activities, including any required units of study;

(f) there is a finding of inappropriate academic practice, research misconduct or a breach of the *Research Code of Conduct 2013*.

**Note:** See *Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015; Research Code of Conduct 2013* and *Academic Honesty Procedures 2016*.

(g) it is not compliant with ethics approvals; or

(h) it breaches any of:

(i) the *Research Data Management Policy 2014*;

(ii) the *Research Data Management Procedures 2015*;

(iii) the *Code of Conduct for Students*;

(iv) the *Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015*; or

(v) any applicable faculty local provisions relating to research data management.
(9) When a faculty committee declines to examine a thesis, they must:

(a) report the circumstances and reasons for the decision to the HDR Examinations Sub-Committee;

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

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

(d) The Associate Dean will decide whether the student will be permitted to re-enrol or required to show good cause.

(e) When the Associate Dean has made a decision in accordance with 9(d) to permit the student to re-enrol, the student will be informed of writing of:
   (i) the reasons for declining to examine the thesis;
   (ii) any changes necessary to make the thesis acceptable for examination;
   (iii) any other actions required to be completed prior to examination;
   (iv) the date by which the student must re-enrol or apply for suspension of candidature.

(f) When the Associate Dean has made a decision in accordance with 9(d) to require the student to show cause, the student will be informed of writing of:
   (i) the reasons for declining to examine the thesis; and
   (ii) the show cause notice in accordance with the requirements of the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011.

Note: The show good cause process is specified in the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 clauses 2.13, 3.13 and 4.12.

14 Notice of intention to submit

(1) The student must provide written notice of their intention to submit a thesis for examination prior to the final submission date.

Note: See the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011

(2) Notice should be given at least three months prior to the intended submission date to allow sufficient time for:
   (a) The appointment of the chair of examination;
   (b) the appointment of examiners; and
   (c) the organisation of other examination requirements such as oral examinations, exhibitions or performances.

(3) The notice of intention to submit must include certification by the student that they have complied with:
(a) any ethics approvals given; and
(b) their research data management plan and report to their supervisor.

Note: See also Research Data Management Policy 2014, Research Data Management Procedures 2015 and any relevant faculty local provisions.

(4) The supervisor, head of school, or postgraduate coordinator should discuss with the student:
   (a) the possibility of an oral examination; and
   (b) the selection of a chair of examination and possible examiners, noting that students:
      (i) may advise the supervisor, in writing, of the names of individuals that they consider appropriate to be appointed as examiners; and
      (ii) may advise the supervisor, in writing, of the names of individuals that they would prefer not to be appointed as examiners; and
      (iii) are not permitted to communicate with examiners regarding the examination during the examination.

15 Qualifications of examiners

(1) Nominated examiners must be approved by the chair of examinations on the advice of the supervisor, then:
   (a) for doctoral degrees, by the HDR Examinations Sub-Committee;
   (b) for masters degrees by research, by the faculty committee.

(2) Examiners should be active in research or scholarship. A research active examiner is understood to be someone who pursues research on an ongoing basis, as a major focus of their academic activity.

(3) Examiners should have the following qualifications appropriate to the discipline, and as determined by the faculty committee or HDR Examinations Sub-Committee:
   (a) a qualification equivalent to the level being examined; or
   (b) equivalent professional or research experience.

(4) Examiners should have experience of, or be familiar with, the supervision and examination of research theses for the University or other local and international educational institutions, as determined by the faculty committee or HDR Examinations Sub-Committee.

(5) The University should take all reasonable steps to ensure that examiners are:
   (a) free from bias for or against the student or the supervisor; and
   (b) free from actual, potential or perceived conflicts of interests.

(6) A person must not be an examiner if they:
   (a) have been involved in the student's research;
   (b) are a co-author on any part of the work;
   (c) have a past or current close personal relationship with the student or supervisor;
   (d) have had substantial contact with the student or supervisor in any other circumstances which might jeopardise the independence, or the perceived independence, of the examination;
(e) have been a research student of the supervisor within the last ten years; or
(f) have supervised the student at any time.

Note: See also *External Interests Policy 2010*

(7) Subject to this clause 15, a person from another institution, who has held the role of supervisor for other higher degree by research students at the University of Sydney, may be appointed as an external examiner.

(8) Former research students of the supervisor must not be appointed as examiners for at least ten years after graduation, except with the specific approval of the HDR Examinations Sub-Committee and in exceptional circumstances.

**15A Appointment of chair of examination**

(1) The associate dean must appoint a chair of examination to co-ordinate the examination.

(2) The chair of examination will:
   
   (a) usually be the Associate Dean (Research Education) but could also be an experienced Head of School or Postgraduate Co-ordinator, or another academic in the school with substantial experience in HDR examinations;

   (b) not be a current or previous research or auxiliary supervisor of the student for the candidature;

**16 Approving examiners**

(1) The chair of examination must make recommendations regarding the appointment of examiners, as follows:

   (a) for a doctorate by research, a minimum of three examiners; and

   (b) for a masters degree by research, a minimum of two examiners.

(2) The chair of examination should inform the faculty committee or HDR Examinations Sub-Committee of any preferences regarding examiners received from the student.

(3) Each group of examiners approved to examine a thesis should include:

   (a) no more than one from any given university or institution; and

   (b) at least one examiner affiliated with a university or degree granting institution; and

   (c) no more than one internal examiner.

(4) The chair of examination may recommend one or more additional individuals who are qualified to examine to be held in reserve and commissioned, consistently with clause 17 of this policy, as required.

(5) Once the faculty committee or HDR Examinations Sub-Committee has received recommendations from the chair of examination regarding the examiners it may consult with the supervisor, associate dean, head of school or postgraduate co-ordinator as required.

(6) The faculty committee or HDR Examinations Sub-Committee may:

   (a) approve any of the examiners as recommended; or
(b) approve different examiners after consultation with the chair of examination, supervisor, associate dean, head of school or postgraduate co-ordinator.

(7) The supervisor should ensure that examiners are nominated at least four weeks before the submission of the thesis.

(8) If the student does not submit the thesis for examination within three months following the approval of examiners, the administrative unit must:
(a) request a revised submission date from the student and the supervisor; and
(b) write to each examiner:
   (i) to inform them of the delay; and
   (ii) ask if they are still willing to conduct the examination of the thesis at a future date.

17 Commissioning of examiners
(1) Once approved, examiners must be commissioned by the administrative unit in the manner provided in the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015.

Note: See Clause 6 of those procedures.

(2) At least the minimum number of approved examiners for the degree must be commissioned.

(3) Approved examiners who are not initially commissioned may be used at a later stage as replacement or additional examiners.

(4) At the time of commissioning, the administrative unit must ensure that examiners are informed that:
(a) the contents of the thesis, including any intellectual property rights contained in the thesis, remain strictly confidential;
(b) the thesis can only be used for the purposes of performing the examination;
(c) their names may be released to the student during or after the examination; and
(d) their reports may be released to the student during or after the examination.

Note: Students have the right to access information about themselves, including their examinations. See the Privacy Policy 2013 and the Privacy Management Plan.

18 Approving and commissioning of additional examiners
(1) Additional approved examiners may be commissioned to examine a thesis if:
(a) an original examiner is unable to examine subsequent to appointment; or
(b) an original examiner does not complete their examination within the required time frame

Note: see clause 20 below

or

(c) as required by the faculty committee or the HDR Examinations Sub-Committee.

(2) An internal examiner may only replace an original internal examiner.
Any additional examiners must be approved consistently with clause 16 of this policy. This may include examiners approved, but not commissioned, at the time of submission.

19 Appointing examiner-as-assessor

(1) Where the relevant committee is unable to form an intention regarding the award, the relevant committee may appoint an examiner-as-assessor to examine the thesis and act as an assessor of the original examiners’ reports.

(2) Previous approval as an examiner is not sufficient to act as examiner-as-assessor.

(3) Examiners appointed as assessors must:
   (a) be an external appointment;
   (b) have the qualifications required in Clause 15 of the policy;
   (c) possess very high standing in the subject of the thesis; and
   (d) be approved by the HDR Examinations Sub-Committee.

20 Replacing examiners

(1) Replacement examiners must be appointed when:
   (a) a report has not been received from an original examiner within ten weeks of the twelve weeks of the receipt of the thesis; or
   (b) an examiner is unable to examine subsequent to appointment.

(2) The faculty committee must:
   (a) inform the original examiner that their services are no longer required; and
   (b) commission a previously approved examiner; or
   (c) approve a new examiner in accordance with clause 16 of this policy.

(3) Once commissioned, the new examiner must examine the thesis consistently with clause 9 of this policy.

(4) If the original examiner returns a report after the replacement examiner has been sent a copy of the thesis, the original examiner’s report will not form part of the body of evidence used to determine the award of the degree.

21 Examiners reports

(1) Within six weeks of the receipt of the thesis, each examiner must:
   (a) complete the examination; and
   (b) submit a report to the administrative unit.

(2) Each examiner must submit an independent report, which will remain confidential until:
   (a) all reports have been received; or
   (b) the Dean or Associate Dean considers that special circumstances exist which warrant its earlier release.

(3) Examiner’s reports must be in English, except where the language of the thesis is in a language other than English.
**Note:** See the *University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research Rule) 2011*.

(a) If the thesis is in a language other than English, the preferred language of the examiner’s report is English, but the examiner’s report may be provided in the same language as the thesis.

(b) An examiner who provides a report in a language other than English must also submit a summary of their report in English. This summary must be sufficient for:
   (i) the relevant committee to review the examination as necessary; and
   (ii) reviewers to understand the key aspects of the report.

(4) Examiners’ reports must
   (a) state whether, in the opinion of the examiner, the thesis fulfils the criteria in clause 8 of this policy; and
   (b) include any other material required by the *Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015*.

## 22 Communication during examination process

(1) **Between examiners**
   (a) The names of examiners must not be disclosed to other examiners until a determination has been made about the awarding of the degree, except if required:
      (i) by the use of an oral examination; or
      (ii) during the examination of a creative or artistic component of a thesis.
   (b) Examiners must not correspond or communicate with other examiners regarding the examination or the thesis, except in discussion:
      (i) at an oral examination; or
      (ii) at the examination of a creative or artistic component of a thesis.

(2) **Between examiners and students**
   (a) The names of examiners may be disclosed to students, on request, after the thesis has been submitted for examination.
   (b) Students, or persons acting on their behalf, must not communicate with the examiners regarding their thesis or examination during the examination process (i.e. from submission to award of degree).
   (c) If a student, or a person acting on their behalf, communicates with an examiner during the examination process:
      (i) the examination must be discontinued; and
      (ii) a new examination process must commence with newly commissioned examiners.

**Note:** Breaches of the *Code of Conduct for Students* may result in disciplinary action.

(3) **Between the University and examiners**
   (a) University staff, including academic and professional staff, may contact examiners:
      (i) to arrange for an oral examination or the examination of a creative or artistic component of a thesis; or
(ii) to ascertain if progress of the report is delayed.

(b) If University staff, including academic and professional staff, communicate with an examiner they should not make any comment which could be seen as influencing, or having the potential to influence, the examination outcome.

(c) The administrative unit will inform the examiners of the outcome of the examination at the conclusion of the examination.

(4) Between the University and the student

(a) Students may be provided with status updates on the examination process, at the stages specified in the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015.

   Note: See clause 15 of those procedures.

(b) The faculty should provide the student with the names of the examiners at the conclusion of the examination process.

(c) The administrative unit must also contact any student who is required to:

   (i) comment on the examination; or

   (ii) fulfil conditions related to the outcome of the examination.

23 Outcome of the examination

(1) The outcome of the examination will be decided:

   (a) for masters degrees, as determined by faculty resolutions.

   (b) by the faculty committee for examinations, except cotutelle examinations, where the examiners and the chair of examinations all recommend that the degree be awarded.

   (c) by the HDR Examinations Sub-Committee for all other examinations, including all cotutelle examinations.

(2) The outcome of the examination must be one of the following:

   (a) Award without qualification: the degree can be awarded without any further action by the student.

   (b) Award with corrections: the degree can be awarded once all required corrections to the thesis have been addressed by the student to the satisfaction of the chair of examination.

   (c) Non-award - revision and re-examination: the degree is not awarded; and the option is provided for the student to revise and resubmit the thesis for a new examination subject to the following:

      (i) the revision and re-examination process must be conducted consistently with the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015.

      Note: See clause 14 of those procedures.

      (ii) no further opportunity to revise and resubmit the whole thesis may be permitted.

   (d) Non-award - option to award another degree: the thesis is not considered satisfactory for the award of the degree for which it was submitted, but another degree for which the student is eligible may be awarded instead.
(e) Non-award: the thesis is unsatisfactory for the award of the degree for which it was submitted and for any other another degree for which the student is eligible, and does not demonstrate sufficient potential to achieve this standard through resubmission.

(3) The administrative unit will notify the student and supervisor when the decision has been made.

(4) When the decision to award the degree has been made, the faculty may certify that the student is eligible to graduate subject to the student:

(a) fulfilling any conditions of award to the satisfaction of the chair of examination; and

(b) lodging a final copy of the final thesis with the University for the Library.

23A Appeals of examination decisions

Examination decisions are academic decisions, and are subject to appeal in accordance with the University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended).

Note: Such appeals are described in Clauses 3.2, 4.2 and Part 5 of University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended).

24 Rescissions and replacements

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

(1) Postgraduate: Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
(2) Higher degree theses policy
(3) Oral examinations of PhD Theses at the University of Sydney
(4) PhD: Appointment of Additional Examiner as Assessor
(5) PhD: Submission of Doctor of Philosophy Theses containing published work
(6) Proof reading and editing of theses and dissertations
(7) Submission of treatise containing published work
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RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board approve the amendment of the Resolutions of the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery, as presented, with effect from 1 January 2018.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

These amendments reflect updates to the late submission policy in Clause 9 Late Submission Policy of the Faculty Resolutions. The changes update the penalties for late assessments and clearly state how these penalties will be applied.

Clause 9(1) has been updated to read to indicate that students will submit work on the designated due date unless a simple extension, special consideration or disability services adjustment has been granted.

Clause 2 (a) has been amended to change the penalty from 2% to 5% per calendar day for late work. The penalty will be taken from the total available marks out of 100.

Clause 3 (b) has been amended to state that work received after 14 calendar days (rather than 2 weeks) will receive a mark of zero. Clause 3 (c) has been removed as this information is now included in Clause 3(b).

CONSULTATION

The changes to the resolutions were approved by the Curriculum Subcommittee on 17 July 2017. The Faculty Board approved the changes on 7 August 2017.

IMPLEMENTATION

The changes will be implemented in the 2018 handbook.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Amended Faculty Resolutions.
Resolutions of the University of Sydney Nursing School for coursework awards

These resolutions must be read in conjunction with applicable University By-laws, Rules and policies including (but not limited to) the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2000 (the 'Coursework Rule'), the Resolutions of the School, the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended), the University policy on Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism and the Sydney Nursing School Clinical Policy.

Part 1: Course enrolment

1 English language proficiency requirements

(1) Applicants who have completed an undergraduate course: an Australian Educational qualification equivalent to a completed NSW HSC or at least one year of full-time tertiary studies where the language of instruction and assessment is in English are deemed to have met English language requirements. Where an applicant does not meet this requirement, proof of English language proficiency will need to include:

(a) an IELTS overall band score of 7.0 with a minimum of 7.0 in each band, or equivalent score in another recognised test; or
(b) satisfactory completion of an appropriate course at the University's Centre for English Teaching within the past two years at the time of enrolment; or
(c) a record of satisfactory achievement in secondary/tertiary studies in an English speaking country, or in a secondary/tertiary institution where the language of instruction was in English (i.e. where the applicant has completed senior secondary study or at least one year of full-time university study), within the past two years at the time of enrolment.

In addition, for pre-registration courses, external bodies such as the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency may specify additional English language proficiency requirements for professional registration.

The Academic Board Postgraduate English Language Requirements policy outlines English language requirements for admission to Postgraduate courses.

(2) Applicants require an IELTS overall band score of 7.0 with a minimum of 7.0 in each band, or equivalent score in another recognised test completed in the two years prior to their application; or

(3) successful completion of an appropriate course at the University's Centre for English Teaching in the two years prior to their application;

(4) For admission to postgraduate courses, proof of English language proficiency may also be provided through a record of satisfactory achievement in tertiary studies in which the language of the institution was English and the language of instruction, examination and assessment was English. The School defines satisfactory achievement as:

(a) a three year degree, completed no more than five years prior to commencement; or
(b) a degree of two or more years duration, completed no more than three years prior to commencement.

(4) For admission to post-registration postgraduate courses, proof of English Language proficiency may also be provided by a record of current registration with the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency (AHPRA) as a (Division 1) Registered Nurse and proof of current employment in this capacity at an appropriate health facility.

2 Clinical Requirements

(1) Students may be required to complete professional experience (clinical placements) and laboratory sessions as prescribed by the School.

(2) New South Wales Ministry of Health, and other government agencies require students to comply with relevant policies prior to being given access to their facilities for clinical placements.

(3) At the time of enrolment students will also need to sign a statement agreeing not to disclose personal information obtained during clinical placements relating to patients and staff employed by NSW Ministry of Health or other government and non-government services/agencies.

(a) Students will be notified at the point of enrolment, of the policies with which they will be required to comply.

(b) Students must demonstrate compliance with those policies by the Census Date. The Dean may grant an extension of time in exceptional circumstances.

(c) Policies may be introduced or varied from time to time, and students will be notified of any new or varied obligations that result from policy changes, and will be required to comply with such changes as they occur.

3 Enrolment restrictions

(1) Except as with the permission of the delegated academic a student may not enrol in units of study with a total value of more than:

(a) 24 credit points in either semester one or two; or
(b) 18 credit points in the summer session; or
(c) 12 credit points in the winter session.

(2) Except as with the permission of the delegated academic a student may not enrol in units of study with a total value of less than 12 credit points in either semester one or two.

4 Suspension, discontinuation and lapse of candidature

The Coursework Rule specifies the conditions for suspending or discontinuing candidature, and return to candidature after these events. The Rule also defines the circumstances when candidature is deemed to have lapsed. Students should pay careful attention to the significant dates in these processes and their effect on results and financial liability.

5 Credit for previous study

(1) The award of credit for previous study toward courses in the University of Sydney Nursing School will be consistent with the Coursework Rule. In addition:

(a) Credit toward nursing units in the professional masters course will not be granted for recognised prior learning older than five years at the time of first enrolment.
(b) Credit toward the graduate certificate, graduate diploma and advanced learning masters courses may be considered for recognised prior learning older than five years at the time of first enrolment provided the candidate can demonstrate ongoing experience within the discipline. Full credit will be granted for graduates of an award in an embedded program who become candidates for the higher award.

(c) A student may be granted waivers in place of credit. In this case the student will be required to complete alternative units of study prescribed by the school.

(d) Credit granted on the basis of work completed at an institution other than a university will not exceed one third of the course requirements. The exception is for clinically relevant Graduate Certificate completed at the Australian College of Nursing (ACN), where up to 24 units of credit may be granted, for a 48 credit point Graduate Diploma, or 60 credit point Master’s Degree.

(2) Any variations from the above rules on credit for previous study are specified in the course resolutions.

Part 2: Unit of study enrolment

6 Cross-institutional study

(1) The Dean may permit a student to complete a unit of study at another institution and have that unit credited to the student’s course requirements, provided that:

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

(2) Cross-institutional study is another form of credit and this will be taken into consideration when considering eligibility.

7 International exchange

The school does not usually allow students to participate in international exchange programs due to the strict course requirements. Short term overseas study programs or clinical placements may be available.

Part 3: Studying and Assessment

8 Attendance

(1) Students are required to be in attendance at the correct time and place of any formal or informal examinations. Non attendance on any grounds insufficient to claim Special Consideration will result in the forfeiture of marks associated with the examination and may result in an Absent Fail for the unit of study. Participation in a minimum number of assessment items may be included in the requirements specified for a unit of study.

(2) Students are expected to attend 100% of clinical placement activities and a minimum of 90% of timetabled activities for a unit of study, unless granted exemption by the Dean. The Dean may determine that a student fails a unit of study because of inadequate attendance. Alternatively, at their discretion, they may set additional assessment items where attendance is lower than 90%.

9 Late submission policy

(1) It is expected that unless a simple extension, special consideration or disability services adjustment Special Consideration or an extension has been granted, students will submit all assessment for a unit of study on the specified due date. If the assessment is completed or submitted within the period of extension, no academic penalty will be applied to that piece of assessment.

(2) If an extension is either not sought, not granted or is granted but work is submitted after the extended due date, the late submission of assessment will result in an academic penalty as follows:

(a) Work submitted after the deadline will incur a penalty of 5% of the total available marks (out of 100) for each calendar day, but up to seven calendar days late, a penalty of 2 per cent per day of the maximum mark awardable for the assignment will apply.

(b) Work submitted fourteen calendar days or more after seven calendar days and less than two weeks after the deadline will not be assessed and receive a mark of zero, a penalty of 5 per cent per day of the maximum mark awardable for the assignment will apply. Work submitted more than two weeks after deadline will be awarded a zero mark.

(c) Work submitted after the deadline will not be assessed.

10 Special Consideration for illness, injury or misadventure

(1) Special Consideration is a process that affords equal opportunity to students who have experienced circumstances that adversely impact their ability to adequately complete an assessment task in a unit of study. The Coursework Rule provides full details of the University policy. The procedures for applying for Special Consideration are described in each unit of study outline.

(2) Where students are unable to complete a clinical placement due to illness, injury or misadventure and Special Consideration has been granted, they will be required to make up all the missed time.

11 Re-assessment

(1) The school does not offer opportunities for re-assessment other than on the grounds of approved Special Consideration.

(2) Students who have successfully requested Special Consideration may be allowed to sit an exam or submit required work on an alternative date determined by the school. In normal circumstances, further sittings of end of semester examinations will be scheduled during the two weeks following the University’s formal examination period. Students should be given at least three days notice of the timing of a test. Marks will be awarded at full value for re-assessment where Special Consideration is approved. Non-submission of work or non-attendance at exams by the agreed time will be considered a failure of the assessment item.

Part 4: Progression, Results and Graduation

12 Satisfactory progress

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

(2) In addition, students must meet all requirements of off-campus clinical placement components of any unit of study undertaken. Performance in clinical placements will be monitored in accordance with the school’s Clinical Policy.

13 Clinical Requirements

(1) Students must continue to comply with required NSW Ministry of Health and other relevant policies throughout their candidature.

(2) Preregistration students must maintain Student Registration with the National Nurses and Midwives Board of Australia as outlined in the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law.

(a) A student who has conditions imposed on their registration as a student under this Law may be unable to make satisfactory progress in the award course and may be required to attend a Professional Standards Sub-Committee hearing. In cases where conditions
imposed on registration prohibit the student from completing professional clinical placements, the student may be unable to make satisfactory progress in the award course and may need to show good cause as to why they should be permitted to continue with the degree.

(b) A student who has their Student Registration removed by the National Nurses and Midwives Board of Australia may be unable to make satisfactory progress in the award course and may be required to discontinue their enrolment in the award course.

(3) A student whose conduct is deemed to be unsatisfactory at any time during a clinical placement may have that placement terminated, may be failed in that unit of study by the School, and may be required to attend a Professional Standards Sub-Committee hearing.

(4) A student whose behaviour, performance or character is considered to be incompatible with the safe and professional practice of nurses and midwives, or commits any serious breach of the ethical standards required for the professional practice of nursing, or is convicted of an indictable offence, may be required to attend a School Professional Standards Subcommittee hearing.

(5) Where students are required to appear before the Professional Standards Sub-Committee, the committee may:

(a) require the student to undertake units of study or clinical practice or other requirements in addition to the minimum credit point value for the degree; and/or

(b) ask the student to show good cause as to why they should be allowed to continue in the degree.

14 Weighted average mark (WAM)

The University has a formula for calculating a Weighted Average Mark and this is defined in the University Glossary. WAMs are used by the University as one indicator of performance. For example, WAMs can be used in assessing admission to and award of honours, eligibility for prizes and scholarships, or assessing progression through a course.

Part 5: Other

15 Transitional provisions

(1) These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature after 1 January, 2016 and students who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2016 who elect to proceed under these resolutions.

(2) Students who commenced prior to 1 January, 2016 may complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions in force at the time of their commencement, provided that requirements are completed by 1 January, 2021. The school may specify a later date for completion or specify alternative requirements for completion of candidatures that extend beyond this time.
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board approve the amendment of the Resolutions of the Faculty of Pharmacy, as presented, with effect from 1 January 2018.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To amend the Faculty Resolutions and remove redundant clauses and correct nomenclature as per advice from Office of General Counsel.

The AQF learning outcomes are unchanged.
Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Faculty of Pharmacy

Contact person: Associate Professor Lorraine Smith, Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching

1. Name of award course
   Graduate Certificate in Pharmacy Practice

2. Purpose of proposal
   (1) Amend unit of study table for Graduate Certificate of Pharmacy Practice to include PHAR7811 which is a new unit for 2018
   (2) The Faculty proposes to amend the Course Resolutions for the Graduate Certificate in Pharmacy Practice to allow students in the registered pharmacist pathway more valid combinations of elective units of study to select from.
   (3) Amend the Faculty Resolutions as per advice from OGC (an outcome from the Academic Board meeting held in July 2017).

3. Details of amendment
   (1) Amend Graduate Certificate in Pharmacy Practice Units of Study Table to add PHAR7811 as a new elective unit as attached.
   (2) Current course rules currently limit students in the registered pharmacist pathway to complete PHAR7110 plus three other elective units. Permitting these students to fulfil course requirements by completing any four elective units will provide for more combinations of valid study to select from. The Faculty progression rules will be amended as per the attached Faculty Course Resolutions.
   (3) Amend nomenclature from ‘Coursework Rule’ to ‘Coursework Policy’ and remove redundant clauses in the Faculty Resolutions and Faculty Course Resolutions.

4. Transitional arrangements
   These changes will apply to postgraduate students from 2018

5. Other relevant information
   The OGC has recommended changes to the Faculty Resolutions and the Faculty Course Resolutions to remove redundant clauses and amend nomenclature. These changes have also been sent to UGSC.

6. Signature of Dean
   Professor Iqbal Ramzan
Resolutions of the Faculty of Pharmacy for coursework awards

These resolutions apply to all undergraduate and postgraduate coursework award courses in the Faculty, unless specifically indicated otherwise. Students enrolled in postgraduate research awards should consult the resolutions for their course. These resolutions must be read in conjunction with applicable University By-laws, Rules and policies including (but not limited to) the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014 (the 'Coursework Rule'), the Coursework Policy 2014, the Resolutions for the course of enrolment, the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended), the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 and the Academic Honesty Procedures 2016. Up to date versions of all such documents are available from the Policy Register: http://sydney.edu.au/policies.

Part 1: Course enrolment
1 Enrolment restrictions
   Except with the permission of the Dean, a student may not enrol in units of study with a total value of more than 24 credit points in either semester one or two, 12 credit points in the summer session and 6 credit points in the winter session.
2 Time Limits
   (1) A student must complete all the requirements for a master's degree within four calendar years of first enrolment.
   (2) A student must complete all the requirements for a graduate diploma within four calendar years of first enrolment or six calendar years if enrolled part time.
   (3) A student must complete all the requirements for a graduate certificate within five calendar years of first enrolment.
   (4) A student must complete all the requirements for a bachelor's degree or undergraduate advanced diploma within ten calendar years of first enrolment.
   (5) All time limits include any period(s) of suspension.
3 Suspension, discontinuation and lapse of candidature
   (1) A candidate who wishes to suspend their candidature must apply to the Faculty. The application must be received by the Faculty prior to the census date of the relevant semester.
   (2) A candidate may apply for a period of suspension for up to two semesters. Should a candidate wish to suspend their candidature for more than the approved period another application must be made to the Faculty prior to the census date of the relevant semester. If the candidate has previously had two semesters of suspension, or if an application is submitted after the census date for that period, the application will be considered by the Faculty.
   (2) Where a candidate has previously enrolled for the relevant semester, a suspension of enrolment may be recorded as Withdrawn (WD), Discontinued - Not to count as failure (DC) or Discontinued with failure (DF).
4 Credit for previous study
   For units of study offered by the Faculty of Pharmacy, credit will not usually be granted for recognised prior learning older than five years at the time of first enrolment in the unit or course for which credit is sought. For other units of study credit transfer is subject to the provisions of the Coursework RulePolicy.

Part 2: Unit of study enrolment
5 Cross institutional study
   (1) Provided permission has been obtained in advance, the Dean may permit a student to complete a unit of study at another institution and have that unit credited to the student's course requirements, provided that:
      (a) The unit of study content is not taught in any corresponding unit of study at the University; or
      (b) The student is unable, for good reason, to attend a corresponding unit of study at the University.
   (2) Cross institutional study is regarded as another form of credit and will be counted as such when considering eligibility.
6 International Exchange
   Exchange for pharmacy students is not straightforward due to the strict requirements of the pharmacy courses. For students enrolled in the international major of the Bachelor of Pharmacy or the Bachelor of Pharmacy and Management, international exchange is permitted in semester 2 of the final year.

Part 3: Studying and Assessment
7 Attendance
   (1) Students are required to be in attendance at the correct time and place of any formal or informal examinations. Non attendance on any grounds insufficient to claim special consideration will result in the forfeiture of marks associated with the assessment. Participation in a minimum number of assessment items may be included in the requirements specified for a unit of study.
   (2) Students are expected to attend a minimum of 85% of compulsory activities for a unit of study, unless granted exemption by the Dean, Associate Dean or coordinator. The Dean, Associate Dean or coordinator most concerned may determine that a student fails a unit of study because of inadequate attendance. Alternatively, at their discretion, they may set additional assessment items where attendance is lower than 90%.
8 Late submission policy of work
   (1) It is expected that unless an application for special consideration has been approved, students will submit all assessment for a unit of study on the due date specified. If the assessment is completed or submitted within an approved period of extension, no academic penalty will be applied to that piece of assessment.
(2) If an extension is either not sought, not granted or is granted but work is submitted after the extended due date, the late submission of assessment will result in an academic penalty as follows:
(a) For work submitted after the deadline but up to three calendar days late, a penalty of 15 per cent of the maximum mark awardable for the assignment will apply.
(b) For work submitted after 3 days and less than one week after the deadline, a penalty of 30 per cent of the maximum mark awardable for the assignment will apply.
(c) For work submitted more than one week late but less than two weeks after the deadline, a penalty of 50 per cent of the maximum mark awardable for the assignment will apply.
(d) Work submitted more than two weeks after deadline will not be assessed (zero mark).

Special consideration for illness, injury or misadventure

Special consideration is a process that offers equal opportunity to students who have experienced circumstances that adversely impact their ability to adequately complete an assessment task in a unit of study. The Coursework Rule provides full details of the University policy. The procedures for applying for special consideration are described in each unit of study outline.

Concessional pass

In this Faculty the grade PGON is not awarded.

Re-assessment

(1) In this Faculty re-assessment is offered to students whose performance is in the prescribed range and circumstances.
(2) Re-assessment may be permitted if students in their final year fail a single compulsory assessment resulting in a grade of fail in only that unit of study, preventing them from completing the degree that year. A grade of 50 pass is the maximum grade a student can achieve if they pass the final year rule in the assessment.
(3) Students who have successfully requested special consideration may be allowed to sit the exam or submit the required work at a negotiated date that should not be longer than the period of incapacitation, and in any case normally not longer than 3 months after the original examination or submission date. After this time the student will be considered to have discontinued with permission. Marks will be awarded at full value for re-assessment where special consideration is approved.

Part 4: Progression, Results and Graduation

Satisfactory Progress

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

Award of the bachelor degree with honours

(1) To qualify for the award of the honours degree a candidate must:
(a) complete the requirements for the pass degree but include the alternative 30 credit point honours pathway described in the Units of Study table for the degree;
(b) normally be of no more than four years (Bachelor of Pharmacy) or five years (Bachelor of Pharmacy and Management) standing in the degree; and
(c) normally have no fail or absent fail results.
(2) The level of honours will be determined by both the honours mark and the HWAM as indicated in the table below. If the honours mark and HWAM indicate a different level of honours, the lesser level will be awarded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of honours</th>
<th>Honours mark</th>
<th>HWAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Class, Division 1</td>
<td>mark &gt;= 85</td>
<td>mark &gt;= 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Class, Division 1</td>
<td>mark &gt;= 80</td>
<td>mark &gt;= 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Class, Division 2</td>
<td>mark &gt;= 75</td>
<td>mark &gt;= 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours not awarded</td>
<td>mark &lt; 75</td>
<td>mark &lt; 65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A candidate for the honours program who does not meet the requirements for the award of honours shall be awarded the pass degree.

(3) HWAM means the Honours Weighted Mark calculated from results for all 2000, 3000, 4000 and 5000 level units attempted for the degree, weighted 2, 3, 4 and 5 for their respective levels. The Honours units of study are given a weighting of 8 in this calculation.

Weighted Average Mark (WAM)

(1) The University WAM is calculated using the following formula:

\[
\text{WAM} = \frac{\text{sum}(Wc \times Mc)}{\text{sum}(Wc)}
\]

Where Wc is the unit of study credit points x the unit weighting and Mc is the mark achieved for the unit. The mark used for units with a grade AF is zero. Pass/ fail units and credited units from other institutions are not counted.

(2) The weight of a unit of study is assigned by the owning faculty. In the Faculty of Pharmacy, 1000, 2000, 3000 and 4000 level units attempted for the degree, weighted 1, 2, 3, 4 for the respective levels. Units with a result of SR (satisfied requirement) are not counted.

University Medal

A student who is awarded Honours Class I and achieves a minimum final honours mark of 90 or greater, and also achieves a final WAM of 85 or greater over the entire degree, in both honours units of study may be awarded a University Medal. The calculation of the final honours mark will be based on a 20 percent weighting of the mark awarded for PHAR4815 and an 80 percent weighting on the mark awarded for PHAR4830. The medal is awarded at the discretion of the Faculty to the highest achieving students who in the opinion of the Faculty have an outstanding academic record, in accordance with the Coursework Rule.
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board approve the amendment of the Resolutions of the Faculty of Science, as presented, with effect from 1 January 2018.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The proposal is to amend the Resolutions of the Faculty to refine the conditions previously specified in Faculty Resolutions of the Faculties of Agriculture and Environment and Faculty of Veterinary Science.

The Resolutions have been amended as follows:

- Amending the admission requirements to reflect change in availability from 2018 of the Flexible Entry Scheme and the Rural Entry Scheme and incorporating the 2018 availability of courses
- Replacing reference to Faculty with “Student Centre” to reflect the centralisation of Faculty Services
- Updating the table of courses to reflect amended resolutions
- Amending and refining the following sections: Course Transfer, International Study, Attendance and Re-assessment

IMPLEMENTATION

The amended resolutions will be implemented in the 2018 Science Undergraduate and Postgraduate Handbooks.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Minor amendment proposal for the Resolutions of the Faculty
Attachment 2: Amended Faculty of Science Resolutions
Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Please complete the proposal electronically with the "instruction information" provided. Instruction information is indicated in italics, enclosed in a shaded box.

Please return this form to science.committees@sydney.edu.au nine calendar days prior to the PGSC meeting where you wish it to be discussed. For assistance please contact the Science Curriculum Project Team at science.curriculum@sydney.edu.au

Proposer's Contact Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Veronica Boulton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>+61 412 331 847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:veronica.boulton@sydney.edu.au">veronica.boulton@sydney.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Head, Education Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Name of award course**
   Resolutions of the Faculty of Science, Resolutions of the Senate

2. **Purpose of proposal**
   Amendments to the Faculty of Science 2018 Faculty Resolutions to further refine the conditions specified in previous Faculty Resolutions of the Faculties of Agriculture and Environment and Faculty of Veterinary Science. The Resolution of the Senate reflect postgraduate Veterinary Science program that will have no new intakes in 2018.

3. **Details of amendment**

   Specifically, amendments are proposed to the following sections of the Resolutions:

   Admissions, Re-enrolment after an absence, Course Transfer, Credit for Previous Study, International Study, Attendance, Re-assessment, Weighted Average Mark and Talented Student Program.

   Admissions: Reflects the change in availability from 2018 of the Flexible Entry Scheme and the Rural Entry Scheme and incorporates the 2018 availability of courses

   Re-enrolment after an absence: Replace 'Faculty' with 'Student Centre' as the contact point to reflect the centralisation of faculty services

   Course Transfer: Change to the order of the 5(1) with 5(5).

   Credit for Previous Study: updates to the table to reflect refinement of resolutions

   International Study: Removal of 8(4)

   Attendance: refinements

   Re-assessment: removal of the repeated content from degree resolutions

   Weighted Average Mark clarification of 2(a)

   Talented Student Program: refinement of 16(1).

   Senate resolution to reflect the postgraduate programs with no new intake in 2018:

   - Master of Veterinary Studies
   - Master of Veterinary Public Health Management
   - Master of Wildlife Health and Population Management
   - Master of Animal Science

4. **Transitional arrangements**
   These apply to all students in the Faculty of Science

5. **Other relevant information**
   Clarification of 5(1). The courses shown in Schedule 1 and 2 includes only courses that are open to new students in 2018. Stream transfers are not listed.
6. Signature of Dean (to be obtained after Faculty Board)

[Signature]

5-9-17

Acting Dean
Resolutions of the Faculty of Science

Resolutions of the Faculty of Science for coursework awards

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

1. Admissions

(1) The provisions of the Coursework Rule and the Coursework Policy apply to the admission of domestic and international applicants to undergraduate and postgraduate coursework courses. Course resolutions may prescribe additional admission requirements.

(2) The Faculty participates in the following approved special admission programs under the Coursework Policy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Flexible Entry Scheme</th>
<th>Broadway Scheme</th>
<th>Cadigal Program</th>
<th>Principal’s Recommendation/Conditional Offer Scheme</th>
<th>Mature-Age Applicants Scheme</th>
<th>Elite Athletes or Performers Scheme</th>
<th>Special Consideration for Admission Scheme</th>
<th>Future Leaders Scheme</th>
<th>Rural-Entry Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced Mathematics)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Medical Science</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Liberal Arts and Science</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Psychology</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science and Master of Nutrition and Dietetics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) and Doctor of Medicine</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Medical Science and Doctor of Medicine</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) and Doctor of Dental Medicine</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Animal and Veterinary Science</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Veterinary Biology/Doctor of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Course Overview

#### Resolutions of the Faculty of Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Flexible Entry Scheme</th>
<th>Broadway Scheme</th>
<th>Cadigal Program</th>
<th>E12 Scheme</th>
<th>Mature Age Applicants Scheme</th>
<th>Elite Athletes or Performers Scheme</th>
<th>Special Consideration for Admission Scheme</th>
<th>Future Leaders Scheme</th>
<th>Rural-Entry Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Liberal Arts and Science</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Advanced Studies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) and Bachelor of Advanced Studies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Medical Science)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Medical Science) and Bachelor of Advanced Studies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Health)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Health) and Bachelor of Advanced Studies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Agriculture)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Food and Agribusiness)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Animal and Veterinary Bioscience)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Veterinary Bioscience and Doctor of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science and Doctor of Dental Medicine</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science and Doctor of Medicine</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Medical Science) and Doctor of Medicine</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Enrolment restrictions

1. Except with the permission of the Associate Dean an undergraduate student may not enrol in units of study with a total value of more than 30 credit points in either semester one or two, 12 credit points in the summer session and 6 credit points in the winter session.

2. Except with the permission of the Associate Dean a postgraduate coursework student may not enrol in units of study with a total value of more than 24 credit points in either semester one or two, 12 credit points in the summer session and 6 credit points in the winter session.

3. Except with the permission of the Associate Dean, undergraduate students are prohibited from:
   1. Re-enrolling in a unit of study that they have previously completed within the last 10 calendar years, regardless of whether the unit of study was completed in their current or previous award course; and
   2. Enrolling in any unit of study that overlaps substantially in content with a unit of study already completed in their current or previous award course within the last 10 calendar years; and/or
   3. For which credit equivalence or exemption has been granted within the last 10 calendar years.

4. Except with the permission of the Associate Dean, postgraduate coursework students are prohibited from:
   1. Re-enrolling in a unit of study that they have previously completed within the last 5 calendar years, regardless of whether the unit of study was completed in their current or previous award course; and
   2. Enrolling in any unit of study that overlaps substantially in content with a unit of study already completed in their current or previous award course within the last 5 calendar years; and/or
   3. For which credit equivalence or exemption has been granted within the last 5 calendar years.

### 3. Time Limits

The provisions of the Coursework Rule apply to the time limits for undergraduate and postgraduate programs, unless otherwise stated in the course resolutions.

### 4. Re-enrolment after an absence

Unless otherwise stated within the course resolutions, provisions of the Coursework Rule and the Coursework Policy apply. A student who plans to re-enrol after a period of suspension must advise the Student Centre of their intention prior to the commencement of semester. Students should pay careful attention to the significant dates in processes and their effect on results and financial liability.

### 5. Course Transfer

1. Schedule 1 of the Faculty Resolutions lists the allowable Undergraduate course transfers and the conditions for transfer approved by the Faculty of Science for students who commenced their studies after 1 January 2018. Schedule 2 of the Faculty Resolutions lists the allowable Postgraduate course transfers and the conditions for transfer approved by the Faculty of Science for students who commenced their studies after 1 January 2018. For students who commenced their studies prior to 1 January 2018, please refer to the 2017 handbook.

2. Providing students satisfy the admission requirements for each stage of an articulated postgraduate coursework program, a student may apply to progress to the award of any of the courses within that sequence. Only the highest award completed will be conferred.

3. A student enrolled in a postgraduate coursework masters may, with the approval of the Associate Dean, elect to discontinue study and graduate with the graduate diploma provided the requirements of the graduate diploma have been met.

4. A student enrolled in a postgraduate coursework graduate diploma may, with the approval of the Associate Dean, elect to discontinue study and graduate with the graduate certificate provided the requirements of the graduate certificate have been met.

5. All applications for transfer in a postgraduate coursework program must satisfy the Faculty specified time limits for application and transfer requests.

6. Schedule 1 of the Faculty Resolutions lists the allowable Undergraduate course transfers and the conditions for transfer approved by the Faculty of Science. Schedule 2 of the Faculty Resolutions lists the allowable Postgraduate course transfers and the conditions for transfer approved by the Faculty of Science.

### 6. Credit for previous study

1. Unless otherwise stated within the course resolutions, the provisions of the Coursework Rule and the Coursework Policy apply to the granting of credit, and in addition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Rule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Science courses</td>
<td>All students must complete all the 3000-level units of study required for a Science Table A+ major at the University of Sydney.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Science courses</td>
<td>Credit is available in the articulated postgraduate courses for postgraduate study as long as it has been undertaken in these award courses within the previous five years. Unless otherwise stated in the course resolutions, external credit and the reduced volume of learning are not available to students enrolled in postgraduate programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Resolutions of the Faculty of Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Rule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>Credit may be granted for specific core units up to a maximum of 75% of the requirements for the degree. Alternatively, the Associate Dean may approve a maximum of 50 credit points towards the requirements. A maximum of 50 credit points may be awarded for students moving through an embedded sequence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, graduate certificates, graduate diplomas, and masters degrees</td>
<td>Credit may be granted only for specific core and elective units in year 1 and year 2 up to a maximum of 48 credit points. Studies must have been completed with at least a credit grade and no more than five years prior to admission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Veterinary Biology/Doctor of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>Credit for previous study will not be granted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>The Associate Dean may approve a maximum of 50 credit points of credit towards the requirements. A maximum of 20 unspecified credit points for units of study not comparable to units listed in table 1 for each degree may be granted as part of the 50 credit point maximum credit transfer permitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Veterinary Science courses</td>
<td>The Associate Dean may approve a maximum of 50 credit points of credit towards the requirements. A maximum of 20 unspecified credit points for units of study not comparable to units listed in table 1 for each degree may be granted as part of the 50 credit point maximum credit transfer permitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Veterinary Science courses</td>
<td>Credit for up to a maximum of 25% of the requirements for a degree may be granted for studies completed no more than five years prior to admission for which an award was not made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Cross institutional study

(1) Provided the Associate Dean's permission has been obtained in advance, a student may be permitted to complete a unit of study offered by another institution and have that unit credited to the student's course requirements, provided that:

(a) the unit of study content is not taught in any corresponding unit of study at the University; or
(b) the student is unable, for good reason, to attend a corresponding unit of study at the University.

(2) Cross-institutional study is regarded as another form of credit.

(3) Unless otherwise stated in the course resolutions, cross-institutional study is not available to students enrolled in postgraduate programs.

### 8. International Study

(1) The Faculty encourages students to participate in international study, unless the resolutions for a particular course preclude this. Provided the Associate Dean's permission has been obtained a student may be permitted to count units completed overseas towards their undergraduate degree by participating in:

(a) the University of Sydney Exchange Program; or
(b) a Study Abroad program; or
(c) an International Placement

(2) For International Placements, Associate Dean approval must be given well in advance of travel for unit of study enrolment based on an agreed degree plan.

(3) Students applying for Study Abroad should refer to the Faculty of Science - Short Term Independent Undergraduate Study Abroad local provisions.

(4) Students in the Bachelor of Science in Agriculture can complete an international specialisation. To qualify for the award of international specialisation, a candidate must complete a minimum of 48 credit points in approved units of study for two semesters at an approved university. Once a student has applied for and been accepted for International Exchange, the student may then apply for the International Specialisation.

### 9. Attendance

(1) Unless otherwise stated in a separate local provision, students are expected to attend a minimum of 80% of timetabled activities for a unit of study, unless granted exemption by the Associate Dean. Students are expected to attend a minimum of 80% of timetabled activities for a unit of study, unless granted exemption by the Associate Dean. The Associate Dean may determine that a student has failed a unit of study because of inadequate attendance. Alternatively, the Associate Dean may allow additional assessment items where attendance is lower than 80%.

(2) For some units of study the minimum attendance requirement, as specified in the relevant table of units or the unit of study outline, may be greater than 80%.

(3) The Associate Dean may determine that a student has failed a unit of study because of inadequate attendance.

(4) The Associate Dean may allow additional assessment items where attendance is lower than the requirement as specified in 9(1) and 9(2).

### 10. Results

(1) The provisions of the Coursework Rule and the Coursework Policy apply to the award of grades in Science units of study.

(2) The determination of what warrants a DC grade after the published date for Discontinued not to count as failure is made at the discretion of the Associate Dean on a documented case-by-case basis. Discretion will not be exercised where:

(a) the request is made 12 months or more after the advertised date of result publication; or
(b) where the student has passed the unit of study.

### 11. Satisfactory Progress

In addition to meeting the provisions of the Coursework Rule and the Coursework Policy, students must also meet all progression requirements listed in specific course resolutions.

### 12. Re-assessment

- **Re-assessment is not permitted unless otherwise specified in the course resolutions.** Students enrolled in a postgraduate unit of study prescribed for Year 3, Year 4, Year 5 or Year 6 of candidature of the Bachelor of Veterinary Biology/Doctor of Veterinary Medicine, who fail one unit of study only within a semester may be offered the opportunity for re-assessment for the failed unit of study.
  
  (a) The scope of the re-assessment will encompass all topics and learning outcomes within the unit of study. The methods used for re-assessment may differ from those used in the original delivery of the unit.
  
  (b) Re-assessment will only be offered to eligible students on the dates prescribed in the year schedule, and it is the student’s responsibility to be available to attend at these times.
13. Award of the bachelor degree with honours

The following rules apply to the award of the bachelor degree with Honours unless otherwise stipulated in the relevant course resolutions.

(1) To qualify for admission to the bachelor degree with honours, an applicant must meet all of the following requirements:
   (a) have either:
      (i) qualified for the award of a relevant pass degree from the Faculty of Science; or
      (ii) be a pass graduate of the Faculty of Science; or
      (iii) be a pass graduate holding an equivalent qualification from another institution,
   (b) have completed a minimum of 24 credit points of senior units of study relevant to the intended honours course (or equivalent at another institution);
   (c) have achieved either:
      (i) a SCIWAM of at least 65 (or equivalent at another institution); or
      (ii) a credit average in 48 credit points in relevant intermediate and senior Science units of study as determined by the School concerned,
   (d) satisfy any additional criteria set by the Head of School concerned.

(2) General conditions of candidature include:
   (a) Students must complete the requirements for the honours course full-time over two consecutive semesters. If the School is satisfied that a student is unable to attempt the honours course on a full-time basis permission may be granted by the Associate Dean to undertake honours part-time.
   (b) An applicant who is qualified to enrol in two honours courses may either:
      (i) complete the honours courses in the two subject areas separately and in succession; or
      (ii) complete a joint honours course, equivalent to an honours course in a single subject area, in the two subject areas as agreed by the Associate Dean and both Schools. A joint honours course shall comprise such parts of the two honours courses as may be decided by the Associate Dean.
   (c) A student may not re-attempt an honours course.

(4) To qualify for the award of honours, a student must complete 48 credit points of honours undergraduate units of study, as described in the Science Honours Unit of Study Table.

(5) The grade of honours and the honours mark are determined by performance in only the units of study listed in the Science Honours Unit of Study Table.

(6) Honours is awarded in the following classes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mark Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class I</td>
<td>Mark &gt;= 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class II (Division 1)</td>
<td>75 &lt;= Mark &lt; 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class II (Division 2)</td>
<td>70 &lt;= Mark &lt; 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class III</td>
<td>65 &lt;= Mark &lt; 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours not awarded</td>
<td>Mark &lt; 65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. University Medal

A student who is awarded Honours Class 1 may be awarded a university medal. The medal is awarded at the discretion of the Faculty to the highest achieving students who, in the opinion of the Faculty, have an outstanding academic record, in accordance with the Coursework Rule.

15. Weighted Average Mark (WAM) and Science Weighted Average Mark (SCIWAM)

(1) The University has a formula for calculating a WAM, which is defined in the University Glossary. WAMs are used by the University as one indicator of academic performance.

(2) A SCIWAM is used by the Faculty of Science as one indicator of academic performance.

(a) A SCIWAM is calculated from the results of all intermediate and senior units of study with a weighting of two for intermediate units and three for senior units. Junior units are not included in the calculation.

(b) Discontinued - Fail (DF) grades will contribute to the SCIWAM. The mark used for units of study with a grade of DF is zero.

(c) Discontinued - Not to count as failure (DC) grades do not contribute to the SCIWAM.

(d) Pass/Fail units of study do not contribute to the SCIWAM, with the exception of Exchange units where a mark is available.

(3) In this Faculty:

(a) A junior unit of study is a 1000-level unit.

(b) An intermediate unit of study is a 2000-level unit.

(c) A senior unit of study is a 3000-level unit or above.

16. Talented Student Program

(1) The Talented Student Program (TSP) is a special program of study for students of exceptional merit who are enrolled in undergraduate degrees administered by the Faculty of Science or for the Science component of combined and double degrees who commenced prior to January 1 2018.

(2) Entry to the TSP is available for students enrolled in: the Bachelor of Science and its streams, the Bachelor of Medical Science, the Bachelor of Liberal Arts and Science, the Bachelor of Psychology, and the Bachelor of Science or Bachelor of Medical Science component of a combined or double degree.

(2) Entry to the TSP is by invitation from the Dean. Invitations are made each year, for that year. The following guidelines apply generally, although schools and departments may have additional (and more stringent) requirements for entry to the activities they offer in the program:

(a) To be considered for the program in their first year, students should have an ATAR (or equivalent) of 99.00 or higher.

(b) To be considered for entry into the Program in their second or third years, students not in the Program in the previous year should have AAMs of 85 or over in their previous year of study. Subsequent entry to TSP is available only to students who have been enrolled full-time in units of study totalling at least 48 credit points in the previous 12 months.

(4) Readmission to the Program in a subsequent year requires:

(a) AAM of 80 or above; and

(b) have completed a minimum of 24 credit points of senior units of study relevant to the intended honours course (or equivalent at another institution); or

(c) have achieved either:

(i) qualify for the award of a relevant pass degree from the Faculty of Science; or

(ii) be a pass graduate of the Faculty of Science; or

(iii) be a pass graduate holding an equivalent qualification from another institution,

(d) satisfy any additional criteria set by the Head of School concerned.

(2) General conditions of candidature include:

(a) Students must complete the requirements for the honours course full-time over two consecutive semesters. If the School is satisfied that a student is unable to attempt the honours course on a full-time basis permission may be granted by the Associate Dean to undertake honours part-time.

(b) An applicant who is qualified to enrol in two honours courses may either:

(i) complete the honours courses in the two subject areas separately and in succession; or

(ii) complete a joint honours course, equivalent to an honours course in a single subject area, in the two subject areas as agreed by the Associate Dean and both Schools. A joint honours course shall comprise such parts of the two honours courses as may be decided by the Associate Dean.

(c) A student may not re-attempt an honours course.

(4) To qualify for the award of honours, a student must complete 48 credit points of honours undergraduate units of study, as described in the Science Honours Unit of Study Table.

(5) The grade of honours and the honours mark are determined by performance in only the units of study listed in the Science Honours Unit of Study Table.

(6) Honours is awarded in the following classes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mark Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class I</td>
<td>Mark &gt;= 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class II (Division 1)</td>
<td>75 &lt;= Mark &lt; 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class II (Division 2)</td>
<td>70 &lt;= Mark &lt; 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class III</td>
<td>65 &lt;= Mark &lt; 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours not awarded</td>
<td>Mark &lt; 65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) completion of 42 credit points in the previous 12 months.
(5) At the discretion of the Associate Dean, these requirements may be varied on a year to year or individual basis.

Schedule 1: Allowable Undergraduate Course Transfers

(1) **Single Undergraduate Degrees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer From</th>
<th>Transfer To</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Agricultural Economics</td>
<td>Bachelor of Food and Agribusiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Agricultural Economics</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Environmental Systems</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Food and Agribusiness</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Resource Economics</td>
<td>Bachelor of Food and Agribusiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Agricultural Economics</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Agriculture</td>
<td>Faculty Approval Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Agriculture</td>
<td>Bachelor of Environmental Systems</td>
<td>Faculty Approval Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Agriculture</td>
<td>Bachelor of Food and Agribusiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Medical Science</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Psychology (Arts and Social Sciences)</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Psychology (Science)</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Psychology</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Veterinary)</td>
<td>Bachelor of Veterinary Science</td>
<td>Faculty Approval Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Veterinary Science</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Veterinary)</td>
<td>Completed 4 years of the Bachelor of Veterinary Science and obtained academic approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) **Combined Undergraduate Degrees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer From</th>
<th>Transfer To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) and Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts (Advanced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced Mathematics) and Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced Mathematics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Commerce and Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>Bachelor of Design in Architecture and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Economics and Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology/Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of International and Global Studies and Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>Bachelor of Political, Economic and Social Sciences and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced)</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) and Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) and Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>Bachelor of Commerce and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) and Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>Bachelor of Design in Architecture and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) and Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>Bachelor of Economics and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) and Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) and Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>Bachelor of International and Global Studies and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) and Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>Bachelor of Political, Economic and Social Sciences and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) and Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) and Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) and Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>Bachelor of Commerce and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) and Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>Bachelor of Design in Architecture and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) and Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>Bachelor of Economics and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) and Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) and Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>Bachelor of International and Global Studies and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced) and Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>Bachelor of Political, Economic and Social Sciences and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Schedule 2: Allowable Postgraduate Course Transfers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer From</th>
<th>Transfer To</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Environmental Science</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Environmental Science</td>
<td>Complete the requirements of the Graduate Certificate OR; accumulate a minimum of 18 cps in the Graduate Certificate within a maximum of two consecutive semesters with a WAM of at least 65.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Environmental Science</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Environmental Science</td>
<td>Complete the requirements of the Graduate Diploma OR; accumulate a minimum of 18 cps in the Graduate Diploma within a maximum of two consecutive semesters with a WAM of at least 65.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Environmental Science</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Environmental Science</td>
<td>Complete the requirements of the Graduate Diploma OR; accumulate a minimum of 18 cps in the Graduate Diploma within a maximum of two consecutive semesters with a WAM of at least 65.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Marine Science and Management</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Marine Science and Management</td>
<td>Complete the requirements of the Graduate Certificate OR; accumulate a minimum of 18 cps in the Graduate Certificate within a maximum of two consecutive semesters with a WAM of at least 65.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Marine Science and Management</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Marine Science and Management</td>
<td>Complete the requirements of the Graduate Diploma OR; accumulate a minimum of 18 cps in the Graduate Diploma within a maximum of two consecutive semesters with a WAM of at least 65.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Sustainability</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Sustainability</td>
<td>Complete the requirements of the Graduate Certificate OR; accumulate a minimum of 18 cps in the Graduate Certificate within a maximum of two consecutive semesters with a WAM of at least 65.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Sustainability</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Sustainability</td>
<td>Complete the requirements of the Graduate Certificate OR; accumulate a minimum of 18 cps in the Graduate Certificate within a maximum of two consecutive semesters with a WAM of at least 65.0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Resolutions of the Faculty of Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer From</th>
<th>Transfer To</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Sustainability</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Sustainability</td>
<td>Complete the requirements of the Graduate Diploma OR; accumulate a minimum of 18 cps in the Graduate Diploma within a maximum of two consecutive semesters with a WAM of at least 65.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Sustainability</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Medical Physics</td>
<td>Complete the requirements of the Graduate Diploma with a WAM of 65.0 or better and have Course Coordinator approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Medical Physics</td>
<td>Master of Medical Physics</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Diploma requirements and have Course Coordinator approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Medical Physics</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Medical Physics</td>
<td>Course Coordinator approval required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Science (History and Philosophy of Science)</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Science</td>
<td>Course Coordinator approval required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Animal Science</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Animal Science</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements, no WAM is specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Animal Science</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Animal Science</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements and have a research supervisor, no WAM is specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Animal Science</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Animal Science</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Animal Science</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Animal Science</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Animal Science</td>
<td>Master of Animal Science</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Animal Science</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Animal Science</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Animal Science</td>
<td>Master of Animal Science</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Animal Science</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Animal Science</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Animal Science</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Animal Science</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Animal Science</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Animal Science</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Animal Science</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Animal Science</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements, achieve a WAM of &gt;70%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements and achieve a WAM of &gt;70%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream and have a research supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer From</td>
<td>Transfer To</td>
<td>Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Veterinary Studies</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Veterinary Studies</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Studies</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream and achieve a WAM of ≥70%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer From</td>
<td>Transfer To</td>
<td>Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Veterinary Studies</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Studies</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Animal Science</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Veterinary Studies</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health Management</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Veterinary Public Health</td>
<td>Complete the Graduate Certificate requirements including units required for the stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Agriculture</td>
<td>Complete the degree requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Agriculture</td>
<td>Complete the degree requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>Complete the degree requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>Complete the degree requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>Complete the degree requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>Complete the degree requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>Complete the degree requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>Complete the degree requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board note the Educational Integrity Trend Report, Semester 1, 2017.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Educational Integrity Trend Report (Attachment 1) highlights the efforts of the University community to build upon the gains made following the introduction of the new policy and procedures related to assuring the academic integrity of coursework award courses in 2016.

In particular, a focus on educating students in academic honesty has continued to be a hallmark of the University’s approach. The Academic Honesty Education Module was extended to encompass a broader range of issues, and having been rebuilt in a more user-friendly platform was completed by a higher number of students (approx. 18,700 completions) in Semester 1, 2017, than in the same semester in 2016 (approx. 14,700 completions). Faculty Educational Integrity Coordinators and nominated academics also continued to pursue explicitly educational outcomes for those students reported for potential breaches of academic honesty, with over a quarter (approx. 400) of the reported incidents being resolved without a formal finding of plagiarism or academic dishonesty being made. In total, over 700 students completed a further development course as a result of being reported to faculty teams by unit of study teaching staff.

At the same time, there has been a reduction in the number of incidents reported across the semester, down from the 1,852 incidents reported in Semester 1, 2016, to 1,418 incidents reported in Semester 1, 2017. This has been more or less matched by a decline in the number of individual students being reported, which declined by a similar volume from 1,689 students in Semester 1 last year to 1,289 students this year.

A number of demographic trends identified in 2016 have also continued in 2017 despite this decline. As in 2016, the reported incidents overwhelmingly involved students in the first two years of candidature (86.9% of all incidents) and undertaking full time study (92.5% of all incidents). The number of reported incidents involving international students has also remained steady at around 50% of all incidents across the past three semesters relative to total international coursework enrolments (approx. 31.5% in Semester 1, 2017). In contrast, there was a notable shift in the proportion of incidents involving postgraduate students, down approximately 25% on 2016 levels, and a shift in the proportion of incidents involving male students, increasing by approximately 15% as compared to last year.

**COMMUNICATION**

The Educational Integrity Trend Report Semester 1, 2017, will be circulated to the University Executive Education Committee, the Academic Board, via the Academic Standards and Policy Committee, and faculties via Educational Integrity Coordinators. The report has also been provided for noting to the Undergraduate and Graduate Studies Committees of the Academic Board.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – Educational Integrity Trend Report, Semester 1, 2017
Educational Integrity Trend Report
Semester 1, 2017
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Abbreviations

AHEM  Academic Honesty Education Module
ARCH  Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning
ARTS  Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
BUSI  The University of Sydney Business School
CONS  Sydney Conservatorium of Music
DENT  Faculty of Dentistry
ENGI  Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies
HSCI  Faculty of Health Sciences
LAWS  The University of Sydney Law School
LMS   Learning Management System (or Blackboard)
LSRE  Language Strategies for Referring to Evidence (workshop)
MEDI  The University of Sydney Medical School
NURS  Sydney Nursing School
PHAR  Faculty of Pharmacy
QPSS  Quoting, Paraphrasing and Summarising Sources (online module)
QSP   Quoting, Summarising and Paraphrasing Evidence (workshop)
SCIE  Faculties of Science (incl. Agriculture and Environment, and Veterinary Science)
UEE   Using Evidence in Essays (workshop)
Education in academic honesty

The Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 and Academic Honesty Procedures 2016 require that all students be clearly informed about the University’s academic standards. Faculties and unit of study coordinators are also required to ensure that students are provided with discipline-specific education in academic writing and referencing conventions early in their first year of candidature. To ensure consistency of message and to supplement the work of faculties, the Office of Educational Integrity provides educational resources to all students on a University-wide basis in the form of the Academic Honesty Education Module and an academic honesty workshop program delivered by the University’s Learning Centre.

Academic Honesty Education Module

In accordance with the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015, all students commencing study under a new coursework award are required to complete the Academic Honesty Education Module (AHEM) within the first semester of their candidature. Faculties are also permitted to require all or some of their students to undertake the module. A new, expanded version of the AHEM was introduced ahead of the commencement of Semester 1, 2017. This version encompasses a wider range of issues associated with academic honesty and was built in the more user-friendly platform, Smart Sparrow. Students are required to correctly answer all questions, which is facilitated by the provision of immediate feedback should they answer anything incorrectly. The improvements made to the AHEM have led to a significant increase in the number of students (by approx. 4,000) who successfully completed the module in Semester 1, 2017, compared to the same period in 2016.

![Figure 1: AHEM completions since Semester 1, 2016](image)

Learning Centre Development Courses

In lieu of making a formal finding of academic impropriety, faculty Educational Integrity Coordinators and nominated academics are able to direct reported students to complete an approved development workshop. Three such workshops delivered by the Learning Centre were approved in 2016 for this purpose:
- Quoting, Summarising and Paraphrasing Evidence (QSP).
- Using Evidence in Essays (UEE).
- Language Strategies for Referring to Evidence (LSRE).

As an alternative to these workshops, students may complete an online development module adapted from the core QSP workshop: Quoting, Paraphrasing and Summarising Sources (QPSS). The online module was launched in late-2016, and has been made available on an ongoing basis to provide students with a flexible means by which to meet any further

---

1 See clause 16 of the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 and clause 8 of the Academic Honesty Procedures 2016. Both can be accessed via the [Policy Register](#).
development requirements within the allocated time. The academic honesty workshop program has been scaled back in Semester 2, 2017, as students overwhelmingly elected to complete the online module in Semester 1, although the availability of the face-to-face workshops is still greater than pre-2016 levels. The workshops also remain available to all students of the University.

**Figure 2:** Development course completions in Semester 1, 2017

---

**Trends in detection, reporting and outcomes**

**Detection and reporting**

In Semester 1, 2017, a total of 1,418 incidents reports were made across the University (see Table 1. Although this represents a decline on the incidents reported in each semester in 2016, this is almost equal to the historical average of 1,500 reported per annum by faculties to the Academic Board between 2010 and 2015. In addition to the improved reporting procedures and systems introduced in 2016, the mandated use of similarity detection software (SDS) for the submission of all text-based written assignments continues to be a significant factor in the increased rates of reporting witnessed over the past 18 months. Despite a decrease in the total number of incidents reported in relation to the use of SDS in Semester 2, 2016, over 85% of all incidents reported in Semester 1 this year involved the use of SDS (see Table 3).[2]

**Figure 3:** Proportion of incidents reported by use of similarity detection software since Semester 1, 2016

---

2 N.B. The School of Information Technologies employed the program MOSS (Measure of Software Similarity) to check work submitted by students enrolled in several of their large core programming units of study.
Figure 4 below shows that the timing and volume of reporting in Semester 1 broadly follows a pattern similar to that seen in 2016 insofar as the bulk of reporting occurs through the second half of the main Semester 1 teaching session. The noticeable difference in the volume of reporting at the end of the semester in 2016 relative to 2017 is in part attributable to the decline in incidents reported by the Examinations Office, with 86 (or 48%) fewer incidents reported this year. Regardless of the decline, the concentration of reporting through the latter stages of the semester — often the result of delayed reporting by teaching staff — meant that educational integrity teams in most faculties were again placed under considerable strain in managing high caseloads in a compressed period of time. Even so, average case duration has held steady at around 29 days per case between Semester 2, 2016, and Semester 1, 2017, which is a considerable improvement on the average of 38 days per case in Semester 1, 2016.

**Figure 4: Incidents reported by week in Semester 1, 2017**

![Graph showing incidents reported by week in Semester 1, 2017](image)

**Outcomes**

As of 25 August 2017, 137 of the 1,418 incidents reported in Semester 1 are yet to be formally resolved (see Table 1). Of those that have been resolved:

- 241 (or 17.0%) were resolved with an outcome of “no impropriety”
- 392 (27.6%) with an outcome of “development workshop completed”
- 242 (17.1%) with an outcome of “plagiarism”
- 396 (27.9%) with an outcome of “academic dishonesty” and
- Only 10 (0.71%) were referred to the Registrar on grounds of “potential academic misconduct.”

As shown in Figure 6 below, the number of reported incidents resulting in a finding of no impropriety have decreased by half (approx. 52%) over the past year (see Table 2). Although this may change as the outcomes of all reported incidents are finalised, the decline here may be indicative of the degree of institutional learning that has occurred over the past year in terms of what may reasonably be considered plagiarism or academic dishonesty. It is also likely to be the result of the improved education on academic honesty and writing conventions provided to students in units of study and the AHEM. There has also been an overall decline in the number of incidents with outcomes recorded as “development workshop completed,” plagiarism, and potential academic misconduct. As a proportion of the outcomes for all incidents, these three outcomes have remained relatively steady over the past three semesters.

---

3 N.B. There were no incidents reported by the Examinations Office resulting in a finding of “potential other misconduct” as was the case in each of the previous two semesters.
In contrast, findings of academic dishonesty increased as a proportion of all outcomes in the first semester of 2017 as compared to Semester 2, 2016. As was noted in the Educational Integrity Annual Report 2016, a very high number of incidents were reported in Semester 1 last year for two large computer programming courses, many of which resulted in a finding of academic dishonesty. Unfortunately, a very high number of incidents have been reported again for these units on the basis of similar issues, which appears to have contributed to the increase in findings of academic dishonesty relative to Semester 2, 2016.

**Figure 5:** Incidents reported by outcome in Semester 1, 2017

![Pie chart showing incidents reported by outcome](image)

- No impropriety (241)
- Development workshop completed (392)
- Plagiarism (242)
- Academic dishonesty (396)
- Potential academic misconduct (10)

**Figure 6:** Incidents reported by outcome since Semester 1, 2016

![Bar chart showing incidents reported by outcome](image)

Individual students and rates of recidivism

As in the previous two semesters, there were fewer students reported than there were incidents. In Semester 1, 2017, a total of 1,289 (or 2.4% of all coursework) students were reported to faculty Educational Integrity Coordinators and nominated academics. This is down from the 1,689 students reported in Semester 1 and 1,326 students reported in Semester 2 in 2016.

---

*See [https://intranet.sydney.edu.au/teaching-support/educational-integrity.html](https://intranet.sydney.edu.au/teaching-support/educational-integrity.html)*
Only a small proportion of students reported this semester (less than 10%) were involved in more than one incident, and most of these were related to incidents reported simultaneously. The number of students who have been reported in each of the past three semesters is also low, with only 169 (3.7%) of the 4,473 students reported since the beginning of Semester 1 last year being reported in two or more semesters. This suggests that the improved education, detection and reporting practices adopted across the University at the beginning of 2016 have had a measurable impact on the likelihood of students to engage in repeated breaches of the University’s academic honesty standards.

**Demographic trends**

A number of demographic trends that emerged in 2016 remained broadly consistent in Semester 1, 2017, although as with last year this varies from faculty to faculty. The greater number of incidents reported involved students in their first (63.6%) or second (23.3%) year of candidature (Table 5). At the same time, over 90% of the incidents reported involved students studying full time, which is again somewhat disproportionate to full time coursework enrolments of approximately 80% at the University-level (Table 6).

In contrast, there has been a moderate decline in the proportion of reported incidents involving postgraduate students, down from an annual average of 43.1% of all incidents reported in 2016 to 32.5% in Semester 1, 2017 (Table 4). There also appears to have been a proportional increase in the number of male students reported for potential academic impropriety, increasing from an annual average of 42.1% of all incidents reported in 2016 to 49.7% so far this year (Table 8).

The higher rate at which international students were reported in 2016 also appears to have continued this semester, with 49.4% of reported incidents involving international students as compared to international coursework enrolments of approximately 31.5% (Table 7). This trend appears to have persisted in each of the past three semesters, so the Office of Educational Integrity has undertaken to provide information for further analysis to the International Student Experience Taskforce being chaired by Professor Greg Whitwell, Dean of the University of Sydney Business School.

---

## Tables and additional figures

### Table 1: Incidents reported by faculty and outcome, Semester 1, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>No Impropriety</th>
<th>Development Workshop Completed</th>
<th>Plagiarism</th>
<th>Academic Dishonesty</th>
<th>Potential Misconduct (Academic)</th>
<th>Potential Misconduct (Other)</th>
<th>Outcome Pending</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSI</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGI</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSCI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDI</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHAR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIE</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>241</strong></td>
<td><strong>392</strong></td>
<td><strong>242</strong></td>
<td><strong>396</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>137</strong></td>
<td><strong>1418</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ratio</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.64%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.07%</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.93%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.71%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.66%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Incidents reported by semester and outcome, 2016 to 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>No Impropriety</th>
<th>Development Workshop Completed</th>
<th>Plagiarism</th>
<th>Academic Dishonesty</th>
<th>Potential Misconduct (Academic)</th>
<th>Potential Misconduct (Other)</th>
<th>Outcome Pending*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sem 1 2016</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem 2 2016</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1473*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem 1 2017</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
<td>27.64%</td>
<td>17.07%</td>
<td>27.93%</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>9.66%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Outcomes pending as at 25 August 2017
### Table 3: Incidents reported by use of similarity detection software

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Incidents</th>
<th>Used Incidents</th>
<th>Incident Ratio</th>
<th>Coursework</th>
<th>Examination</th>
<th>Incident Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSI</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGI</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSCI</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDI</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHAR</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIE</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 8: Incidents reported by use of similarity detection software
Table 4: Incidents reported by level of coursework qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Incidents</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Postgraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incidents</td>
<td>Incident Ratio</td>
<td>Enrolment Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSI</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGI</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSCI</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDI</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHAR</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIE</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: Incidents reported by level of coursework qualification
Table 5: Incidents reported by year of candidature (course block)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Incidents Reported</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSI</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGI</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSCI</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDI</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHAR</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIE</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10: Incidents reported by year of candidature (course block)
### Table 6: Incidents reported by attendance pattern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Incidents</th>
<th>Full-time Incidents</th>
<th>Part-time Incidents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incidents</td>
<td>Incident Ratio</td>
<td>Enrolment Ratio</td>
<td>Incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSI</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGI</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSCI</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDI</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHAR</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIE</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 11: Incidents reported by attendance pattern

[Diagram showing incidents reported by attendance pattern]
### Table 7: Incidents reported by enrolment type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Incidents</th>
<th>Domestic Incidents</th>
<th>Domestic Incident Ratio</th>
<th>International Incidents</th>
<th>International Incident Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSI</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGI</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSCI</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDI</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHAR</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIE</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1418</strong></td>
<td><strong>718</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>700</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 12: Incidents reported and enrolment type**

[Diagram showing the distribution of incidents by enrolment type across different faculties.]

- Domestic  - International
Table 8: Incidents reported by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Incidents</th>
<th>Female Incidents</th>
<th>Enrolment Ratio</th>
<th>Male Incidents</th>
<th>Enrolment Ratio</th>
<th>X Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSI</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGI</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSCI</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDI</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHAR</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIE</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13: Incidents reported by gender
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**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board note the attached report, Education Key Performance Indicators 2016 Performance and 2017 Targets.

**BACKGROUND**

In 2015, a set of three Education Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) focused on students' learning experiences was introduced at the University of Sydney. In 2017, three further KPIs have been added in response to the Strategy. These focus on student retention, graduate outcomes, and demand for the new undergraduate curriculum. They have been selected to support the University to move to a position of sector leadership in the educational experience in coming years.

The survey-related KPIs (KPI-E1 through to KPI-E3) provide a uniform approach for setting targets for improvement: targets are computed as the level that would deliver a specified annual percentage reduction in the difference between the baseline indicator level and a perfect score.

The graduate outcomes target (KPI-E4) has been set with the goal of being in the top decile of Australian universities by 2020.

The student retention KPI (KPI-E5) targets have been set with the goal of moving the University to a position of sector leadership by 2020, with an overall target of 90% student retention at the whole of university level by 2020.

Please note that this report presents KPI performance results and KPI targets for KPI-E1 to KPI-E5 only, as the definition for KPI-E6 (demand for the new undergraduate curriculum) is still in development.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The University met one out of three 2016 KPI targets (KPI-E2: SES) and was within 0.05 of the 2016 KPI targets for KPI-E1: USS and KPI-E3: SREQ.

Table 1 below presents an executive summary of 2016 performance on the Education KPIs, and University-level targets for 2017-2020. Faculty and school level targets are contained in the report.
Table 1. Education KPIs: 2016 performance and targets to 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI-E1</strong>: Student Satisfaction – Unit of Study Survey (USS)</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>No</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>71.67</td>
<td>73.08</td>
<td>73.76</td>
<td>Yes</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>3.96¹</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>No</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</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.28²</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>N/A</td>
<td>N/A³</td>
<td>=6th</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI-E5</strong>: Student Retention</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A⁴</td>
<td>87.97</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>88.50</td>
<td>89.03</td>
<td>89.56</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATTACHMENTS

**Attachment 1**: Education Key Performance Indicators 2016 Performance and 2017 Targets

¹ KPI-E3 is based on the Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ) in odd years, and on the Student Research Experience Questionnaire (SREQ) in even years. The SREQ is run every second year, so please note that 2016 KPI-E3 targets were based on 2014 performance.

² Although the PREQ is run every year, KPI-E3(b) targets are based on PREQ results two years prior, to be consistent with the method for setting KPI-E3(a): SREQ targets in even years.

³ The Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS) was run for the first time in 2016, therefore there were no KPI-E4 targets for 2016.

⁴ KPI-E5: Student Retention is a new indicator and targets are being set for the first time in 2017.
Education Key Performance Indicators

2016 Performance and 2017 Targets

Prepared by Quality and Analytics Group, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) Portfolio

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

In 2015, a set of three Education Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) focused on students’ learning experiences was introduced at the University of Sydney. In 2017, three further KPIs have been added in response to the Strategy. These focus on student retention, graduate outcomes, and demand for the new undergraduate curriculum. They have been selected to support the University to move to a position of sector leadership in the educational experience in coming years.

Targets for 2017-2020 have been set for performance on surveys of the student experience at the unit of study level (KPI-E1: USS), in our coursework degrees (KPI-E2: SES) and research higher degrees (KPI-E3: SREQ/PREQ). Targets are also set in terms of graduate outcomes in relation to the percentage of the graduating cohort in full-time employment or further study 4 months post-completion (KPI-E4: GOS); and student retention of undergraduate, postgraduate coursework and postgraduate research students (KPI-E5: Student Retention).

The survey-related KPIs (KPI-E1 through to KPI-E3) provide a uniform approach for setting targets for improvement: targets are computed as the level that would deliver a specified annual percentage reduction in the difference between the baseline indicator level and a perfect score. The graduate outcomes target (KPI-E4) has been set with the goal of being in the top decile of Australian universities by 2020. The retention KPI (KPI-E5) targets have been set with the goal of moving the University to a position of sector leadership by 2020, with an overall target of 90% student retention at the whole of university level by 2020. See Table 1a for details of KPI and target definitions. Please note that this report presents KPI performance results and KPI targets for KPI-E1 to KPI-E5 only, as the definition for KPI-E6 (demand for the new undergraduate curriculum) is still in development.

Section 2 presents our 2016 performance against the 2016 KPI targets for KPI-E1 to KPI-E3, which have been reported separately to the University Executive (UE) committees via the 2016 annual survey reports. Performance on KPI-E4 and KPI-E5 are reported here for the first time and therefore there were no KPI targets set for 2016. Section 3 presents KPI targets for 2017 at the university, faculty, school and department levels for KPI-E1 to KPI-E3, at the university level only for KPI-4 and at the university and faculty level for KPI-E5.

A PDF of this report and all individual QA Group survey reports are available at https://intranet.sydney.edu.au/teaching-support/quality-analytics/curriculum-quality/qa-reports.html. Please direct any queries regarding this report to qa.surveys@sydney.edu.au.
Table 1a. Education KPIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education KPIs</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>University target</th>
<th>Faculty target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPI-E1 (USS score)</td>
<td>Unit of Study Survey (USS) - mean score across all core items of the new Unit of Study Survey</td>
<td>Averaged over all units of study, an annual improvement of 7.5% of the difference between the perfect scale score of 5 and: - the prior year outcome (for 2017 target) - the prior year target (for 2018-2020 target)</td>
<td>Averaged over faculty-administered units of study, an annual improvement of 7.5% of the difference between the perfect scale score of 5 and: - the prior year outcome (for 2017 target) - the prior year target (for 2018-2020 targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI-E2 (SES scores)</td>
<td>Student Experience Survey (SES) (formerly known as University Experience Survey, UES) teaching and learning component - mean of scale scores for Skills Development (SD), Learner Engagement (LE) and Teaching Quality (TQ) on the annual national Student Experience Survey</td>
<td>Averaged over all course work students, an annual improvement of 5% of the difference between the perfect scale score of 100 and: - the prior year outcome (for 2017 target) - the prior year target (for 2018-2020 target)</td>
<td>Averaged over equivalent full-time study load (EFTSL) taught to survey respondents in faculty, an annual improvement of 5% of the difference between the perfect scale score of 100 and: - the prior year outcome (for 2017) - the prior year target (for 2018-2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI-E3 (SREQ/ PREQ scores)</td>
<td>Sydney Research Experience Questionnaire (SREQ), alternating with the national Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ) – mean of scale scores for Overall Satisfaction (OS), Intellectual Climate (IC), Skills (Sk), Supervision (Su).</td>
<td>Averaged over all HDR students/graduates, a biennial improvement of 9.75% of the difference between the perfect scale score of 5 and: - the outcome two years prior (for 2017 target) - the target two years prior (for 2018-2020 target)</td>
<td>Averaged over all HDR students/graduates allocated to the faculty, a biennial improvement of 9.75% of the difference between the perfect scale score of 5 and: - the outcome two years prior (for 2017 target) - the target two years prior (for 2018-2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI-E4: Employment/ Further Study – Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS)</td>
<td>Graduate Outcomes Study (GOS), percentage of graduating cohort in full-time employment or full-time further study 4 months post-completion.</td>
<td>To be in the top decile of Australian universities by 2020.</td>
<td>Ranking targets are not possible at the faculty-level due to differing faculty structures across institutions, however the aim is for each QILT study area to be in the top decile of Australian universities by 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI-E5: Student Retention</td>
<td>Student retention (%) = number of reenrolled students/number of students enrolled in the base year – number of students who graduated in the base year (expressed as a percentage)</td>
<td>To achieve a retention rate of 90% at the whole of university level by 2020.</td>
<td>To achieve a retention rate of 90% at the whole of university level by 2020, all faculties with a current retention score of below 90% have been set an annual improvement of 0.6% per year until 2020. Faculties with a current retention score at or above 90% are set a target to maintain or improve on their current performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 Executive Summary

Table 1b below presents an executive summary of 2016 performance on the Education KPIs, and targets for 2017-2020. The University met one out of three 2016 KPI targets (KPI-E2: SES) and was within 0.05 of the 2016 KPI targets for KPI-E1: USS and KPI-E3: SREQ.

Table 1b. Education KPIs: 2016 performance and targets to 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPI-E1: Student Satisfaction – Unit of Study Survey (USS)</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI-E2: Student Satisfaction – Student Experience Survey (SES)</td>
<td>71.67</td>
<td>73.08</td>
<td>73.76</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75.07</td>
<td>76.32</td>
<td>77.50</td>
<td>78.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI-E3(a): HDR Experience – Sydney Research Experience Questionnaire (SREQ)</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI-E3(b): HDR Experience – Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ)</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI-E4: Employment/Further Study – Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>=6th</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI-E5: Student Retention</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>87.97</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>88.50</td>
<td>89.03</td>
<td>89.56</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 KPI-E3 is based on the Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ) in odd years, and on the Student Research Experience Questionnaire (SREQ) in even years. The SREQ is run every second year, so please note that 2016 KPI-E3 targets were based on 2014 performance.

2 Although the PREQ is run every year, KPI-E3(b) targets are based on PREQ results two years prior, to be consistent with the method for setting KPI-E3(a): SREQ targets in even years.

3 The Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS) was run for the first time in 2016, therefore there were no KPI-E4 targets for 2016.

4 KPI-E5: Student Retention is a new indicator and targets are being set for the first time in 2017.
## 2. EDUCATION KPI PERFORMANCE 2016

Section 2 presents 2016 Education KPI performance against the 2016 targets (which used 2015 survey results as a baseline, with the exception of the biannual SREQ, which used 2014 results).

### 2.1 KPI-E1: Unit of Study Survey (USS) – 2016 KPI Performance

Table 2a. USS 2016 KPI performance on 1-5 scale (Mean of core items 1-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty / School / Department</th>
<th>2015 KPI Performance</th>
<th>2016 KPI Target</th>
<th>2016 KPI Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1,986</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>18,448</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2,177</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages and Cultures</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3,715</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic and Islamic Studies</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Studies</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buddhist Studies</strong></td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Studies Program</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Studies</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Studies</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanic Studies</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew, Biblical and Jewish Studies</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Indonesian Studies</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*International and Comparative</td>
<td>4.11*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Studies</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Studies</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Studies</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Greek Studies</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish and Latin American Studies</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages &amp; Cultures (not allocated)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature, Arts and Media</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4,576</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History and Theory</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Celtic Studies Program</td>
<td>4.34*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media and Communications</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Studies</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Studies</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in Religion</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Hub Unit</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued over page
Table 2a. USS 2016 KPI performance on 1-5 scale (Mean of core items 1-6) (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty / School / Department</th>
<th>2015 KPI Mean</th>
<th>2015 KPI N</th>
<th>2016 KPI Target Mean</th>
<th>2016 KPI Performance Mean</th>
<th>2016 KPI Performance N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosopherial and Historical Inquiry</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3,272</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics and Ancient History</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Political Sciences</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4,195</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and International Relations</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Graduate School of Government</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.80*</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Security Studies</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace and Conflict Studies</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Economy</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology and Social Policy</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Studies Centre</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences (not allocated)</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business School</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,579</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.10</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,851</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>2,615</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Analytics</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Information Systems</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Law</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1,686</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>2,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1,819</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Education Office</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Logistics Studies</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Organisational Studies</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dentistry</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.66</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,057</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.76</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.83</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,042</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and Social Work</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,334</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,162</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering and Info. Technologies</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.92</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,247</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,578</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace, Mechanical &amp; Mechatronic</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2,484</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical and Biomolecular</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3,429</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>5,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and Information Engineering</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>2,121</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technologies</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3,559</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>5,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and IT (not allocated)</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2a. USS 2016 KPI performance on 1-5 scale (Mean of core items 1-6) (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty / School / Department</th>
<th>2015 KPI Performance</th>
<th>2016 KPI Target</th>
<th>2016 KPI Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>8,126</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural and Social Sciences</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Developmental Disability</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise and Sport Science</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Radiation Sciences</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapy</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Pathology</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences (not allocated)</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3,425</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>6,138</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Sciences</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>2,911</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG Course Work Disciplines</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4,269</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>12,486</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geosciences</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1,557</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Statistics</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3,970</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>2,647</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Philosophy of Science</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life and Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science (not allocated)</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>102,791</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Surveys with less than 5 responses or less than 20% response rate excluded. Schools and departments reflect organisational hierarchy current at 21 March 2016, when the KPIs were set. Blank KPIs (“-“) due to changes in organisational hierarchy.

* Figures for faculties/schools/departments with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.

** Figures for faculties/schools/departments with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
### 2.2 KPI-E2: Student Experience Survey (SES) – 2016 KPI Performance

The 2016 KPI-E2 baselines and targets (calculated from 2015 SES results) presented in Section 2.2 include both undergraduate and postgraduate coursework students. This is the first year that KPI-E2 has included postgraduate students, as prior to 2015, the SES surveyed undergraduates students only.

#### Table 2b. SES 2016 KPI performance on 0-100 satisfaction scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty / School / Department</th>
<th>2015 KPI Performance</th>
<th>2016 KPI Target</th>
<th>2016 KPI Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%  N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%  N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>80.66 63</td>
<td>81.63</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>74.00 273</td>
<td>75.30</td>
<td>74.27 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>71.64 1,560</td>
<td>73.06</td>
<td>72.72 2,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>65.01 287</td>
<td>66.76</td>
<td>67.42 407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages and Cultures</td>
<td>71.72 233</td>
<td>73.13</td>
<td>70.56 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Arabic and Islamic Studies</td>
<td>73.04* 7</td>
<td>74.39*</td>
<td>63.70 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Asian Studies</td>
<td>72.00 26</td>
<td>73.40</td>
<td>69.89* 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Studies</td>
<td>62.81 41</td>
<td>64.67</td>
<td>70.26 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*European Studies Program</td>
<td>79.71* 6</td>
<td>80.73*</td>
<td>72.96* 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Studies</td>
<td>73.07 38</td>
<td>74.41</td>
<td>74.38 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Germanic Studies</td>
<td>76.75* 16</td>
<td>77.92*</td>
<td>65.89 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hebrew, Biblical and Jewish Studies</td>
<td>76.29* 11</td>
<td>77.48*</td>
<td>79.78* 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Indonesian Studies</td>
<td>92.46* 5</td>
<td>92.83*</td>
<td>76.88* 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Italian Studies</td>
<td>76.77* 12</td>
<td>77.94</td>
<td>85.77* 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Studies</td>
<td>67.66 30</td>
<td>69.28</td>
<td>65.44 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Korean Studies</td>
<td>66.35* 11</td>
<td>68.03*</td>
<td>67.65* 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish and Latin American Studies</td>
<td>77.45 22</td>
<td>78.58</td>
<td>68.25 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature, Arts and Media</td>
<td>74.36 322</td>
<td>75.64</td>
<td>73.31 447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History and Theory</td>
<td>72.76 48</td>
<td>74.12</td>
<td>74.62 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>73.42 105</td>
<td>74.75</td>
<td>73.76 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Linguistics</td>
<td>72.85 26</td>
<td>74.21</td>
<td>74.69 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media and Communications</td>
<td>78.08 71</td>
<td>79.17</td>
<td>72.86 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Performance Studies</td>
<td>77.05* 14</td>
<td>78.20*</td>
<td>77.16* 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Studies in Religion</td>
<td>83.74* 10</td>
<td>84.55*</td>
<td>77.95* 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Museum Studies Program</td>
<td>73.65* 11</td>
<td>74.97*</td>
<td>81.72* 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Hub Unit</td>
<td>67.82 32</td>
<td>69.43</td>
<td>66.51 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*US Studies Centre</td>
<td>78.01* 17</td>
<td>79.11*</td>
<td>79.13 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Arts and Social Sciences Academic Operations</td>
<td>74.15* 15</td>
<td>75.44*</td>
<td>75.51 65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2b. SES 2016 KPI performance on 0-100 satisfaction scale (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty / School / Department</th>
<th>2015 KPI Performance</th>
<th>2016 KPI Target</th>
<th>2016 KPI Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy and Historical Inquiry</td>
<td>74.30 305</td>
<td>75.58</td>
<td>75.58 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>77.67 36</td>
<td>78.79</td>
<td>79.75 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics and Ancient History</td>
<td>78.05 53</td>
<td>79.15</td>
<td>80.93 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>66.81 53</td>
<td>68.47</td>
<td>70.05 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>76.52 90</td>
<td>77.70</td>
<td>76.78 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>72.61 73</td>
<td>73.98</td>
<td>73.20 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Political Sciences</td>
<td>73.08 380</td>
<td>73.08</td>
<td>75.28 493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Peace and Conflict Studies</td>
<td>74.18* 6</td>
<td>75.47*</td>
<td>81.53* 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>71.66 47</td>
<td>73.07</td>
<td>75.83 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and International Relations</td>
<td>72.36 133</td>
<td>73.74</td>
<td>77.05 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Economy</td>
<td>75.71 60</td>
<td>76.93</td>
<td>79.01 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology and Social Policy</td>
<td>68.19 124</td>
<td>69.78</td>
<td>69.81 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>63.55 1,297</td>
<td>65.37</td>
<td>70.13 2,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>60.89 215</td>
<td>62.85</td>
<td>68.38 321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>60.71 278</td>
<td>62.67</td>
<td>66.68 403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Analytics</td>
<td>58.97 85</td>
<td>61.02</td>
<td>67.80 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Information Systems</td>
<td>64.37 62</td>
<td>66.15</td>
<td>70.51 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Law</td>
<td>60.97 118</td>
<td>62.92</td>
<td>67.30 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>56.57 209</td>
<td>58.74</td>
<td>67.83 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>71.12 74</td>
<td>72.56</td>
<td>76.81 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>71.44 95</td>
<td>72.87</td>
<td>70.41 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Organisational Studies</td>
<td>69.02 71</td>
<td>70.57</td>
<td>74.78 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Logistics Studies</td>
<td>70.39 31</td>
<td>71.87</td>
<td>70.39 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Education Office</td>
<td>91.03 53</td>
<td>91.48</td>
<td>91.86 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Business Faculty Units</td>
<td>89.10* 7</td>
<td>89.65*</td>
<td>80.66 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>66.59 160</td>
<td>68.26</td>
<td>68.54 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>76.58 451</td>
<td>77.76</td>
<td>76.67 498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>69.08 594</td>
<td>70.62</td>
<td>74.00 1,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace, Mechanical and Mechatronic Engineering</td>
<td>70.35 154</td>
<td>71.83</td>
<td>74.25 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering</td>
<td>65.98 58</td>
<td>67.68</td>
<td>75.42 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>70.33 149</td>
<td>71.82</td>
<td>73.68 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and Information Engineering</td>
<td>68.48 85</td>
<td>70.06</td>
<td>74.57 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technologies</td>
<td>68.05 146</td>
<td>69.64</td>
<td>73.31 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>74.89 729</td>
<td>76.15</td>
<td>75.79 871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural and Social Sciences</td>
<td>72.36 35</td>
<td>73.74</td>
<td>75.06 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise and Sport Science</td>
<td>77.64 93</td>
<td>78.76</td>
<td>78.00 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Radiation Sciences</td>
<td>67.75 91</td>
<td>69.36</td>
<td>68.37 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>75.11 108</td>
<td>76.36</td>
<td>75.35 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapy</td>
<td>73.76 137</td>
<td>75.07</td>
<td>81.14 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Counselling</td>
<td>67.04 36</td>
<td>68.69</td>
<td>68.54 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Pathology</td>
<td>82.88 102</td>
<td>83.73</td>
<td>73.03 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Academic Operations</td>
<td>75.69 125</td>
<td>76.90</td>
<td>77.50 160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty / School / Department</th>
<th>2015 KPI Performance</th>
<th>2016 KPI Target</th>
<th>2016 KPI Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>63.44</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>65.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>73.98</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>75.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Sciences</td>
<td>74.61</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>75.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy and Histology</td>
<td>76.25</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Science</td>
<td>72.64</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>74.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathology</td>
<td>70.45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacology</td>
<td>78.39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>79.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>73.76</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>75.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG Course Work Disciplines</td>
<td>65.97</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Clinical School</td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>78.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Children’s Hospital at Westmead Clinical School</td>
<td>76.31*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>77.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Clinical School</td>
<td>73.44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>74.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmead Clinical School</td>
<td>75.28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>76.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord Clinical School</td>
<td>75.29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>76.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepean Clinical School</td>
<td>75.28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sydney Adventist Hospital Clinical School</td>
<td>75.29*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>79.92</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>80.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>76.96</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>78.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>72.74</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>74.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geosciences School</td>
<td>71.86</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life and Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>71.10</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>72.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Statistics</td>
<td>69.43</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>70.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>74.34</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>75.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>71.89</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>73.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Science Faculty Units</td>
<td>83.84*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84.65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>72.39</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>73.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>77.77</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>78.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>79.96</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>80.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY</td>
<td>71.67</td>
<td>8,306</td>
<td>73.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Schools and departments reflect organisational hierarchy current at December 2016.

^ 2016 Agriculture and Veterinary Science students are included in Science results following transition to School of Life and Environmental Sciences.

* Figures for faculties/schools/departments with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.

** Figures for faculties/schools/departments with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
2.3 KPI-E3: Student Research Experience Questionnaire – 2016 KPI Performance

KPI-E3 is based on the Student Research Experience Questionnaire (SREQ) in even years, and the Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ) in odd years.

Table 2c. SREQ 2016 KPI performance on 1-5 scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty / School / Department</th>
<th>2014 KPI Performance</th>
<th>2016 KPI Target</th>
<th>2016 KPI Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Economics</td>
<td>3.68*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages and Cultures</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Chinese Studies</td>
<td>4.22*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hebrew, Biblical and Jewish Studies</td>
<td>3.89*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Italian Studies</td>
<td>3.59*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.73*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Spanish and Latin American Studies</td>
<td>3.70*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.82*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature, Arts and Media</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Art History and Theory</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Linguistics</td>
<td>3.99*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Media and Communications</td>
<td>3.19*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Performance Studies</td>
<td>4.23*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Studies in Religion</td>
<td>3.95*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical and Historical Inquiry</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Archaeology</td>
<td>3.51*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics and Ancient History</td>
<td>4.22*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Philosophy</td>
<td>3.73*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Political Sciences</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Anthropology</td>
<td>3.84*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.96*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government &amp; International Relations</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Political Economy</td>
<td>3.73*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.86*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology and Social Policy</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Accounting</td>
<td>3.63*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.77*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Business Information Systems</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Finance</td>
<td>4.53*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.58*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*International Business</td>
<td>3.83*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.94*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Marketing</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Work and Organisational Studies</td>
<td>4.20*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.28*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 2c. SREQ 2016 KPI performance on 1-5 scale (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty / School / Department</th>
<th>2014 KPI Performance</th>
<th>2016 KPI Target</th>
<th>2016 KPI Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dentistry</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Info. Technologies</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace, Mechanical and Mechatronic</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and Information Engineering</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technologies</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural and Social Sciences</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise and Sport Science</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Medical Radiation Sciences</td>
<td>4.05*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>3.72*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapy</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Speech Pathology</td>
<td>4.00*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences (not allocated)</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Sciences</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geosciences</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mathematics and Statistics</td>
<td>4.15*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*History and Philosophy of Science</td>
<td>3.64*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.77*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Schools and departments reflect organisational hierarchy current at 31 December 2016.

* Figures for faculties/schools/departments with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.

** Figures for faculties/schools/departments with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
2.4 KPI-E4: Graduate Outcomes Survey – 2016 KPI Performance

The target for KPI-E4 Employment/Further Study is to be in the top decile of Australian universities by 2020. Based on data from the inaugural Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS) in 2016, the University of Sydney is currently equal 6th among the 39 Universities Australia (UA) institutions, with 73.55% of our 2015 graduates in full-time employment or further study (compared to the UA average of 69.3%).

While benchmark rankings are not possible at the faculty-level due to differing faculty structures across institutions, the Quality Indicators of Learning and Teaching (QILT) study area categories can give an indication as to where faculties and schools sit relative to other UA institutions. A summary of where Sydney’s employment/further study rates currently rank for each of the QILT study area categories is presented in Table 2d below. Note that all KPI-E4 figures include all graduates (undergraduates, coursework postgraduates and research postgraduates).

Table 2d. Graduate Outcomes Survey 2016 KPI performance by study area (% in full-time employment or further study)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study area</th>
<th>2016 Performance</th>
<th>UA ranking</th>
<th>UA average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science and mathematics</td>
<td>74.03</td>
<td>9 of 39</td>
<td>70.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing and information systems</td>
<td>78.30</td>
<td>13 of 38</td>
<td>71.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>76.42</td>
<td>20 of 35</td>
<td>76.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; built environment</td>
<td>77.92</td>
<td>12 of 30</td>
<td>77.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; environment studies</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>11 of 34</td>
<td>63.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services and support</td>
<td>70.37</td>
<td>16 of 39</td>
<td>68.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>83.39</td>
<td>20 of 39</td>
<td>88.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>83.87</td>
<td>2 of 34</td>
<td>60.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>88.66</td>
<td>12 of 19</td>
<td>90.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>9 of 12</td>
<td>67.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary science</td>
<td>73.26</td>
<td>9 of 9</td>
<td>84.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>79.71</td>
<td>10 of 23</td>
<td>77.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education</td>
<td>70.36</td>
<td>14 of 39</td>
<td>66.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and management</td>
<td>81.08</td>
<td>7 of 39</td>
<td>76.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, culture &amp; social sciences</td>
<td>66.53</td>
<td>10 of 39</td>
<td>63.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>65.28</td>
<td>12 of 35</td>
<td>59.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>63.92</td>
<td>22 of 38</td>
<td>64.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and paralegal studies</td>
<td>82.47</td>
<td>5 of 39</td>
<td>75.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative arts</td>
<td>47.43</td>
<td>29 of 36</td>
<td>54.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>59.02</td>
<td>17 of 38</td>
<td>59.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY</strong></td>
<td><strong>73.55</strong></td>
<td>=6 of 39</td>
<td><strong>69.30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 KPI-E5: Student Retention – 2016 KPI Performance

KPI-E5 is based on annual student retention figures. This is the first time we are reporting student retention KPI performance and therefore there were no KPI targets set for 2016. Please note that the 2016 KPI student retention performance data shown in Table 2e are based on the number of students from 2015 who reenrolled in 2016. This is why these student retention figures are based on the 2015 organisational hierarchy.

Table 2e. Student retention 2016 KPI performance (% students retained)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>2016 Performance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>84.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>86.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>84.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>92.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>96.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>88.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>89.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>90.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>83.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>85.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>88.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>85.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>86.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>84.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>87.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>92.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY</td>
<td>87.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Faculties reflect organisational hierarchy current at 31 December 2015.

Student retention (%) = number of reenrolled students/(number of students enrolled in the base year – number of students who graduated in the base year) (expressed as a percentage).
3. EDUCATION KPI TARGETS 2017

Section 3 presents Education KPI targets for 2017 at the faculty, school and department level. Please note that although 2017 targets are calculated using a baseline of 2016 survey results (with the exception of the alternating KPI-E3 which is based on 2015 PREQ results), they are applied to reflect the University’s organisational hierarchy current at 31 March 2017 (upon which 2017 performance will be measured).

3.1 KPI-E1: Unit of Study Survey (USS) – 2017 KPI Targets

Table 3a. USS 2017 KPI targets on 1-5 scale (Mean of core items 1-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty / School / Department</th>
<th>2016 KPI Performance</th>
<th>2017 KPI Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>2,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural and Design Science</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Lab</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban and Regional Planning and Policy</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>29,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>6,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Academic Units</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages and Cultures</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic Language &amp; Cultures</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Studies</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Studies</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Studies</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French and Francophone Studies</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanic Studies</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew, Biblical and Jewish Studies</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Indian Subcontinental Studies</td>
<td>4.67*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Indonesian Studies</td>
<td>4.29*</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*International and Comparative Literary Studies</td>
<td>3.18*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Studies</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Studies</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Studies</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Greek &amp; Byzantine Studies</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish and Latin American Studies</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages and Cultures Administration</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3a. USS 2017 KPI targets on 1-5 scale (Mean of core items 1-6) (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty / School / Department</th>
<th>2016 KPI Performance</th>
<th>2017 KPI Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature, Arts and Media</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>6,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History and Film Studies</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Celtic Studies Program</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media and Communications</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Studies Program</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Studies</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, Art History, Film &amp; Media</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in Religion</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Hub Unit</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical and Historical Inquiry</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics and Ancient History</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Political Sciences</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and International Relations</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Graduate School of Government</td>
<td>4.80*</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Security Studies</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace and Conflict Studies</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Economy</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology and Social Policy</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Global Mobility</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Studies Centre</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences (not allocated)</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Analytics</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>5,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Information Systems</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Law</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>2,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Transport and Logistics Studies</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Education</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Organisational Studies</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School Faculty units</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dentistry</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.83</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,042</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 3a. USS 2017 KPI targets on 1-5 scale (Mean of core items 1-6) (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty / School / Department</th>
<th>2016 KPI Performance</th>
<th>2017 KPI Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering and Information Technologies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace, Mechanical and Mechatronic</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical and Biomolecular</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>5,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and Information Engineering</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technologies</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>5,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng. and Info. Technologies Academic Operations</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural and Social Sciences in Health</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Developmental Disability</td>
<td>4.01*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise and Sport Science</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Radiation Sciences</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapy</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Counselling</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Pathology</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Academic Operations</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>2,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medicine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Values, Ethics and the Law in Medicine</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Sciences</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy &amp; Histology</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Science</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathology</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacology</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG Course Work Disciplines</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Anaesthesia</td>
<td>4.11*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Critical Care</td>
<td>3.53*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetic Medicine</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infectious Diseases &amp; Immunology</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Metabolic Health</td>
<td>4.25*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Health</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Surgery</td>
<td>4.42*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Clinical School</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Children’s Hospital at Westmead Clinical School</td>
<td>3.76*</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Trials Centre</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3a. USS 2017 KPI targets on 1-5 scale (Mean of core items 1-6) (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty / School / Department</th>
<th>2016 KPI Performance</th>
<th>2017 KPI Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Clinical School</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Northern Clinical School Office</td>
<td>3.71*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain Management Research Institute</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Academic Operations</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nursing</strong></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pharmacy</strong></td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science</strong></td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>13,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geosciences</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life and Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Statistics</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>2,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Philosophy of Science</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science (not allocated)</strong></td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</strong></td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>2,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompaniment</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Music</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition &amp; Music Technology</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Performance</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicology</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percussion</td>
<td>4.36*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Studies</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strings</td>
<td>4.48*</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal &amp; Opera Studies</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodwind</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCM Academic Operations</strong></td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY</strong></td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>121,707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. N = Number of survey responses. Surveys with less than 5 responses or less than 20% response rate excluded. Schools and departments reflect organisational hierarchy current at 31 March 2017.

* Figures based on less than 20 responses and therefore should be interpreted with caution.

** Figures based on less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
3.2 KPI-E2: Student Experience Survey (SES) – 2017 KPI Targets

Please note that from 2015, the SES surveys both undergraduates and postgraduate coursework students, so the 2016 performance and 2017 targets below include postgraduate coursework students.

Table 3b. SES 2017 KPI targets (undergraduate and postgraduate coursework) on 0-100 satisfaction scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty / School / Department</th>
<th>2016 KPI Performance</th>
<th>2017 KPI Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>74.27</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural and Design Science</td>
<td>73.47</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>73.10</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Lab</td>
<td>78.04</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban and Regional Planning and Policy</td>
<td>74.49</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>2,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>67.42</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>76.67</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>76.15</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Indigenous Academic Units</td>
<td>66.67*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>83.24</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages and Cultures</td>
<td>70.56</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Arabic Language &amp; Cultures</td>
<td>69.89*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Studies</td>
<td>63.70</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Studies</td>
<td>70.26</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*European Studies</td>
<td>72.96*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French and Francophone Studies</td>
<td>74.38</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanic Studies</td>
<td>65.89</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hebrew, Biblical and Jewish Studies</td>
<td>79.78*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Indonesian Studies</td>
<td>76.88*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Italian Studies</td>
<td>85.77*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Studies</td>
<td>65.44</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Korean Studies</td>
<td>67.65*</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish and Latin American Studies</td>
<td>68.25</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3b. SES 2017 KPI targets (undergraduate and postgraduate coursework) on 0-100 satisfaction scale (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty / School / Department</th>
<th>2016 KPI Performance</th>
<th>2017 KPI Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature, Arts and Media</td>
<td>75.69</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History and Film Studies</td>
<td>74.62</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>73.76</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>74.69</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media and Communications</td>
<td>72.86</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Museum Studies Program</td>
<td>81.72*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Performance Studies</td>
<td>77.16*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Studies in Religion</td>
<td>77.95*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>83.64</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Hub Unit</td>
<td>66.51</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical and Historical Inquiry</td>
<td>75.69</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>79.75</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics and Ancient History</td>
<td>80.93</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>70.05</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>76.78</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>73.20</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Political Sciences</td>
<td>75.28</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>75.83</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and International Relations</td>
<td>77.05</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Peace and Conflict Studies</td>
<td>80.90*</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Economy</td>
<td>79.01</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology and Social Policy</td>
<td>69.81</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Studies Centre</td>
<td>79.13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences Centre</td>
<td>75.51</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,034</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>66.68</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Analytics</td>
<td>67.80</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>68.38</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Information Systems</td>
<td>70.51</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Law</td>
<td>67.30</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>67.83</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Transport and Logistics Studies</td>
<td>70.39</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>76.81</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Education</td>
<td>91.86</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>70.41</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Organisational Studies</td>
<td>74.78</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School Faculty units</td>
<td>80.66</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dentistry</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.54</strong></td>
<td><strong>149</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3b. SES 2017 KPI targets (undergraduate and postgraduate coursework) on 0-100 satisfaction scale (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty / School / Department</th>
<th>2016 KPI Performance</th>
<th>2017 KPI Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>1,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace, Mechanical and Mechatronic</td>
<td>74.25</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical and Biomolecular</td>
<td>75.42</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>73.68</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and Information Engineering</td>
<td>74.57</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technologies</td>
<td>73.31</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Eng. and Info. Technologies Faculty Units</td>
<td>72.87*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>75.79</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural and Social Sciences in Health</td>
<td>75.06</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise and Sport Science</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Radiation Sciences</td>
<td>68.37</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>75.35</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapy</td>
<td>81.14</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Counselling</td>
<td>68.54</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Pathology</td>
<td>73.03</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Academic Operations</td>
<td>77.50</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>67.26</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>75.18</td>
<td>1,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>70.25</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Values, Ethics and the Law in Medicine</td>
<td>70.24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>70.22</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Sciences</td>
<td>78.89</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy &amp; Histology</td>
<td>78.28</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Science</td>
<td>77.68</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathology</td>
<td>80.49</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacology</td>
<td>80.13</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>81.20</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG Course Work Disciplines</td>
<td>65.84</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Critical Care</td>
<td>43.58*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Genetic Medicine</td>
<td>63.70*</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infectious Diseases &amp; Immunology</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
<td>64.03</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sexual Health</td>
<td>74.00*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Surgery</td>
<td>50.08*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Clinical School</td>
<td>80.37</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Hospital at Westmead Clinical School</td>
<td>70.38</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmead Clinical School</td>
<td>76.73</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepean Clinical School</td>
<td>76.73</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Adventist Hospital Clinical School</td>
<td>76.74</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Clinical School</td>
<td>75.84</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Clinical School Office</td>
<td>76.66</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Pain Management Research Institute</td>
<td>70.47*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3b. SES 2017 KPI targets (undergraduate and postgraduate coursework) on 0-100 satisfaction scale (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty / School / Department</th>
<th>2016 KPI Performance</th>
<th>2017 KPI Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>80.66</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>73.99</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>74.85</td>
<td>1,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geosciences</td>
<td>76.68</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>74.05</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life and Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>77.44</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Statistics</td>
<td>71.28</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>76.44</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>73.42</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Philosophy of Science</td>
<td>70.93</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Science Faculty Units</td>
<td>85.59*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>80.28</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Accompaniment Studies</td>
<td>66.22*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Music</td>
<td>78.49</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition &amp; Music Technology</td>
<td>85.88</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Conducting</td>
<td>83.19*</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Historical Performance</td>
<td>78.00*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Jazz</td>
<td>75.05</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>88.34</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicology</td>
<td>80.84</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Performance Studies</td>
<td>68.85*</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Piano</td>
<td>68.40*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Strings</td>
<td>85.90*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Vocal &amp; Opera Studies</td>
<td>85.10*</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Woodwind</td>
<td>78.01*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY</strong></td>
<td>73.76</td>
<td>11,179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. N = Number of survey responses. Surveys with less than 5 responses or less than 20% response rate excluded. Schools and departments reflect organisational hierarchy current at 31 March 2017.
* Figures based on less than 20 responses and therefore should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures based on less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
3.3 KPI-E3: Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire – 2017 KPI Targets

KPI-E3 is based on the Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ) in odd years, and on the biennial Student Research Experience Questionnaire (SREQ) in even years. Although the PREQ is run every year, KPI-E3 targets are based on PREQ results two years prior, to be consistent with the method for setting SREQ targets in even years.

Table 3c. PREQ 2017 KPI targets on 1-5 scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty / School / Department</th>
<th>2015 KPI Performance</th>
<th>2017 KPI Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>4.38*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>4.18*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Education and Social Work</td>
<td>4.16*</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature, Arts and Media</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Art History and Film Studies</td>
<td>4.18*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*English</td>
<td>4.26*</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Philosophical and Historical Inquiry</td>
<td>4.32*</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>4.18*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Social and Political Sciences</td>
<td>4.01*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Business School</td>
<td>4.10*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dentistry</td>
<td>3.74*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Aerospace, Mechanical and Mechatronic</td>
<td>4.42*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering</td>
<td>4.62*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Electrical and Information Engineering</td>
<td>4.06*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Information Technologies</td>
<td>3.97*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Health Sciences</td>
<td>4.24*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***Law</td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Sciences</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Pathology</td>
<td>4.29*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Public Health</td>
<td>4.58*</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Postgraduate Coursework Disciplines</td>
<td>4.52*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Medical Research Institutes</td>
<td>4.70*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Children’s Hospital at Westmead Clinical School</td>
<td>4.47*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Northern Clinical School (Kolling Institute)</td>
<td>4.23*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Medical School Academic Operations</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3c. PREQ 2017 KPI targets on 1-5 scale (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty / School / Department</th>
<th>2015 KPI Performance</th>
<th>2017 KPI Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nursing</strong></td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pharmacy</strong></td>
<td>-**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Geosciences School</td>
<td>4.11*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Chemistry</td>
<td>4.23*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Physics</td>
<td>4.44*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>4.05*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Veterinary Science</td>
<td>4.25*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Schools and departments reflect organisational hierarchy current at 31 March 2017.
* Figures for faculties/schools/departments with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties/schools/departments with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
^ 2015 Agriculture and Environment; and Veterinary Science students are included in Science results following transition to School of Life and Environmental Sciences.
3.4 KPI-E4: Graduate Outcomes Survey – 2017 KPI Target

To achieve the target of being in the top decile of Universities Australian (UA) institutions by 2020 (i.e. 3rd of higher), targets have been set for 2017-2020 as shown in Table 3d.

Table 3d. KPI-E4: Graduate Outcomes Survey Targets to 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPI-E4: Employment / Further Study – Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS)</th>
<th>Performance 2016</th>
<th>Target 2017</th>
<th>Target 2018</th>
<th>Target 2019</th>
<th>Target 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA Ranking (of 39 institutions)</td>
<td>=6th</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 KPI-E5: Student Retention – 2017 KPI Targets

KPI-E5 is based on annual student retention figures for undergraduate, postgraduate coursework and postgraduate research students. 2017 KPI targets for student retention are based on the 2016 KPI student retention figures (see Table 3e). KPI targets were calculated by setting an overall student retention target of 90% at the whole of university level; taking the difference between this target and the 2016 KPI student retention score for the University (87.97%) and then dividing this evenly over the four years between 2017 – 2020. This results in a required annual increment improvement score of 0.51% across the University. To achieve this, all faculties with a current retention score of below 90% have been set an annual improvement of 0.6% per year until 2020. Hence, 2017 KPI targets are calculated by multiplying the 2016 KPI performance score by 0.6%, and then adding this figure to the 2016 KPI performance score. Faculties with a current retention score at or above 90% are set a target to maintain or improve on their current performance.

Table 3e. Student retention 2017 KPI targets (% students retained)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>2016 KPI Performance %</th>
<th>2017 KPI Targets %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>86.42</td>
<td>86.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>85.64</td>
<td>86.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>92.30</td>
<td>≥92.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>96.31</td>
<td>≥93.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>^ ^</td>
<td>^ ^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>89.31</td>
<td>89.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>90.74</td>
<td>≥90.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>83.54</td>
<td>84.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>85.08</td>
<td>85.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>88.87</td>
<td>89.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>85.86</td>
<td>86.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>87.37</td>
<td>87.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>^ ^</td>
<td>^ ^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>87.44</td>
<td>87.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY</td>
<td>87.97</td>
<td>88.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Student retention (%) = number of reenrolled students/(number of students enrolled in the base year – number of students who graduated in the base year) (expressed as a percentage).

^ 2016 Agriculture and Environment; and Veterinary Science students are included in Science results following transition to School of Life and Environmental Sciences.

^ ^ 2016 Education and Social Work; and Sydney College of the Arts students are included in the Arts and Social Sciences results.
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RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards & Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board note the Student Misconduct Report 2015 – 2016, as presented.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Prior to 31 March 2017, allegations of student misconduct were investigated in accordance with Chapter 8 of the University of Sydney By-Law 1999 (as amended) ("the By-law"). On 31 March 2017, Chapter 8 was withdrawn from the By-law and the University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016 was promulgated.

Chapter 8 of the By-law set out the procedures for resolving allegations of misconduct by students. Clause 76(3) required the Vice-Chancellor and any Proctorial Board to provide a report to the Senate and the Academic Board on all matters in which a penalty was imposed on a student as a result of a finding of misconduct.

Set out below is a summary of all such matters that were referred in 2015 and 2016 under the By-law.

1. 2015 Misconduct Penalties

In 2015, penalties were applied on students for breaches of the following policies:
- Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy;
- Code of Conduct for Students
- Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Policy 2015

Below is a summary of thirty six (36) cases which resulted in penalties being applied for breaches of these policies.

1.1 Sexual Harassment:

There were no cases where this class of misconduct was processed through to penalty.

1.2 Harassment/Bullying/Discrimination:

The University applied penalties as follows:
- Four (4) cases: Severe Reprimand.

1.3 Fraud:

A penalty was applied as follows:
- One (1) case: Reprimand; expulsion from the University for seven (7) years.
1.4 Falsified Medical Certificate:

Providing either a forged or illegally purchased Professional Practice Certificate or medical certificate in support of a Special Consideration application.

A range of penalties was applied in sixteen (16) cases:

1.4.1 Seven (7) cases involved multiple units of study which incurred penalties as follows:
   i. One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in seven units of study; suspension from the award course for two semesters.
   ii. One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in six units of study, expulsion from the University for six semesters.
   iii. One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in five units of study, expulsion from the University for six semesters.
   iv. One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in four units of study.
   v. One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in three units of study, one semester suspended suspension from the award course.
   vi. One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in two units of study; one semester suspended suspension from the award course for one semester.
   vii. One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in two units of study, two semester suspension from the award course

1.4.2 Nine (9) cases involved a single unit of study which incurred penalties as follows:
   i. One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail in one subject, one semester suspension from the award course; an additional one semester suspended suspension from the award course.
   ii. Ten (10) cases: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in one unit of study; one semester suspension from the award course.
   iii. One (1) case: Reprimand, one semester suspended suspension from the award course.
   iv. One (1) case: Reprimand; revision of the thesis (with conditions).

1.5 Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy

Engaging another person to contribute to an assignment; submitting work for assessment that has been completed by another person or to which another person has made significant contribution.

A range of penalties was applied in fifteen (15) cases:

1.5.1 Two (2) cases involved multiple units of study which incurred the following penalty:
   • Two (2) cases: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in two units of study, one semester suspension from the award course

1.5.2 Thirteen (13) cases involved a single unit of study which incurred penalties as follows:
   i. One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail in one subject, one semester suspension from the award course; an additional one semester suspended suspension from the award course.
   ii. Ten (10) cases: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in one unit of study; one semester suspension from the award course.
   iii. One (1) case: Reprimand, one semester suspended suspension from the award course.
   iv. One (1) case: Reprimand; revision of the thesis (with conditions).
2 2016 Student Misconduct Penalties

In 2016, penalties were applied on students for breaches of the following policies:
- Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy;
- Code of Conduct for Students
- Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Policy 2015

Below is a summary of thirty three (33) 2016 cases which resulted in penalties being applied for breaches of the above rules.

2.1 Sexual Harassment:
A penalty was applied in two (2) cases:
- One (1) case: Severe reprimand; one year suspension from the University; cancelation of a residency agreement.
- One (1) case: Reprimand.

2.2 Harassment/Bullying
A penalty was applied in two (2) cases:
- One (1) case: Severe reprimand; two semester suspension from the award course.
- One (1) case: Reprimand.

2.3 Falsified Medical Certificate
Providing either a forged or illegally purchased Professional Practice Certificate or medical certificate in support of a Special Consideration application.

A range of penalties was applied in twenty five (25) cases.

2.3.1 Twelve (12) cases involved multiple units of study which incurred penalties as follows:
- One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in eleven units of study; exclusion for one year
- One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail in seven units of study; two year expulsion from the University.
- One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in five units of study, one year suspension from the University.
- One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in five units of study, one year suspension from the University.
- One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in three units of study, one semester suspended suspension from the award course.
- Two (2) cases: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in two units of study; one semester suspension from the award course.
- Four (4) cases: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in two units of study; one semester suspended suspension from the award course.
- One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in one unit of study; one semester suspended suspension from the award course.

2.3.2 Ten (10) cases involved a single unit of study which incurred penalties as follows:
- One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in one unit of study; one semester suspension from the award course.
- Nine (9) cases: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in one unit of study; one semester suspended suspension from the award course.

2.3.3 Three (3) cases incurred penalties as follows:
- One (1) case: One semester suspension from the award course.
- One (1) case: Severe reprimand.
iii. One (1) case: Expulsion from the University if the student re enrolls (student had voluntarily withdrawn before the finalisation of the case)

2.4 Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy

Engaging another person to contribute to an assignment; submitting work for assessment that has been completed by another person or to which another person has made significant contribution.

A penalty was applied in four (4) cases as follows:

i. One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in two units of study; three year suspension from the award course.

ii. One (1) case: Zero mark and fail grade in one unit of study; one semester suspended suspension from the award course.

iii. One (1) case: Severe reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in one unit of study; one semester suspension from the award course.

iv. One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in one unit of study; one semester suspended suspension from the award course.