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NOTICE OF MEETING

Meeting 8/2017 of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee will be held from 2:00pm – 4:00pm on Tuesday 14 November 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></th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>WELCOME AND APOLOGIES</td>
<td>Apologies have been received from Professor Pip Pattison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PROCEDURAL MATTERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Minutes of Previous Meeting</td>
<td>Chair attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Business Arising</td>
<td>Chair verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STANDING ITEMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Report of the Chair</td>
<td>Chair verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Report of Academic Board</td>
<td>Tony Masters attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ITEMS FOR ACTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Phase 5 AB-UE Faculty Reviews</td>
<td>Kate Small attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Assessment: A University-wide Approach</td>
<td>Peter McCallum attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Curriculum and HESF Policy Changes</td>
<td>Peter McCallum attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Continuing and Extra-Curricular Education Policy 2017</td>
<td>Peter McCallum attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Curriculum Framework and Coursework Policy Changes for a Research-Pathway Masters degree and Vertically-Integrated Masters degrees</td>
<td>Peter McCallum attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended)</td>
<td>Kerrie Henderson attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Sciences: Faculty Resolutions</td>
<td>Mark Melatos attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Dentistry: Faculty Resolutions</td>
<td>Chair attached</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respect is a core value of the Academic Board
5 ITEMS FOR NOTING

5.1 Student Misconduct Report 2015-2016  
TBA  
attached

5.2 2016 Quality Verification System Review  
Pip Pattison  
attached

5.3 Arts & Social Sciences: Phase 4 Faculty Review Report and Response – CONFIDENTIAL  
Chair  
separate attachment

6 OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 Any Other Business

Next meeting:  2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 13 February 2018  
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.
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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 7/2017, held on 26 September 2017, be confirmed as a true record.

**MINUTES**

**ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY COMMITTEE**

2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 26 September 2017
Senate Room, Quadrangle (A14)

**Members Present:** Professor Jane Hanrahan (Chair); Helen Agus (Science) (from 3:15pm); Andrew Barnes (Conservatorium); Dr Vasiliki Betihavas (Nursing); Isabella Brook (President, SRC); Associate Professor Vincent Gomes (Engineering & IT); Professor Manuel Graeber (Medicine); Associate Professor Glen Hill (Architecture, Design & Planning); Georgia Mantle (Undergraduate Student); Associate Professor Tony Masters (Chair of the Academic Board); Associate Professor Peter McCallum (Director, Educational Strategy) (for Professor Pip Pattison); Associate Professor Maurice Peat (Business); Samay Sabharwal (Nominee, SUPRA); Dr Debra Shirley (Health Sciences); Professor Anne Twomey (Law); Professor Sandra van der Laan (Business).

**Attendees:** Dr Matthew Charet (Secretary); Associate Professor Ross Coleman (Director, Graduate Research) (for Items 4.5 – 4.8); Idena Rex (Head, Student Affairs Unit) (for Item 5.3); Tim Robinson (Manager, Archives and Records Management Services) (for Item 4.1).

**Apologies:** Associate Professor Tim Allender (Education & Social Work); Associate Professor Alex Chaves (Veterinary Science); Dr Frances Di Lauro (Arts & Social Sciences); Kerrie Henderson (Office of General Counsel); Associate Professor Veysel Kayser (Pharmacy); Dr Peter Knight (Medicine); Associate Professor Mark Melatos (Arts and Social Sciences); Professor Pip Pattison (Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)) (Associate Professor McCallum attending instead); Amy Wenham (Postgraduate Student).

---

**UNCONFIRMED MINUTES**

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The Chair welcomed Samay Sabharwal as the new nominee of the President of SUPRA, and Professor Sandra van der Laan, who replaces Associate Professor Geoff Frost as representative of the Business School. Apologies were extended as recorded above.

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

2.1 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Subject to the correction of several records of attendance, the minutes of the previous meeting held on 8 August 2017 were approved as a true record of that meeting.
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**Resolution ASPC17/7-1**

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolve that the amended minutes of meeting 6/2017, held on 8 August 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 that she had nothing to report.

**Resolution ASPC17/7-2**

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

3.2 Report of Academic Board

Associate Professor Masters advised that he had nothing to report further to the written report circulated with the agenda.

**Resolution ASPC17/7-3**

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

4 ITEMS FOR ACTION

4.1 Consultation Drafts – Privacy and Recordkeeping policies

Further to the written report circulated with the agenda, Mr Robinson advised that these proposals reflect not only the University’s compliance with the *State Records Act 1998 (NSW)*, but also to clarify for staff what needs to be done in relation to the University’s record keeping and privacy obligations. The current revised versions of these policies also enable a simpler update process for future amendments, by separating different aspects of process into discrete sections of the policy. Members were advised that procedures are currently in development for future dissemination.

The committee agreed to endorse these amendments to the Academic Board for noting, being advised that implementation authority rests with the Office of General Counsel.

**Resolution ASPC17/7-4**

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.

4.2 Course Review Template

The Chair advised that this proposal has been revised following discussion at the Undergraduate and Graduate Studies Committee meetings of 19 September 2017, to clarify some of the wording and better present our obligations for reporting on learning outcomes and graduate qualities. The inclusion of assessment plans has also been incorporated. The Secretary undertook to circulate the amended version to members for noting.

The proposal was endorsed for presentation to the Academic Board.

**Resolution ASPC17/7-5**

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.

4.3 Higher Education Standards Framework and University Policy

Associate Professor McCallum informed members that this is a revised version of a proposal which had previously been considered by the committee, now incorporating feedback provided on the earlier draft. Members were advised that the section of the *Learning and Teaching Policy*
2015 relating to staff qualifications has been clarified to enable delivery of course content by those who may not meet the standards (such as industry professionals and students) provided such teaching is supervised by a staff member who holds the required qualification. Reference to the Australian Higher Education Graduation Statement (AHEGS) has also been removed from both the Learning and Teaching Policy and the Procedures. Associate Professor McCallum advised that a further amendment will be brought to a future meeting to clarify the governance of transcripts and testamurs.

The version of the Student Placement Policy 2015 is largely the same as previously presented and has now been endorsed by the Office of General Counsel.

The current Agreements for Educational Services Policy 2011 will be replaced by the new Educational Services Agreements Policy 2017 and the previous policy is to be rescinded. Members were also informed that the Guidelines for Inter-institutional Agreements 1997 has already been rescinded by the Academic Board on 29 August as endorsed at the previous meeting of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee.

Subject to a number of typographical corrections, the amended proposals were endorsed for presentation to the Academic Board.

**Resolution ASPC17/7-6**

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee:

1. recommend that the Academic Board approve the amendment of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 and the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016, 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, 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, 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 and the Agreements for Educational Services Procedures 2011, as presented.

4.4 Amendments to the Assessment Procedures 2011

The Chair informed members that this proposal had been referred to the Academic Board following its endorsement at the last meeting of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee, and that it had been referred back to the committee following feedback provided by the Academic Board. The Chair has suggested that this feedback does not directly relate to the proposed amendments as submitted to the 8 August 2017 meeting and so the original proposal is resubmitted for endorsement by the committee, for presentation to the Academic Board.

In discussion, it was observed that there is no delegation for return of results and this was suggested for future development.

Subject to a number of typographical corrections, the proposal was endorsed for presentation to the Academic Board.

**Resolution ASPC17/7-7**

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

1. approve the amendment of the Assessment Procedures 2011, as presented; and
2. approve the adoption of the amended policy with effect from 23 October 2017 (for Semester 2 examinations).

4.5 Amendments to the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (as amended)

Associate Professor Coleman advised that the proposed amendments are necessitated by changes to the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016 to ensure that the HDR Rule aligns with the updated delegations.

The proposal was endorsed for presentation to the Academic Board.
Resolution ASPC17/7-8
That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board:
(1) endorse the amendments to the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (as amended); and
(2) recommend that Senate approve the amendment of the policy.

4.6 Amendments to the Progress Planning and Review of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy and Procedures 2015
Associate Professor Coleman advised that the proposed amendments for this and Items 4.7 and 4.8 have been recommended by the Office of General Counsel to reflect changes to the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016 and the University of Sydney (Governance of Faculties and University Schools) Rule 2016. He further advised that inconsistencies in definition (as raised at the Graduate Studies Committee meeting of 19 September 2017) would be addressed before presentation of the amendments to the Academic Board.

Subject to the making of these amendments, the proposal was endorsed for presentation to the Academic Board.

Resolution ASPC17/7-9
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.

4.7 Amendments to the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013
This item was discussed under Item 4.6 above.

Resolution ASPC17/7-10
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.

4.8 Amendments to the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015
This item was discussed under Item 4.6 above.

Resolution ASPC17/7-11
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.

4.9 Nursing: Faculty Resolutions
This proposal was endorsed for presentation to the Academic Board.

Resolution ASPC17/7-12
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.

4.10 Pharmacy: Faculty Resolutions
This proposal was endorsed for presentation to the Academic Board.

Resolution ASPC17/7-13
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.

4.11 Science: Faculty Resolutions
This proposal was endorsed for presentation to the Academic Board.
5 **ITEMS FOR NOTING**

5.1 **Educational Integrity Trend Report, Semester 1, 2017**

Associate Professor McCallum observed that the report suggests that international students are more likely to breach policy than domestic students, and that the matter would be referred to the International Student Experience Taskforce, with a request that that group develop strategies to address this area. More generally, it was observed that incidence of second offences and breaches by students above first year remain low (suggesting that remediation strategies are effective). Increased engagement with the online learning tool has also enabled speedy turn-around of cases, which assists with the timely processing of results. Feedback for individual faculties is provided in the report, and Faculty Boards are required to assess and act on the reports on an annual basis.

In discussion, it was observed that the new centralised reporting process is cumbersome and that this may be contributing to a decline in incidents being reported (as staff may simply not be reporting). Associate Professor McCallum advised that the process is intended to be easier than the previous reporting process and that he will revisit this offline to see where the sticking points are. It was observed that the need to enter individual incidents separately is time consuming, and that the technical interface resets all fields if the user fails to provide the attachment on each attempt; this should be addressed to enable retention of form data and speed up processing time.

**Resolution ASPC17/7-15**

*That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board note the Educational Integrity Trend Report, Semester 1, 2017.*

5.2 **Education Key Performance Indicators 2016 Performance and 2017 Targets**

In discussion, the possibility of a connection between KPIs and funding was raised. Assigning defined values for some of the KPIs might also have unexpected outcomes.

**Resolution ASPC17/7-16**

*That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board note the Education Key Performance Indicators 2016 Performance and 2017 Targets, as presented.*

5.3 **Student Misconduct Report 2015-2016**

The Chair informed members that during 2016, Senate agreed to request that the NSW Government repeal Chapter 8 of the *University of Sydney By-law 1999 (as amended)* and replace it with the *University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016*. The circulated report is the final report required under the By-law.

In discussion, it was observed that under the By-law, anyone was able to report misconduct to the Registrar and that this is no longer the case, with all reports required to come via a faculty. The current report only provides a summary of cases in which misconduct has been found (as required by the By-law), and inclusion was requested of the number of cases initially raised as a comparator (that is, the cases in which the Registrar determined that there was “no finding”). The inclusion of this information is helpful to flag potentially serious issues that may not reach the threshold of the Registrar's intervention but that may nevertheless need to be addressed at the local level. Expansion on the range of penalties enacted would also be helpful, as would a mechanism to provide feedback or resolution to the individual Unit of Study Coordinator who may have raised the issue in the first instance. This latter is particularly helpful to both close the loop on cases raised, as well as serving an educational function to enable staff to develop an expectation of the severity of some actions over others.

Ms Rex undertook to provide an amended report for noting by the Academic Board.
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Resolution ASPC17/7-17
That the Academic Standards & Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board note the Student Misconduct Report 2015 – 2016, as amended.

6 OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 Any Other Business

Professor Graeber expressed concern regarding several issues relating to privacy. Widespread use of Skype across the University was noted, with the advice that the standard version of Skype is not private; its use should therefore be discouraged and a secure alternative provided by the University. The mandatory requirement for all researchers to provide an ORCID online researcher identification number when submitting a publication in IRMA was also raised as a concern, as there is no indication of how ORCID will use any personal information it collects.

Associate Professor Masters recommended that these issues be referred to the Provost for response.

There being no other business, the meeting concluded at 3:26pm.

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

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 10 October 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 26 September 2017; and
- endorsed the proposal to establish a University-wide course review process and endorsed the Course Review Template, as presented, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the amendment of the *Learning and Teaching Policy 2015* and the *Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016* and adopt the amended Policy and Procedures; approved the amendment of the *Student Placement Policy* and adopt the amended Policy; invited the Vice Chancellor to approve the *Educational Services Agreements Policy 2017* and recommended the adoption of the amended Policy; and invited the Vice Chancellor to rescind the *Agreements for Educational Services Policy 2011* and the *Agreements for Educational Services Procedures 2011*;
- approved the amendment of the *Assessment Procedures 2011*, as presented, and approved the adoption of the amended policy, with effect from 23 October 2017 (for Semester 2 examinations);
- approved the amendment of the Resolutions of the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery, as presented, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the amendment of the Resolutions of the Faculty of Pharmacy, as presented, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the amendment of the Resolutions of the Faculty of Science, as presented, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- noted the consultation drafts of the *Recordkeeping Policy 2017* and *Privacy Policy 2017*;
- noted the Educational Integrity Trend Report, Semester 1, 2017; and
- noted the *Education Key Performance Indicators 2016 Performance and 2017 Targets*, as presented.

**Items related to the Admissions Committee**
The Academic Board noted the report from the meeting of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee held on 26 September 2017; and
- approved the amendment of the Governance Instruments *Assumed Knowledge and Special Entry Requirements* and *Flexible Entry* to reflect the degree profile approved for 2018; and
- approved the proposal to make available direct entry into undergraduate award courses for select students who graduate with the Vietnamese High School Graduation Certificate (Bang Tot Ngiep Trung hoc Pho thong) obtained from a high school for gifted students (trường THPT chuyên), with the necessary GPA, and update the University’s admissions criteria to reflect this proposal, with immediate effect.

**Items related to the Graduate Studies Committee**
The Academic Board noted the report from meeting of the Graduate Studies Committee held on 19 September 2017 and:

*Respect is a core value of the Academic Board*
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- approved the proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend the Master of Commerce, Graduate Diploma in Commerce and Graduate Certificate in Commerce and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January, 2018;
- approved the proposal from the Sydney Conservatorium of Music to amend the Doctor of Musical Arts and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, as presented, with immediate effect;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Dentistry to amend the Doctor of Clinical Dentistry and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Dentistry to amend the Doctor of Dental Medicine and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Information Technology and the Master of Information Technology Management and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from the Sydney Law School to amend the Master of Environmental Law, Graduate Diploma in Environmental Law, Master of Health Law and Graduate Diploma in Health Law and approved the amendment of Elective Units of Study Tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from Sydney Medical School to amend the Doctor of Medicine and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from Sydney Nursing School to amend the Master of Advanced Nursing Practice, Master of Cancer & Haematology Nursing, Master of Emergency Nursing, Master of Intensive Care Nursing, Master of Mental Health Nursing, Master of Primary Health Care Nursing and embedded Graduate Diplomas and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Pharmacy to amend the Graduate Certificate in Pharmacy Practice and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science/Doctor of Dental Medicine and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science/Doctor of Medicine and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Master of Clinical Psychology/Doctor of Philosophy and approved the amendment of tables of units of study arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- recommend that Senate approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Resolutions of the Senate for degrees, diplomas and certificates of the Faculty of Science, with effect from 1 January 2018; and
- endorsed the proposed set of PhD Graduate Qualities.

Items related to the Undergraduate Studies Committee
The Academic Board noted the report from the meeting of the Undergraduate Studies Committee held on 19 September 2017 and:
- approved the proposal from the Sydney Conservatorium of Music to amend the Bachelor of Music and approved the amendment to the 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 Bachelor of Arts/Doctor of Medicine and approved the amendment to the Course Resolutions arising from the proposal, as amended, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Dentistry to amend the Bachelor of Oral Health and approved the amendment of the Course Resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
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- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours and approved the amendment to the Course Resolutions and the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2019;
- approved the proposal from Sydney Medical School to amend the Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery and approved the amendment to the Course Resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from the Sydney Nursing School to amend the Bachelor of Nursing (Post-Registration) and approved the amendment to the Course Resolutions and the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from the Sydney Nursing School to amend the Bachelor of Nursing (Advanced Studies) and approved the amendment to the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from the Sydney Nursing School to amend the Bachelor of Nursing (Honours) and approved the amendment to the Course Resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Pharmacy to amend the Bachelor of Pharmacy and the Bachelor of Pharmacy and Management and approved the amendment to the Course Resolutions and the tables 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 and approved the amendment to 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, Bachelor of Science (Advanced), Bachelor of Science (Advanced Mathematics), Bachelor of Science (Honours), Bachelor of Science (Honours) (Advanced), Bachelor of Science (Honours) (Advanced Mathematics), Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Advanced Studies, Bachelor of Medical Science, Bachelor of Liberal Arts and Science, Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Arts, and Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Laws and approved the amendment to the tables 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/Doctor of Medicine and approved the amendment to the Course Resolutions 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/Doctor of Dental Medicine and approved the amendment to the Course Resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Other matters
The Academic Board also:
- approved changes to 2017 membership of the Board and its committees;
- noted an amended 2018 meeting schedule;
- noted presentations by student members on the USyd Student Experience;
- noted the Report of the Chair and the verbal report from the Vice-Chancellor and Principal;
- considered draft committee architectures for the Academic Board, in anticipation of discussion and adoption of a committee architecture for 2018 at the November 2017 meeting of the Academic Board;
- received an update on TEQSA re-registration;
- endorsed the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Degrees, diplomas and certificates of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and agreed to recommend that Senate approved the proposed amendments, with effect from 1 January 2018; and
- approved the 2018 Academic Calendars for the Sydney Conservatorium of Music, Faculty of Dentistry and Faculty of Science.

The full agenda pack for the 10 October 2017 meeting of the Academic Board is available from:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Kate Small, University Quality Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer/Approver</td>
<td>Associate Professor Tony Masters, Chair of the Academic Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Stephen Garton, Provost and DVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper title</td>
<td>Proposal for thematic Academic Board – University Executive Faculty Reviews Phase 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To seek Academic Board endorsement of the proposed review process and themes for the next phase of joint Academic Board-UE reviews of faculties, scheduled to run from 2018-2022.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

1. endorse the proposed model of thematic reviews for the next five-year phase of joint Academic Board – University Executive reviews of faculties and University schools;
2. endorse the theme of “Student Wellbeing and Safety” for review in 2018; and
3. note the themes proposed for future years (to be finalised annually to ensure alignment with contemporary priorities).

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This paper proposes that the next five-year phase of joint Academic Board-University Executive (AB-UE) reviews of faculties should be conducted as an annual thematic review across faculties and University schools. These thematic reviews would supersede the current practice of comprehensive review of individual faculties, providing greater opportunity for faculties, University schools and portfolios to focus and collaborate on key issues as well as reducing the administrative impost of the review process.

The proposed theme for the first year of the new process in 2018 is Student Wellbeing and Safety, an issue of critical importance to the University which has also become the subject of regulatory attention from TEQSA following the Australian Human Rights Commission’s *Change the Course* report.

Themes identified for future reviews include Research Training and Training Needs Analysis, Support and Development for Casual Academic Staff, Graduate Outcomes and Tracking, Multidisciplinary Study, Assessment and Learning Outcomes, Student Placements and Projects.

**BACKGROUND / CONTEXT**

The Academic Board has conducted quality assurance reviews of individual faculties on a series of five-year cycles (known as “Phases”) since 1997. The earlier cycles were focused primarily on compliance with policy, but the remit of the reviews has expanded over time. The current cycle (Phase 4) has been conducted in collaboration with the University Executive and considers all aspect of a single faculty’s activities including resources, teaching, research, enrolments, staffing and student outcomes. Administrative and logistical support for the reviews is provided by the Provost’s Office.

In early 2017, a working group comprised of representatives from the Academic Board, the Provost’s portfolio, Strategy and Higher Education Policy and Projects met to plan the next Phase of reviews. This group agreed that individual faculty reviews, while useful, would not be the best approach going forward; comprehensive reviews are too broad to allow for deep examination of key issues, would be difficult to execute effectively in the large faculties of the new organisational design, and duplicate other monitoring now underway as part of the 2016-2020 strategy or routine operational reporting.
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The group proposed that a thematic approach would allow for a more focused examination of an important issue or issues across faculties and University Schools and increase the University’s capacity to monitor the quality of its operations with regard to strategic priorities and the new Higher Education Standards Framework. This view was endorsed by UE in May 2017, following which a working group comprised of the Chair of the Academic Board, the Provost and Deans or their representatives from a number of faculties and University schools met to consider possible themes and develop this proposal.

ISSUES

1. REVIEW PROCESS

The move to thematic reviews will be a significant change in practice with implications for faculties, University schools and central portfolios. Key changes are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of review</th>
<th>Thematic review (proposed)</th>
<th>Single-faculty review (current)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit of analysis</strong></td>
<td>Faculties and University Schools; may also include individual schools or centres, depending on theme</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timing</strong></td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Once in a five-year cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review Panel</strong></td>
<td>AB Chair, Provost, internal academic staff, internal and external thematic academic and professional experts as determined by AB Chair in consultation with Provost.</td>
<td>AB Chair, Provost, internal and external academic staff from faculty and cognate disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terms of Reference</strong></td>
<td>Vary by theme; to be approved by UE and AB</td>
<td>Standard across all faculties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background information**

- Provost’s office provides all faculties and University schools with data and other information (e.g. policies, legislation, extracts from strategy, case studies, information from portfolio/s) relevant to review theme
- Provost’s office provides faculty with self-evaluation report template populated with faculty-specific data

**Faculty/University school Self-evaluation report (SER)**

- Minimal (approx. 5 pages identifying key issues)
- Extensive (approx. 350pp including data)

**Review process**

- Review of SER and small number of detailed conversations/panels with faculty and University school experts and students and other stakeholders as required
- Review of SER and large number of relatively short interviews with a wide range of faculty staff and students

**Recommendations**

- Provided by the review panel; consider action or outcomes to be pursued pan-faculty and with portfolios as well as within individual faculties and University schools.
- Provided by review panel; identify action or outcomes to be pursued by the faculty

**Acceptance/Approval of recommendations**

- Faculties, University Schools and portfolios have a month to comment before report and recommendations are presented for approval at UE and AB.
- Faculty has two weeks to comment before review report is tabled at UE and AB.

**Monitoring and follow-up**

- Annual report by all faculties, University schools and nominated portfolios to AB and UE until all recommendations implemented or superseded.
- Faculty provides initial response to recommendations upon receipt of report; limited further follow up.
2. THEMES

The proposed theme for the first year of the new process in 2018 is Student Wellbeing and Safety. This is an issue of critical importance to the University which has also become the subject of regulatory attention from TEQSA following the Australian Human Rights Commission’s Change the Course report. Conducting a thematic review of the University’s approach and initiatives in this area would allow the University to internally socialise and consolidate work toward a safer community that has been underway for some time including work to prevent and support victims of sexual harassment and assault, the introduction of the 1800 SYD HLP hotline and improved complaints handling processes. It will also provide a forum for the consideration of student wellbeing more generally, the intersection of University and faculty services and programs, the needs of specific cohorts, the role and responsibilities of the new Associate Dean (Student Life) position, and to ensure the University’s compliance with Higher Education Standard 2.3 Wellbeing and Safety.

Possible themes for future reviews include:

- **Research Training and Training Needs Analysis** – this was identified as an issue in many of the Phase 4 reviews.
- **Student Placements and Projects** – the quality of the student experience, achievement of learning outcomes, and the adequacy of policy, procedures and agreements governing placements and projects should be a high priority as increasing numbers of students undertake these study options.
- **Support and Development for Casual Academic Staff** – this has been identified as an area in which there may be opportunity to strengthen current processes and practice.
- **Graduate Outcomes and Tracking** – this is a key University performance metric, but current tracking mechanisms and graduate survey response rates are sub-optimal. Both University-wide and faculty/University-school level action to address this issue may be required.
- **Multidisciplinary Study** – review of the uptake and quality of OLE and multidisciplinary study pathways should be a priority as students start to move through the new UG curriculum.
- **Assessment and Learning Outcomes, including Graduate Qualities (GQs)** – review of student achievement of GQs and how these are assessed should be a priority as students move through the new UG curriculum.

**FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

No changes to current funding or resourcing arrangements are anticipated. The Provost’s Office will continue to provide administrative and logistical support for the review process. Faculties and University schools will benefit from a lesser administrative burden as a result of more tightly focused self-evaluation and interview processes, but this will likely be offset by the increased frequency of reviews (annually instead of every five years).

**RISKS / BENEFITS**

There are no significant risks associated with adopting a thematic approach to reviews; items no longer included in the reviews are covered by strategy KPIs or other routine monitoring processes. The anticipated benefits of the thematic approach include a tighter focus and deeper analysis of key issues, better alignment with strategic and regulatory priorities, greater comparability of data across faculties, increased involvement by the portfolios, and improved opportunities for faculties to collaborate with each other and with the portfolios to share best practice or identify underlying issues. Associated changes to review processes including streamlined self-evaluation reporting requirements and a more targeted approach to interviews/consultation should also reduce the administrative impost of the review process.
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IMPLEMENTATION

If agreed at UE and the Academic Board, planning will commence for 2018 immediately. This will include the development of a formal terms of reference and review timeline and process, which will be subject to Academic Board and UE approval. Selection of the theme for subsequent reviews will take place at least 12 months ahead of the scheduled review.

COMMUNICATION

n/a
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee:
(1) notes the report of the Assessment Working Group; and
(2) recommend that the Academic Board endorse the recommendations set out in the report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In February 2017, the Assessment Working Group was established by the Chair of the Academic Board and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) to consider how best to implement the assessment-related initiatives articulated in the University’s 2016-20 Strategy. As a result of work carried out throughout the year the working group makes five key recommendations, which are detailed in its final report for 2017 (Attachment 1). These recommendations are intended to: ensure the embedding of the University’s graduate qualities within all undergraduate degrees; establish improved processes for coordinating learning and assessment at levels higher than units of study; create an environment in which teaching teams can develop innovative approaches to the design of learning experiences and assessment; improve feedback on learning to students and staff; and reduce the burden of assessment overall. With the endorsement of the Academic Board and the University Executive Education Committee, implementation of the recommendations is planned to commence in 2018, with support to be provided by the Education portfolio through both the Curriculum Development Fund and targeted professional development activities.

BACKGROUND

The Assessment Working Group was established by the Chair of the Academic Board and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) to undertake the work required to implement the assessment initiatives within the University of Sydney 2016-20 Strategic Plan (the Strategy). Set within the broader transformation of the undergraduate curriculum and learning experience, these initiatives commit the University to: ensuring the coordination of learning outcomes and assessment across the curriculum and at levels higher than units of study; reducing the total volume of assessment while also increasing the use of formative and authentic forms of assessment; and establishing, by 2020, a common approach for measuring and reporting students’ attainment of the graduate qualities.

With representation from across the University’s faculties and schools, the working group investigated the current practice of assessment at the University, along with its impact on students and staff, to identify the steps necessary to implement the initiatives indicated above. The current use and nature of rubric-based approaches to assessment was considered, as was student feedback on assessment collected through regular surveys on units of study and the broader student experience. The working group also engaged in widespread consultation with staff and students, and worked with Professor Jim Tognolini and experts in the Educational Measurement and Assessment Hub in the School of Education and Social Work (see Consultation). Work has commenced on the development of the suite of common University rubrics for assessing the graduate qualities, with these expected to be completed in the first half of 2018. The attached report details the outcomes of the work undertaken by the group and articulates five interconnected
recommendations for which endorsement is sought from the Academic Board as representative of the University (Attachment 1).

**ISSUES**

As detailed below, the working group’s recommendations are intended as first steps toward establishing an enabling framework within which teaching teams can re-think the alignment of learning activities and assessment tasks with learning outcomes, for each curriculum component, that give expression to the graduate qualities. This should present significant opportunities for innovation in the design of assessment, which has the potential to further consolidate assessment across curriculum components and reduce the volume of assessment where appropriate. Improved feedback to both staff and students, gained partly through the assessment of the graduate qualities, is also likely to prompt further review of teaching and learning strategies.

**Recommendation 1: Ensure that learning outcomes for degrees and each curriculum component give expression to the graduate qualities**

The University’s new graduate qualities were established in the *Learning and Teaching Policy 2015*. The University’s 2016-2020 Strategic Plan (the Strategy) subsequently undertook to ensure that the graduate qualities are embedded as learning outcomes in all undergraduate degrees, and faculties have been supported in this curriculum renewal work via the Education compact process during 2016 and 2017 with work expected to continue in 2018. In line with this work to embed the graduate qualities within all undergraduate award courses, the following steps are recommended.

- The Academic Board, as part of its course approval, assurance and review processes should ensure that every degree of the University has learning outcomes articulated in terms that give full expression to the graduate qualities. This can be done through amending the course management and review templates.
- To further ensure the development of the graduate qualities by all students, the learning outcomes for relevant curriculum components of each degree (stream, specialisation, program, and major) should also be expressed in terms of the graduate qualities. These should be prepared by faculties and submitted to the Academic Board for review by mid-2018.
- The DVC Education should ensure that professional development and support is available to assist faculties in undertaking this work, and work with the Academic Board to develop clear requirements.

**Recommendation 2: Map and plan assessment across the curriculum**

Understanding when and how each learning outcome (and hence graduate quality) is developed within each curriculum component is necessary to assure learning and allow assessment of the graduate qualities. Planning assessment in this way will also create a framework to manage assessment across the component more effectively. For these reasons, it is proposed that assessment plans should be developed for each curriculum component.

- As part of its role in monitoring the academic quality of the University, the Academic Board should ensure assessment plans are in place for each relevant curriculum component of a degree. This could be done by ensuring the course management and course review templates require an assessment plan for each curriculum component above the unit of study level (see section 3.1).
  - For liberal studies degrees, assessment plans should be developed at the level of the stream, program, and major, as appropriate.
  - For professional and specialist degrees, assessment plans should be developed at the level of the stream, specialisation or degree, as well as for any majors available in the degree.

- Assessment plans should: articulate the learning outcomes for the relevant course component; indicate where and how the learning outcomes are developed and assessed; and describe how students’ achievement of the graduate qualities will be developed, the tasks typically used, and how they will be assessed on completion of the degree (section 3.1).
- The DVC Education should ensure that staff professional development and support is available, focusing on assessment alignment, assessment task design and assessment innovation, commencing no later than 2019. Further, the Education portfolio should provide funding for innovation in assessment and assessment task design through the 2019 and 2020 Education Compact and Strategic Education Grant process.

**Recommendation 3: Coordinate curriculum components and degrees**

The new curriculum’s emphasis on the coherence of each curriculum component (i.e., the stream, specialisation, program or major) means that it is necessary to ensure that mechanisms are in place to monitor the alignment and coordination of the curriculum at levels intermediate to units of study and the
degree. It is recommended that uniform governance arrangements be established across all faculties and all curriculum components, down to the level of the major.

- Every faculty should ensure there is a degree, stream, specialisation, program or major coordinator appointed, as relevant, for the curriculum components of any undergraduate award course it offers.
- The coordinator will be responsible for maintaining oversight of the learning outcomes for the relevant curriculum component; developing and reviewing the assessment plan for the relevant component; and from 2020, reporting annually to the faculty on students’ achievement of the graduate qualities.

Recommendation 4: Use a common approach to assess the graduate qualities
In addition to its existing commitment to monitoring students’ educational experiences, the Strategy commits the University to systematically assessing students’ acquisition of the graduate qualities (initiative 4.4). To do so, it will be necessary that the University has a shared understanding of the graduate qualities and the potential levels of performance at which students may achieve these qualities.

- A suite of common rubrics will be used as the scale by which student attainment of the graduate qualities is measured. These rubrics are currently under development by the Educational Measurement and Assessment Hub and other experts across the University.
- Where considered necessary, the common University rubrics may be used as a foundation to develop more detailed rubrics suited to a specific field of study, to ensure that the emphasis of learning both across and within the graduate qualities is appropriate for the development of a student in that field. These field of study rubrics will build on the standards of the common rubrics and retain the same components.
- The suite of common University rubrics will be approved by the Academic Board and will be monitored, with the assistance of the Education portfolio, to ensure continued relevancy and effectiveness.

Recommendation 5: Explore the use of the project units and other experiential units to assess student achievement of the graduate qualities
The policy requirement for each major to include a final year project and for all undergraduate degrees to include project-based learning provides an opportunity to assess student achievement of the full suite of graduate qualities. These units are intended to allow students to demonstrate disciplinary expertise by applying their knowledge to an authentic problem. In doing so, the full suite of graduate qualities will often be evident. Trials of a model for multi-faculty projects at a medium scale are being conducted in 2018.

- As 2018 trials of project units proceed, work to consider the assessment model in these units and the potential to use the common suite of graduate quality rubrics to evaluate student performance should be undertaken.
- The utility of such assessment to provide the final statement of attainment of the graduate qualities for graduating students should also be tested.

CONSULTATION
Expert advice was provided by the Sydney School of Education and Social Work’s Educational Measurement and Assessment Hub. Early and periodic input was also sought from the Academic Board, its standing committees, and the University Executive Education Committee. Written submissions and other information were received from Student Support Services, the Office of Educational Integrity, Human Resources, and the student advocacy services provided by the Students’ Representative Council and Sydney University Postgraduate Representatives Association. All staff at the University were invited to provide feedback on early discussion papers through a series of University-wide and faculty fora, while feedback from students was sought from student representatives to the Academic Board at a dedicated roundtable discussion on assessment. The full consultation schedule is as below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>13-Feb-17</td>
<td>University Executive Education Committee</td>
<td>Establish Assessment Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14-Feb-17</td>
<td>Academic Standards and Policy Committee</td>
<td>Establish Assessment Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>27-Apr-17</td>
<td>Degree Advisory Working Group</td>
<td>Progress update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>22-May-17</td>
<td>University Executive Education Committee</td>
<td>Progress update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23-May-17</td>
<td>Undergraduate Studies Committee</td>
<td>Progress update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Non-Confidential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-May-17</td>
<td>Academic Standards and Policy Committee: Progress update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>13-Jun-17: Academic Board: Assessment forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14-Jun-17: All staff: Assessment forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>25-Jul-17: Health Sciences: Assessment forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>07-Aug-17: University Executive Education Committee: Feedback on interim discussion paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08-Aug-17: Academic Standards and Policy Committee: Feedback on interim discussion paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14-Aug-17: Conservatorium of Music: Assessment forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-Aug-17: Business: Assessment forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-Aug-17: Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing and Pharmacy: Assessment forum (combined)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23-Aug-17: Dentistry and Medicine: Assessment forum (combined; Westmead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-Aug-17: Architecture, Design and Planning: Assessment forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-Aug-17: Arts and Social Sciences: Assessment forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-Aug-17: Science: Assessment forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>01-Sep-17: Science: Assessment forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08-Sep-17: Law: Assessment forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student representatives to the Academic Board: Roundtable discussion on assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-Sep-17: University Executive Heads of Schools Committee: Feedback on interim discussion paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ATTACHMENTS

**Attachment 1** – *Assessment: A University-wide approach*, 2017 Assessment Working Group
Assessment
A University-wide approach

2017 Assessment Working Group
Executive Summary

In February 2017 the Chair of the Academic Board and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) formed the Assessment Working Group to examine the University’s current approach to assessment and consider ways to achieve the vision for assessment that was outlined in the University of Sydney 2016-20 Strategic Plan (the Strategy).

That vision involves not only embedding the graduate qualities for undergraduate degrees, adopted in 2015, but assessing them, fostering authentic assessment, and improving feedback on learning through interactive and innovative learning design. This will be achieved through the creation of an assessment framework that supports learning and allows students and staff to share the excitement of discovery unencumbered, as far as is possible, by assessment drudgery. Such a framework would also mean that by 2020, the University would have much greater clarity over what students learn in each degree and its components.

To achieve this, the working group has made the following recommendations. The first (Recommendation 1) is to ensure that learning outcomes give full expression to the graduate qualities. This is a foundational step to create a clear statement at the level of each curriculum component (stream, specialisation, program and major) of what students will learn. By agreeing learning outcomes at levels between the degree and the unit of study, unit of study coordinators will be able to align their own area of responsibility with others and share the load of creating the learning outcomes of the component across multiple units. This should allow them to take action to improve learning and assessment in their own area, confident this is coordinated with other areas of students’ education.

Recommendation 2 is to provide a way to manage and monitor these learning outcomes through the development of assessment plans for majors and other curriculum components higher than the unit of study. By providing a clear statement on how outcomes will be achieved, how we will know they have been achieved, and how they are aligned across the curriculum, assessment plans will empower academics to re-think task design at the unit level, and make greater use of authentic assessment and new learning resources. In the context of the University’s rich curriculum with many pathways and opportunities for building interdisciplinary learning, a coordinated way of managing assessment across the curriculum is needed. It is also recommended that coordinators be appointed to manage this, for appropriate curriculum components (Recommendation 3).

By assessing student attainment of the graduate qualities, the University can provide important feedback to students on learning and to staff on teaching. This will also provide a measure of the success of the work to embed the graduate qualities and to achieve the learning outcomes of each degree or curriculum component. To provide such assessment it will be necessary to use a common suite of rubrics, one developed for each graduate quality (Recommendation 4). While it will be necessary to use the common rubrics as a baseline, where necessary specific rubrics may be developed that build on the common rubric as appropriate to a field of study.

Finally, the opportunity to use the final year project units within the liberal studies majors (and equivalent experiential units that occur in specialist and professional degrees) to provide the final assessment of a students’ attainment of the graduate qualities should be explored as these project units are trialed in 2018 (Recommendation 5). At the same time, the potential for the common rubrics to drive the design of an assessment framework and tasks for these units should be investigated.

These recommendations form the foundation required to achieve the strategic vision by establishing a coherent framework for assessment. This should better enable academics to: use feedback on learning to adjust activities to better achieve the learning outcomes for a unit, major, stream or degree; introduce authentic assessment; design tasks that are well aligned with learning outcomes; and apply innovative and technologically-assisted interactive experiences to learning.
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Recommendations

There are five key recommendations of the Assessment Working Group as detailed below. With the agreement of Academic Board, these recommendations will be progressed during 2018 and plans made for work to continue in 2019 and 2020. A short section outlining the planned implementation schedule follows these recommendations.

Many of these recommendations are focused on first steps that will change some of the policy requirements and governance around assessment at the University. The environment thus created will enable teaching teams around each curriculum component to re-think the alignment of learning activities and assessment tasks with learning outcomes that give expression to the graduate qualities. This should present significant opportunities for innovation in the design of assessment, whether in relation to discrete assessment tasks in units of study or the design spanning multiple units of study. Such innovation has the potential to further consolidate assessment across curriculum components and reduce the volume of assessment where appropriate. Improved feedback to both staff and students, gained partly through the assessment of the graduate qualities, is also likely to prompt further review of teaching and learning strategies.

Recommendation 1: Ensure that learning outcomes for degrees and each curriculum component give expression to the graduate qualities

The University’s new graduate qualities were established in the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015. The University’s 2016-2020 Strategic Plan (the Strategy) subsequently undertook to ensure that the graduate qualities are embedded as learning outcomes in all undergraduate degrees, and faculties have been supported in this curriculum renewal work via the Education compact process during 2016 and 2017 with work expected to continue in 2018. In line with this work to embed the graduate qualities within all undergraduate award courses, the following steps are recommended.

- The Academic Board, as part of its course approval, assurance and review processes should ensure that every degree of the University has learning outcomes articulated in terms that give full expression to the graduate qualities. This can be done through amending the course management and review templates.
- To further ensure the development of the graduate qualities by all students, the learning outcomes for relevant curriculum components of each degree (stream, specialisation, program, and major) should also be expressed in terms of the graduate qualities. These should be prepared by faculties and submitted to the Academic Board for review by mid-2018.
- The DVC Education should ensure that professional development and support is available to assist faculties in undertaking this work, and work with the Academic Board to develop clear requirements.

Recommendation 2: Map and plan assessment across the curriculum

Understanding when and how each learning outcome (and hence graduate quality) is developed within each curriculum component is necessary to assure learning and allow assessment of the graduate qualities. Planning assessment in this way will also create a framework to manage assessment across the component more effectively. For these reasons, it is proposed that assessment plans should be developed for each curriculum component.

- As part of its role in monitoring the academic quality of the University, the Academic Board should ensure assessment plans are in place for each relevant curriculum component of a degree. This could be done by ensuring the course management and course review templates require an assessment plan for each curriculum component above the unit of study level (see section 3.1).
  - For liberal studies degrees, assessment plans should be developed at the level of the stream, program, and major, as appropriate.
  - For professional and specialist degrees, assessment plans should be developed at the level of the stream, specialisation or degree, as well as for any majors available in the degree.
- Assessment plans should: articulate the learning outcomes for the relevant course component; indicate where and how the learning outcomes are developed and assessed; and describe how
students’ achievement of the graduate qualities will be developed, the tasks typically used, and how they will be assessed on completion of the degree (section 3.1).

- The DVC Education should ensure that staff professional development and support is available, focusing on assessment alignment, assessment task design and assessment innovation, commencing no later than 2019. Further, the Education portfolio should provide funding for innovation in assessment and assessment task design through the 2019 and 2020 Education Compact and Strategic Education Grant process.

**Recommendation 3: Coordinate curriculum components and degrees**

The new curriculum’s emphasis on the coherence of each curriculum component (i.e., the stream, specialisation, program or major) means that it is necessary to ensure that mechanisms are in place to monitor the alignment and coordination of the curriculum at levels intermediate to units of study and the degree. It is recommended that uniform governance arrangements be established across all faculties and all curriculum components, down to the level of the major.

- Every faculty should ensure there is a degree, stream, specialisation, program or major coordinator appointed, as relevant, for the curriculum components of any undergraduate award course it offers.
- The coordinator will be responsible for maintaining oversight of the learning outcomes for the relevant curriculum component; developing and reviewing the assessment plan for the relevant component; and from 2020, reporting annually to the faculty on students’ achievement of the graduate qualities.

**Recommendation 4: Use a common approach to assess the graduate qualities**

In addition to its existing commitment to monitoring students’ educational experiences, the Strategy commits the University to systematically assessing students’ acquisition of the graduate qualities (initiative 4.4). To do so, it will be necessary that the University has a shared understanding of the graduate qualities and the potential levels of performance at which students may achieve these qualities.

- A suite of common rubrics will be used as the scale by which student attainment of the graduate qualities is measured. These rubrics are currently under development by the Educational Measurement and Assessment Hub and other experts across the University.
- Where considered necessary, the common University rubrics may be used as a foundation to develop more detailed rubrics suited to a specific field of study, to ensure that the emphasis of learning both across and within the graduate qualities is appropriate for the development of a student in that field. These field of study rubrics will build on the standards of the common rubrics and retain the same components.
- The suite of common University rubrics will be approved by the Academic Board and will be monitored, with the assistance of the Education portfolio, to ensure continued relevancy and effectiveness.

**Recommendation 5: Explore the use of the project units and other experiential units to assess student achievement of the graduate qualities**

The policy requirement for each major to include a final year project and for all undergraduate degrees to include project-based learning provides an opportunity to assess student achievement of the full suite of graduate qualities. These units are intended to allow students to demonstrate disciplinary expertise by applying their knowledge to an authentic problem. In doing so, the full suite of graduate qualities will often be evident. Trials of a model for multi-faculty projects at a medium scale are being conducted in 2018.

- As 2018 trials of project units proceed, work to consider the assessment model in these units and the potential to use the common suite of graduate quality rubrics to evaluate student performance should be undertaken.
- The utility of such assessment to provide the final statement of attainment of the graduate qualities for graduating students should also be tested.
Implementation

The University is committed to assessing the graduate qualities for students who graduate in 2020. An expected small cohort of students will commence in the second year of the new curriculum during 2018, which provides an opportunity to trial assessment of the graduate qualities for the portion of that cohort who choose to exit after their third year in 2019. Working backwards from that goal provides a critical timeline for the development and implementation of the above recommendations, illustrated in the milestones below. In addition to the work to implement these recommendations, further work will be required to achieve the full vision by 2020 and indicative milestones are given here for that work as well.

Support for the work to be undertaken within faculties and University schools during 2017 and 2018 will be provided by the Education portfolio via the Educational Innovation team. Workshops on writing learning outcomes and embedding graduate qualities, as well as the development of assessment plans and curriculum mapping will be made available to all curriculum component coordinators (see Recommendation 3) across the University and rolled out in faculty groupings. In the second part of the year, another series of workshops on the common rubrics developed for assessing the graduate qualities will be held, including progressing work on any necessary interpretation of these at the field of study level.

In line with the recommendations, the Education portfolio should continue to provide funding to the faculties for this work via the mechanisms of the Curriculum Development Fund: that is, the Education faculty compacts and Strategic Education Grants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Key milestones</th>
<th>Month Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Coordinators designated for each degree and course component</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common University rubrics developed</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deliver professional development programs to support implementation</td>
<td>August 2017 – July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate qualities expressed in learning outcomes for all degrees and course components</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete assessment plans for all degrees and course components</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Faculties to use assessment plans to develop innovative assessment approaches</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Validate common rubrics for assessing graduate qualities</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Measure attainment of graduate qualities using the common rubrics</td>
<td>December 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Begin internal reporting on student achievement of the graduate qualities</td>
<td>December 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In parallel with the development work outlined above, the University is in the midst of configuring and making available a curriculum mapping solution. An initial small-scale trial will be underway in early 2018, with the system progressively available to faculties on an opt-in, by-degree basis thereafter. The work progressed under these recommendations to develop learning outcomes and map the development of these and the graduate qualities across the degrees will serve a dual purpose as preparation for participation in the mapping system. At the same time, work will continue to identify a software solution, likely to interface with the University’s new Learning Management System, which can be used to support the assessment of the graduate qualities.
1. Introduction

The University’s 2016-20 Strategic Plan (the Strategy) identified the need to transform the undergraduate curriculum in order to produce graduates with the capacity to influence and contribute to dynamic, changing and globalised environments. The new curriculum framework balances depth of disciplinary expertise with broader capabilities and offers more authentic, ‘real-world’ educational experiences. To achieve this, there are new common requirements for all degrees, such as a sustained and coherent program of study in the major or discipline; collaborative learning activities and assessments; interdisciplinary and inter-professional learning experiences; experience working on authentic problems; and the culmination of each major or broader field of study in a final year project or practicum (for more information on the curriculum, see attachment 1).

Framing the transformed curriculum are the graduate qualities (table 1.1). Developed via University-wide survey and discussion in 2015, these graduate qualities are common to all bachelor degrees, whether liberal studies, professional or specialist degrees. To ensure students develop the graduate qualities regardless of their chosen field of study, appropriate learning experiences must be embedded in every course, work which has been underway since 2016. The new curriculum framework introduces elements specifically designed to develop each of the graduate qualities as illustrated in table 1.1, below. These elements include many already present in professional and specialist degrees, and some which have been introduced into the liberal studies degrees (Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Commerce) as part of restructures to take effect in 2018.

Table 1.1: Qualities of the Sydney graduate, their purpose and the corresponding curriculum component.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate qualities</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Curriculum component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depth of disciplinary expertise</td>
<td>To excel at applying and continuing to develop expertise in the graduate’s chosen discipline or disciplines</td>
<td>– A major or specialisation in at least one field of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– A structured approach to the development of knowledge and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Authentic problems and assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Project-based learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader skills:</td>
<td>To increase the impact of expertise, and to learn and respond effectively and creatively to novel problems and opportunities</td>
<td>– A structured approach to the development of knowledge and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– critical thinking and problem solving</td>
<td></td>
<td>– Collaborative and group-based learning activities and assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– communication (oral and written)</td>
<td></td>
<td>– Interdisciplinary and inter-professional learning experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– information/digital literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>– Authentic problems and assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– inventiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>– An open learning environment for extension of knowledge and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Project-based learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competence</td>
<td>To work productively, collaboratively and openly in diverse groups and across cultural boundaries</td>
<td>– A structured approach to the development of knowledge and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Collaborative and group-based learning activities and assessments</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>
<td>– Interdisciplinary and inter-professional learning experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Authentic problems and assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– An open learning environment for extension of knowledge and skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### An integrated professional, ethical and personal identity

To build integrity, confidence and personal resilience, and the capacities to manage challenge and uncertainty

- A structured approach to the development of knowledge and skills
- Collaborative and group-based learning activities and assessments
- Authentic problems and assessments
- An open learning environment for extension of knowledge and skills
- Project-based learning

### Influence

To be effective in exercising professional and social responsibility and making a positive contribution to society

- Collaborative and group-based learning activities and assessments
- Interdisciplinary and inter-professional learning experiences
- Authentic problems and assessments
- An open learning environment for extension of knowledge and skills
- Project-based learning

In addition to the transformed curriculum, the Strategy also sets out a number of initiatives to renew the University’s approach to assessment. These include an ambition to increase the integrity and effectiveness of assessment, while seeking to reduce volume; to use technology to improve feedback on learning to both staff and students; and an intention that the University measure the extent to which students have achieved the graduate qualities at graduation.

During 2017 the Chair of the Academic Board and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Education jointly formed the Assessment Working Group to progress these initiatives. The working group investigated the current state of assessment at the University, worked with experts from the Educational Measurement and Assessment Hub, and produced discussion papers on which it consulted widely via an Academic Board forum and a large number of University-wide and faculty-specific fora. More detail on the work undertaken during 2017 is at section 4.

This report summarises the findings of the working group and sets out work to be undertaken during 2018 in some detail, as well as the key steps towards realising the Strategy in full by 2020. As the working group did, this report begins by giving an overview of policy and practice of assessment at the University. This includes considering the nature, volume and timing of assessment, and the current use of rubric-based approaches (section 2). In section 3, the report explores the ways in which the University’s vision for assessment may be achieved, detailing the steps necessary to draw together current good practices, take advantage of the new curriculum framework, integrate assessment more fully in the learning feedback loop and assure student achievement of the graduate qualities. Doing so will allow the University to in turn assure the efficacy of the University’s degrees in developing the graduate qualities.
2. Current assessment

Assessment practice underpins all of teaching and learning at the University, and while what are considered appropriate assessment tasks can vary widely by field of study, there are general principles of assessment which are common across the diverse fields represented at the University. Students and staff can tend to have similar concerns regarding assessment – for the most part, all can agree that assessments should be fit for purpose, that is, they accurately reflect the degree of student learning that has taken place; they should not be unduly burdensome in their volume or timing; and they should be as difficult to cheat as possible, ensuring that accuracy of assessment is maintained.

This section explores the current practice of assessment at the University, though it is limited to considering only those data which could be obtained on assessment from University-wide systems, or through the voluntary participation of those invited by the working group to share their data.

2.1 Policy

As the University is classified by the regulator as a self-accrediting higher education provider, the Academic Board (the Board) is delegated authority by the Senate to approve all degrees offered at the University. Faculty boards may propose to the Board new degrees or revisions to existing degrees, and govern the delivery of those degrees. Units of study within degrees are approved by faculty boards that are also responsible for maintaining the quality and integrity of these units and reporting to the Board.

This means that while faculties are responsible for developing degree resolutions and approving requirements for curricula, units of study and course components (i.e., streams, specialisations, programs, majors and minors), any such approvals are subject to final approval by the Board, usually on the basis of expert advice provided by its own standing and other University committees or boards of studies. The Board is also responsible for ensuring that all award courses are reviewed over a seven-year cycle. To manage these responsibilities, the Board currently uses a course management template for new degree proposals, for major amendments to existing degrees, or for the deletion of degrees, and has just approved a new course review template.

Under the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015, faculties are responsible for: the articulation of learning outcomes for degrees and curriculum components, including, as appropriate, for streams, programs, majors and units of study, among other things. The policy also outlines the responsibilities of faculties for ensuring the coherence of degrees and curriculum components above the level of the unit of study.

Heads of schools are required to assign unit of study coordinators who are responsible for each unit of study. Coordinators’ responsibilities include: developing and aligning learning outcomes; reviewing assessment tasks and standards in relation to policy; reviewing the academic integrity of each assessment task and the assessment framework for the unit; and reporting incidents of potential academic dishonesty or plagiarism in line with University policy. They must also administer surveys of the educational experience and provide reports to students and the faculty on the quality of the student experience and make recommendations about changes to learning outcomes, curriculum or assessment.

The University last reviewed its assessment policies in 2010, a process which resulted in the development of a new Assessment Policy 2011 and Assessment Procedures 2011. These were subsequently incorporated into the Coursework Policy 2014. Four principles for assessment and their associated requirements are articulated in policy, as set out in table 2.1.1 below.

---

1 Here and throughout, ‘faculty’ is used by convenience but refers to both faculties and university schools, which have much the same governance responsibilities in regards to coursework degrees.
### Table 2.1.1: The University of Sydney assessment principles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 1</th>
<th>Assessment practices must advance student learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Assessment practices align with goals, context, learning activities and learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>A variety of assessment tasks are used while ensuring that student and staff workloads are considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Assessment tasks reflect increasing levels of complexity across a program and foster enquiry-based learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Constructive, timely and respectful feedback develops student skills of self and peer evaluation and guides the development of future student work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 2</th>
<th>Assessment practices must be clearly communicated to students and staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Unit of study outlines explain the rationale for the selection of assessment tasks (e.g. group task) in relation to learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Procedures exist to ensure that all staff involved in teaching of a unit share a common understanding of assessment practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>The process of marking and of combining individual task marks is explicitly explained in the unit outline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 3</th>
<th>Assessment practices must be valid and fair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Assessment tasks are authentic and appropriate to disciplinary and/or professional context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Assessment will be evaluated solely on the basis of students’ achievement against criteria and standards specified to align with learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 4</th>
<th>Assessment practices must be continuously improved and updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Assessment tasks and outcomes are moderated through academic peer review and used to inform subsequent practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Assessment is regularly updated to ensure alignment with program learning outcomes or graduate attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Professional development opportunities that are related to design, implementation and moderation of assessment are provided to staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of these principles are worth noting in the context of this report. Principle 3(2) committed the University to single standards-based assessment regime in place of the previous policy which permitted either standards-based or norm-referenced assessment. The University benchmarks the disciplinary standards used to assess final year undergraduate students by participating in the Quality Verification System among the Group of Eight universities (Go8). In this system, reviewers from partner Go8 universities evaluate the standards expressed in learning outcomes and assessment tasks and comment on the standards of sample student responses. The disciplines to be benchmarked are rotated from year to year.

Principle 1(2) has been interpreted by some, notably the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association (SUPRA), as effectively prescribing, or at least sharply curtailing assessment tasks that constitute 100% of the final mark.

Principle 3(1) commits the University to ensuring that assessment tasks are authentic. In the context of assessment, the term ‘authentic’ is used to indicate that students have applied their knowledge to a ‘real world’ task, demonstrating their achievement of the learning outcomes. For example, medical
students might complete a clinical exam in which they measure a patient's blood pressure, or other vital signs, or a dentistry student might be asked to diagnose and repair a simulated diseased tooth. The decision as to what is 'authentic' must be made by those with knowledge of the field of study and its application, but the intention is usually to get away from over-reliance on forms of assessment such as multiple choice exams that are seen as having little relevance to tasks students might eventually perform when working in their chosen field.

2.2 Types of assessment

To understand the degree to which the above principles have influenced practices across the University, the working group attempted to determine the current assessment types used. At present, it is not easy to obtain University-wide data on assessment, or to understand how various terms may be used or interpreted in the data that is available – though this may change if there is widespread uptake of the curriculum mapping system discussed below.

This difficulty was also encountered by the Student Administrative Services (SAS) Special Consideration and Special Arrangements team in 2016 when they attempted to collect data on assessments within units of study from unit of study coordinators. On review of the data, the team found that there were so many assessment types used that cleaning this data and maintaining it would have significant resourcing implications.

A similar problem was encountered by the working group, who accessed the data from the 2016 University Handbook. The assessment field within this data is a ‘free text’ field, which would require a significant data cleaning and coding exercise to make sense of the different assessment descriptors used. Even with that complete, there is no way to properly understand whether what one coordinator terms a ‘test’ could be considered the same thing as what another might term an ‘exam’, or whether an ‘assignment’ and an ‘essay’ might be considered the same task for certain purposes short of a discussion with each unit of study coordinator.

In an effort to determine the most common types of assessment, a simple key word count was done across the assessment field, resulting in the data presented in figure 1 below. The most commonly used term in this field is ‘exam’, which occurs 2,754 times across approximately 9,000 entries. This is nearly double the number of mentions of the next most common type of assessment, ‘assignment’ which is in turn closely followed by ‘presentation’. This accords with the Special Consideration and Special Arrangement team’s report that the assessment types for which arrangement requests are most commonly requested are exams, assignments and participation assessments – the first, second and fifth ranked categories here (attachment 2).

Without a nuanced understanding of the sort of tasks that are described here as ‘exams,’ ‘assignments’ or ‘presentation’ it is not possible to disentangle whether these assessment types are achieving the University’s aims with regard to authentic assessment. For example, the term ‘exam’ could easily be applied both to types of assessment that might be seen as ‘authentic’ and those that may not be, such as a ‘clinical exam’ and ‘multiple choice exam.’ However, the predominance of the exam category might imply that ambitions regarding the mix of assessment types are yet to be fully realised. In general, the table does appear to suggest an over-reliance on examinations and written assignments, and a lesser reliance on projects and other forms of authentic assessment.

The apparent preponderance of just a few types of assessment can make it difficult for different types of learners to full engage with the curriculum. By ensuring that a variety of assessment tasks are used within a unit, and perhaps even offering students a choice of format for an assessment task, the numbers of students who may need adjustments can be reduced. These both are important principles of the ‘universal design for learning’ which attempts to ensure equity of assessment for diverse learning styles (attachment 3).
2.3 The amount of assessment

The Strategy notes that while there are ambitions to increase the types of certain kinds of assessment across the curriculum (notably authentic assessment and assessment used in project learning), there is also desire to reduce the overall volume of assessment, summative assessment in particular. The oft-reported perception of both students and staff is that the volume of assessment has increased over the years, with concomitant workload burdens on both parties. Student Support Services and the SRC casework service both submitted commentary to the working group indicating broad support for reducing assessment volume and improving the quality and timeliness of feedback (attachments 3 and 4).

To test the perception of an increased amount of assessment the working group sought data on the use of casual academic time as a proxy for total academic time. Casual academics must submit timesheets for remuneration purposes, and hours spent marking assignments are often coded separately to teaching and preparation time. These data are imperfect: coding is not always done rigorously, and some units use the ‘administration’ code in place of the ‘marking’ code, but they provide an indication of the amount of time the University’s staff have spent on marking in any given year and of trends over several years.

The data show that the number of hours claimed under the casual academic marking code, when looked at across the time series available, has increased at a higher rate than the increase in the number of students at the University across the same period (figure 2.3.1). There are a number of potential explanations for this increase, but one worth exploring in the context of this report is that it reflects an increase in assessment volume across this time.
One explanation for the apparent increase in assessment volume could be that the policy changes discussed in section 2.1 above, specifically principle 1(2), led to an increase in the volume of assessment, starting around 2010 when the changes occurred. This implies that the overall response to the policy requiring a mix of assessment styles was to add assessments to a unit, rather than to rethink the size or number of tasks holistically.

Too much assessment has been shown to have a negative impact on student learning. Hornby (2003) outlined a range of negative consequences of over-assessment that accord with the issues raised with the working group by both Student Support Services and the SRC. These are: slow feedback, little meaningful feedback, little formative feedback for students to learn from mistakes, repeated assessment of the same outcomes without rationale, lack of correlation between credit point weighting and student and staff workload, lack of alignment of assessment between units, and assessment ‘bunching’.

2.4 The timing of assessment

The timing of assessment is also often raised as an issue, with concerns that the independent approach to managing units of study leads to a convergence of assessment on specific weeks within each semester, increasing the pressure on students to complete multiple pieces of assessment concurrently. Reports to the working group by Student Support Services, the Office of Educational Integrity and the Students' Representative Council casework service all commented on the impact of coincident timing as well as the volume of assessment. The Office also provided data from its incident reporting and case management system that provides some indication of the pattern of assessment across the 2016 academic year. This is combined in figure 2.4.1 with data for 2016 on special consideration and special arrangements applications provided by Student Administration Services and casual academic marking hours provided by Human Resources to map the timing of assessment at the University level.

The data reported here by Student Administration Services relates to the annual volume and timing of applications for special consideration and special arrangements (attachment 2). Students may seek special consideration or special arrangements where their personal circumstances prevent them from completing an assessment task or otherwise impact on their achievement within that task. Starting in 2016, the University centralised special consideration and special arrangements. During that year, approximately 16% of the University’s students sought these arrangements via the online system. The timing of these requests can be presumed to slightly precede the due dates of assessment tasks, as most arrangements must be in place ahead of deadline. The data show distinct peaks at the middle and end of semester (figure 2.4.1).

Student Support Services reports that peak periods for the University’s Counselling and Psychological Services and Disability Services units coincide with what they identify as ‘assessment log jams’ in weeks 7, 11, and 13 of semester. Qualitative feedback received by the unit has indicated that students believe they are under a high degree of pressure during these periods from multiple assignments that they perceive as non-integral to their learning. For students with disabilities, these ‘log jams’ of assignments can often exacerbate disability and impact on student performance. Significant delays in
returning feedback to students on assessment tasks, a likely impact of the same ‘log jam’ on staff, then make it difficult for students to use this feedback to improve later tasks (attachment 3).

The data from the Office of Educational Integrity reflects the number of cases reported into the workflow system, used for the first time in 2016 for case management at the faculty level (attachment 5). In contrast to the special consideration and special arrangements data, the peaks of reporting of integrity-related incidents can be expected to lag slightly behind the due date of assessment tasks as marking takes place, similarity-detection software reports are checked, and so forth.

The Office reports that full-time students are more likely to be reported for suspected plagiarism or academic dishonesty when compared with part time students, and attributes this to the volume of assessment experienced by students with full-time loads, as well as the coincident timing of assessment. Qualitative feedback from educational integrity teams in faculties has also indicated that poor time management, stress, and anxiety are the most common reasons given by students for making the choices that result in their being reported for a potential breach of academic honesty. Further, the Office suggests that the higher rates of international students found to have engaged in plagiarism or academic dishonesty, when compared with domestic students, may be at least partially attributable to the requirement for international students to be engaged in full-time study.
Figure 2.4.1. Applications for special consideration and special arrangements; reports of suspected breaches of academic honesty; and volume of casual staff marking hours across the academic year (2016). As the scale across the data sets varies widely, the data has been represented as a percentage of the total load for the year.
While the data presented in figure 2.4.1 are proxies for the timing of assessment and appear to show clear peaks across the academic year, this pattern is less obvious at the degree level.

The working group reviewed the timing and volume of assessment in three sample degrees, the Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Arts and a stream of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours to get a view of the assessment timing an individual student might experience. These are mapped across the weeks of semester with the weighting of the task used as an indicator of its potential size (figures 2.4.2, 2.4.3 and 2.4.4).

**Figure 2.4.2.** Assessment profile of the Bachelor of Arts (2017). Weeks of each semester are shown on the x-axis while the y axis represents the weighting of each assignment within the relevant unit of study.
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- **Arts II (Sem 1)**
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Figure 2.4.3. Assessment profile of the Bachelor of Science (2017). Weeks of each semester are shown on the x-axis while the y-axis represents the weighting of each assignment within the relevant unit of study.
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Figure 2.4.4. Assessment profile of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (2017). Weeks of each semester are shown on the x-axis while the y axis represents the weighting of each assignment within the relevant unit of study.
The most striking thing about these graphs is the strong similarity in assessment regimes across all units and all semesters in the Bachelor of Science, while more variation is seen in the other degrees. In the Bachelor of Engineering Honours degree, early semesters involve units of study taken from other faculties, potentially leading to some of the diversity seen here. Such diversity could be expected to increase as students in the new curriculum, particularly those in liberal studies degrees, but also some specialist and professional degrees, access units and majors from other faculties through the new shared pool of majors and minors.

2.5 Student feedback

As part of the consultation process, the working group hosted a student roundtable attended by student members of the Academic Board. Notably, when presented with the sample degree assessment patterns shown above (figures 2.4.2 – 2.4.4), students expressed mixed views regarding the desirability of any one pattern of assessment. Students tended to defend the assessment pattern they were used to and were acutely aware of the context-dependent nature of assessment and its relationship to the particular field of study. Nonetheless, they were also highly critical of assessment tasks that they viewed as non-authentic and unrelated to the learning outcomes of the unit (attachment 6).

The University has had a long standing commitment to collecting feedback from students on their overall experience and uses a range of survey instruments to do so. For coursework students, these include: the Unit of Study Survey (USS); Student Experience Survey (SES); Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ); International Student Barometer (ISB); and Student Barometer (SB). The outcomes of these surveys indicate that there are many aspects of the student experience that the University does well when benchmarked against the Go8 and the sector in general. Feedback students have provided on assessment has, however, been mixed and tends to be more critical than other aspects of the student experience (table 2.5.1).

Table 2.5.1. Students’ perceptions of teacher approaches to assessment and feedback 2016. Note that the scale for all indicators reported below is 0 – 100 except the USS, which is a scale of 0 – 5. All data is reported in the 2016 Consolidated Summary of the Student Experience and Graduate Outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-Scale Item</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Go8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Teachers provided clear explanations on coursework and assessment</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Teachers set assessment tasks that challenge you to learn</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS-5: The assessment tasks challenged me to learn</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Marking criteria</td>
<td>78/72</td>
<td>84/76</td>
<td>84/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Assessment</td>
<td>85/84</td>
<td>88/87</td>
<td>88/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Teachers commented on your work in ways that help you learn</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS-6: I have been guided by helpful feedback on my learning</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GTS: The staff put a lot of time into commenting on my work</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GTS: The teaching staff gave me helpful feedback on how I was going</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Performance feedback</td>
<td>78/72</td>
<td>83/77</td>
<td>84/76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey data aligns with the student feedback reported to the working group by Student Support Services, the SRC, the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association (SUPRA), and by the students who participated in the roundtable. Students in general see assessment as beneficial to their learning; however, they are critical of the clarity with which assessment tasks and marking criteria are communicated, and report relatively high levels of dissatisfaction with the helpfulness of the feedback they receive on their learning. In an Academic Board focus topic presented by student representatives in response to the survey data, the President of the SRC cited three assessment-related areas of student concern: volume and timing of assessment, feedback, and group work (Academic Board 10 October 2017).
Student perceptions of the time staff put in to providing feedback are also of concern. This may reflect pressure on staff time resulting from both the timing and volume of assessment, which might prevent staff from being able to provide feedback that students feel would assist with improving their performance.

2.6 Assessment rubrics

The Strategy commits the University to developing a common rubric-based approach for assessing the graduate qualities. To investigate the extent to which rubric-based approaches are already in use across the University, the working group reviewed a small sample of rubrics from each faculty.

The use of rubrics for assessment is not currently required by any policy or principle of the University. Nevertheless, many staff across the University are working with rubrics, though the style and practice of these vary. Many of the features identified in the literature as best-practice feature in some of the rubrics currently used, including: a clear indication of the evaluative criteria to be used; an explanation of what each potential level of achievement means in relation to each criterion; and an explicit link between the task and the learning outcomes of the unit so that students may understand their progress towards achieving those outcomes (Popham, 1997). The rubrics that are currently used across the University provide a promising foundation upon which a common, rubric-based approach for assessing the graduate qualities can be developed.
3. Future assessment

Moving from the current state of assessment practices at the University to one with clearer learning and assessment goals, better feedback, more authentic tasks and less drudgery as set out at the start of this report will require several steps, which are outlined in this section.

Firstly, understanding where and how the graduate qualities are embedded within the learning outcomes of the curriculum will ensure that every student has the opportunity to develop the qualities no matter which degree, or pathway within that degree, they choose. Creating assessment plans is the next step toward developing this understanding (section 3.1). Agreement within the University to a common suite of rubrics to provide a scale by which the graduate qualities thus embedded may be assessed, is then necessary before further developing the plan to the level of the assessment tasks themselves (section 3.2).

The elements of the new curriculum framework that emphasise experiential and collaborative learning, interdisciplinary experiences and work on authentic problems are a key part of both ensuring the development of the graduate qualities and providing students with opportunities to demonstrate their achievement. Section 3.3, below, discusses the ways in which project units within the majors could be used to achieve these aims within the liberal studies degrees and, by adaption of the process, in specialist and professional degrees as well.

Finally all of these steps – establishing clarity over how graduate qualities are given expression in learning outcomes; improving coherence and coordination of assessment within curriculum components; and developing common rubrics for assessing the graduate qualities – will provide the foundation to explore further innovation in assessment task design, feedback and authentic assessment. Such work should be supported by the Education portfolio by providing faculties with additional resources through the Curriculum Development Fund, and offering staff development programs in 2018, 2019 and beyond.

3.1 Planning assessment across the degree

An important aim of shifting the focus of assessment planning from the unit of study to the curriculum level is to allow staff and students to focus on tasks that support learning outcomes of their unit with assurance that other outcomes will be appropriately covered elsewhere. If staff and students have a clear sense of where an individual unit or task fits into the broader learning outcomes, they will be able to optimise the learning effectiveness of those tasks and avoid unnecessary duplication. Knowing that the curriculum is well-planned frees unit of study coordinators from the responsibility of, for example, attempting to address every graduate quality in every unit.

An assessment plan would allow ‘top down’ consideration of the structure of assessment throughout the student journey to develop their disciplinary expertise and other graduate qualities, whether that is at the level of the entire degree (such as in a tightly structured professional degree like the Bachelor of Pharmacy) or within a major in a liberal studies degree. This planning should make it possible to ensure that the balance of assessment tasks gives appropriate priority to the learning outcomes most valued by students, staff and employers. For example, a well-structured sequence of low or zero-weighted formative assessment tasks could be used within units of study, and paired with an appropriately situated final measurement of learning outcomes for the relevant curriculum component or degree.

Such an approach has the potential to reduce the overall burden of assessment on students and staff and allow more emphasis to be placed on providing students and staff with feedback. This would also create more space in the curriculum for integrated, deep, and complex learning. Similarly, appointing a coordinator to oversee the learning outcomes and assessment of curriculum components would allow unit of study coordinators to focus on the responsibilities outlined in the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 and in section 2.1.

Good planning at the curriculum level also meets the needs of good governance that the University requires in order to assure the overall quality of learning. The Higher Education Standards Framework...
(Threshold Standards) 2015 require that the University be able to demonstrate that methods of assessment are consistent with stated learning outcomes and that these outcomes have been demonstrated by students, with grades reflecting students' level of attainment. The University assures this standard via the Academic Board and its course approval and review processes (section 2.1).

In addition to this, a number of the University’s degrees, particularly specialist and professional degrees, are accredited by professional bodies. For students, accreditation is often an enforced minimum entry standard to many professions. While accrediting bodies are not usually higher education bodies themselves, the most common route to obtaining accreditation is via higher education. The accrediting bodies accredit degrees offered by higher education providers, providing an endorsement that someone who has completed that degree should be able to meet the standards for accreditation in that profession (PhillipsKPA, 2016).

The extent to which the accreditation requirements for a particular profession dictate the structure of an accredited degree can vary widely among accrediting bodies. A common requirement for accreditation is the demonstration, throughout the breadth and duration of the degree curriculum, of the places in which specific learning outcomes are achieved. This is usually achieved via a 'mapping' of the curriculum, where the embedding of the relevant knowledges and skills, usually at the level of the unit of study is noted, along with any assessment or demonstration of learning outcomes.

Those faculties which manage accreditation requirements for their degrees have thus often already managed a similar planning process to that described here. For others, this may be the first time such planning has been undertaken, and there are some challenges in the less-structured liberal studies degrees in understanding the various student pathways possible. The structured curriculum components of these degrees, such as streams, programs and majors, will therefore logically be the focus of planning.

Once the graduate qualities have been given expression through the learning outcomes of every degree and curriculum component, it should be feasible to produce an assessment plan for each degree or curriculum component of the University that expresses how the graduate qualities are achieved. This work would assure the Academic Board that every student is given the opportunity to develop the graduate qualities through all of the University’s degrees and will be able to be assessed on that development at the end of their degree. These plans should also be communicated to students, in order to describe how their degree will result in their achievement of the graduate qualities.

Production of assessment plans should be done as part of the course approval process and included in the course review process as it essentially ‘accredits’ degrees of the University as appropriately embedding the graduate qualities of a University of Sydney undergraduate degree. Updates to the Board’s course management template to reflect the new graduate qualities are overdue, with the template still reflective of the University’s old ‘generic attributes for graduates’ and using terms to describe the curriculum which are superseded by the new curriculum framework. The template currently asks faculties to describe the assessment procedures and the assurance of learning to be undertaken within any degree. A review of the course management template should be undertaken, with a view to inserting a requirement for assessment plans in place of the sections on assessment and assurance of learning.

The new curriculum mapping system will be integral to supporting such work, acting as a dynamic repository of information needed for assessment plans, and generating products such as unit of study outlines that communicate learning outcomes and assessment tasks to students. Configuration of the new mapping system is currently underway, with a small pilot group of degrees to trial the system in early 2018. By mid-2018, the system should be available on an opt-in basis to faculties. As part of readying for use of the system, those in the trial have already reported that work needs to be done to review the learning outcomes of the degrees, curriculum components and units of study. Beginning the work to produce the assessment plans, as outlined above, will dovetail with this work.

Essential requirements for an assessment plan would be that it details: the ways in which the learning outcomes are developed throughout the degree or curriculum component; the places in which the graduate qualities are assessed for the graduating student in order to come up with their final
statement of achievement; and considers the assessment of units of study in light of the agreed common scale of achievement of the relevant graduate qualities as expressed in the rubrics, interpreted through the lens of the field of study. These three requirements are outlined below.

Assessment plans must:
1. articulate the learning outcomes in terms that give expression to the graduate qualities for the degree and relevant curriculum components;
2. indicate where and how in the curriculum the learning outcomes and graduate qualities are developed and where they are assessed; and
3. describe in narrative terms how students’ achievement of the graduate qualities will be developed, the tasks typically used and how they will be assessed on completion of the degree.

3.2 A common assessment of the graduate qualities

The development of a common, rubric-based approach for assessing the graduate qualities is foreshadowed in the Strategy and builds upon existing assessment practices and policy. Consistent with the University’s existing commitment to standards-based assessment, the approach developed here is predicated on a standards-referenced model of assessment in which evaluations of student achievements of explicit learning outcomes are mapped against a developmental continuum (attachment 7).

Assessing students’ attainment provides important feedback on the effectiveness of our efforts to ensure students’ development of the graduate qualities. It also assists staff understanding of student learning and measures the effectiveness of teaching. For students, it provides them, and potentially their subsequent employers, with evidence of their achievement.

It will be important that, having reached agreement as to the University’s graduate qualities, a common scale of achievement is also used for these qualities across the University. A number of methods of assessment could potentially be used, including that of standardised testing. Internationally, this has sometimes been used as a means of systematically measuring student attainment of higher level generic learning outcomes. These have, however, generally been judged as burdensome, expensive, and difficult to sustain. If applied here, such an approach would run contrary to ambitions to generally reduce the volume of assessment experienced by students, and would not allow for interpretation of the graduate qualities to reflect the specific needs of a field of study. The benefits such testing would provide to learning is also unclear – which should be the key aim of any assessment. Finally, this approach could encourage a view of the graduate qualities as additional to, rather than integrated within, the components of the curriculum that develop a students’ depth of knowledge.

A rubric-based approach, on the other hand, has been demonstrated to improve students’ understanding of assessment objectives and, in turn, their academic performance (Jonsson, 2014; Menéndez-Varela and Gregori-Giralt, 2016; Reddy and Andrade, 2010). This has been attributed to the ways in which rubrics communicate learning intentions to students; and the clarity with which they describe success and demonstrate the various levels at which students might achieve (Hattie, 2009).

Rubrics have also been linked to improved consistency and reliability in marking, and can be used as a mechanism for identifying potential improvements in instruction, the design of curricula, and the comparability of assessment across courses and teaching sessions (Crotwell et al., 2011; Halonen et al., 2003; Reddy and Andrade, 2010; Tractenberg et al., 2010). Finally, rubrics can provide feedback to staff on student learning in a calibrated format.

Rubrics are already being used elsewhere to support the assessment of broad program-level outcomes for undergraduates, such as is in the Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) project of the Association of American Colleges and Universities and the National Academies of

Example: the OECD’s Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes (AHELO) Project, which appears to have foundered; the OECD Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), which, through an international survey, measures cognitive and workplace skills necessary for societal participation and economic prosperity; and the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) for measurement of broad skills such as critical thinking and problem solving (eg. Arun and Roksa 2011; 2014).
An early finding of this work has been that, when measured by the rubrics, some of the outcomes presumed to have been part of these programs were found to require much greater development within the curriculum. This demonstrates the power of the rubric approach to assessment to support the work to embed, develop and scaffold the graduate qualities throughout the curriculum (section 3.1).

A common rubric is necessary to establish a baseline understanding of the learning intentions across the University for the graduate qualities and of the developmental stages for each quality. Nevertheless, it is possible, and perhaps desirable, that each of the University’s diverse fields of study consider the meaning of these qualities within the context of their field and the levels of attainment of the qualities that are necessary for success within their field. This interpretation of the common rubric may lead to the development of a rubric specific to the field of study, with statements as to the interpretation of the quality within that field and the desirable levels, or nature of attainment, within that field. Where such interpretive work is undertaken, this could form a useful basis for communication with both students and staff as to the learning outcomes, developmental stages and performance standards within the field of study. Reporting to students on their achievement of the qualities could then build on the common rubric to give specific feedback on their achievement within the context of their expertise.

On graduation, the University would then provide to students a final statement of their attainments of the graduate qualities in a form that would be meaningful to them in planning their future educational development and also meaningful to employers. It is not envisaged that the descriptions of attainment, developed as part of the agreed common rubric, will be expressed in terms of grade bands, such as those used on the NSW Higher School Certificate or the common result grades used at the University (i.e., Pass, Credit, etc.). Instead, descriptions of student attainment will make positive statements about what each student can do, rather than what they have achieved relative to their peers and the wider student cohort. Deciding at what point the evidence for the final statement on attainment for a graduating student should be assembled and assessed is a crucial step in the development of assessment plans (section 3.1).

To support both students and staff to assemble the evidence of development and attainment of the graduate qualities, a technological solution is being sought that will integrate with the Learning Management System and can be used to assemble a final statement of attainment.

### 3.3 Using project-based units to assess the graduate qualities

As outlined in table 1.1, project-based learning and authentic problems and assessment are integral to developing the qualities the University has agreed are necessary for graduates to make a productive contribution to contemporary society. The curriculum framework embeds such experiences in undergraduate degrees and is structured such that each major or broader field of study includes a final year project or practicum. For liberal studies degrees, this requirement is focused on the major, where a 3000-level project unit (or higher for 192 credit point combined, professional or specialist degrees) should be embedded. The purpose of this is to provide students with the opportunity to apply the knowledge they have gained throughout their study of the major area to an authentic problem.

Each University major must also have a unit in which students have the opportunity to demonstrate their disciplinary knowledge in an interdisciplinary setting. Recognising that ‘real world’ problems rarely accede to disciplinary boundaries, in designing majors many disciplines have chosen to combine the interdisciplinary experience with the project unit. Indeed, the Education Enterprise and Engagement team within the Education portfolio has been established to assist faculties both with brokering relationships with the external industry and community organisations that can provide authentic problems as the basis for these project units, and to assist with the organisation of multi-faculty teams of students.

The University has, of course, run projects and project units in a number of settings for many years. For example, project units involving inter-professional learning have been successfully piloted by health faculties, who have aspirations to increase such learning opportunities as consolidation of the new campus health precinct proceeds. The new curriculum framework expands students’ access to project units and other similar experiences and facilitates interdisciplinary learning. In moving to this model, the
University has been motivated by the considerable body of research which has established the high impact of projects on learning and the development of broader skills such as critical thinking and problem solving (Brownell and Swaner 2010; Kuh et al., 2005; Pascarella and Terenzini, 2005; Thompson, 2014), but is also mindful of the well-documented problems with assessment in group work and project-based units, particularly as perceived by students.

Many staff who have successfully run project units across the University have expressed a preference for moving to pass/fail assessment at the unit level, albeit with significant formative feedback, often guided by rubrics, given to students within the unit. A critical driver of this preference is the perceived positive impact on student motivation, innovation and creativity, once the pressure of marked group work was removed. Arguably, this is an issue that could be addressed through better support for, and training for students in collaborative learning structures.

In most cases, where project units have been run across the University they have also been offered at a relatively local scale, within a single discipline, where competitive pressures are likely to be highest. They have also mostly been offered to high-achieving students via selective entry, and thus necessarily within an elective space within a degree. Offered at scale, and as a key part of students major, pass/fail assessment may provide an unsatisfactory degree of rigour with which to grade a student’s achievement of the major’s learning outcomes, but this is an issue that should be explored as trials of project units continue across the University. When asked, students often express a distaste for pass/fail assessment, feeling that their hard work would not be adequately reflected or rewarded in this mark.

During 2017 there have been several trials of the new model for project units which have tested: the model of partnership with industry and community organisations; the approach of having students work in multi-faculty teams and of having multiple teams work on the same problem; and tested an assessment approach built around the graduate qualities.

In 2018, the University will run several larger-scale trials. Some of these will be situated within faculties and trial a disciplinary project; some, an interdisciplinary project that draws on disciplines from within the one faculty; and some industry and community project units that will work with external partners in multi-faculty teams facilitated by the Education Enterprise and Engagement group. For this latter group of trial units a single common assessment regime will be tried that is built on that used in the smaller 2017 trials, and shaped both by the experiences from those trials and from other project units run successfully across the University (attachment 8). These larger scale trials will be occurring at the same time as the University progresses its work on the rubrics for the graduate qualities, including those that will be built at the disciplinary level.

The integrative nature of a project-based unit, particularly where the project requires group work across disciplinary boundaries on an authentic problem, provides students with opportunities to demonstrate not only their disciplinary expertise, but also the full range of graduate qualities. For this reason, once the common rubrics have been established, these could be used as the basis to create assessment tasks within project units that focus on the qualities. Specifically, assessment tasks need to be designed that allow students to demonstrate their achievement against the developmental standards given in the rubric. If this can be achieved, it may be possible to use the project units to provide the evidence of student attainment of the graduate qualities that can be used for the final assessment. Doing so would simplify the process of gathering evidence to provide the graduation statement to students on their achievement.

Challenges inherent in this approach are those associated with assessing the individual achievements of students in the context of group work. This may be particularly exacerbated where the group work is interdisciplinary in nature and the assessor may not be the disciplinary expert. These concerns were noted by the working group in their consultation with staff across the University. Student consultation also indicated concern regarding the current conduct of group-based assessment, particularly where the group project result formed the basis for assessment.

Nevertheless, as the trials of interdisciplinary industry and community project units proceed during 2018, the potential for the common suite of University rubrics to form the basis for the assessment in those units should be considered. This would include consideration of whether or not it would be
possible to use any specific field of study rubrics to assess students undertaking the project but whose disciplinary knowledge was related to that field of study. The common rubrics could also be used to review the design of assessment tasks for project units, to ensure the graduate qualities can be demonstrated through that assessment structure.
4. Methods

The Assessment Working Group was established as a partnership between the Chair of the Academic Board and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) to review the University’s current approach to assessment and undertake the work required to give effect to the assessment initiatives of the education strategy. The working group’s Terms of Reference and membership are shown in table 4.1.

Table 4.1. Assessment Working Group Terms of Reference and membership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>To develop and deliver the assessment initiatives in the University Strategy 2016-2020.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
<td>The Assessment Working Group will:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. develop a common approach for assessing graduate qualities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. develop a common approach for development of aligned assessment plans at the level of course component to ensure effective placing of authentic assessment experiences and achievement of learning outcomes at the appropriate level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. recommend optimal processes for effective assessment practice in collaborative and project-based learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. recommend policy and course management options for integrative assessment across units of study and disciplines and in interdisciplinary units embedded in majors, projects and the Sydney Research Seminars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. recommend policy reforms in support of reducing summative assessment at unit of study level, making increased use of low or zero weighted formative assessment, and of learning analytics to provide feedback on learning to students and staff and on the learning process as a whole.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Co-chairs
Associate Professor Peter McCallum, Director, Education Strategy, DVC Education
Associate Professor Judy Anderson, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Academic Board

Members
Professor Philippa Pattison, Deputy-Vice Chancellor (Education) (ex-officio)
Associate Professor Anthony Masters, Chair, Academic Board (ex-officio)
Mrs Helen Agus, Faculty of Science
Professor Michael Anderson, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Associate Professor Corrine Caillaud, Faculty of Health Sciences
Associate Professor Rae Cooper, University of Sydney Business School
Associate Professor Jamie Gliister, University of Sydney Law School
Professor Inam Haq, University of Sydney Medical School
Dr Melissa Hardie, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Professor David Lowe, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies
Associate Professor Stefan Meisiek, University of Sydney Business School
Dr Ann Rogerson, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

Attendees
Professor James Tognolini, Educational Measurement and Assessment Hub
Tristan Enright, Manager, Educational Integrity, DVC Education (secretariat)
Dr Leah Schwartz, Program Manager, Education Strategy, DVC Education
John Hardie, Coordinator, Professional Development for the Graduate Qualities, DVC Education

The Assessment Working Group met 14 times between March and November 2017. Early and periodic feedback was sought in relation to key working and discussion papers from the University Executive Education Committee; the Academic Board and its Undergraduate Studies and Academic Standards and Policy Committees; the Degree Advisory Working Group; and the University Executive Heads of School Committee.

A dedicated Academic Board session on assessment was held on 13 August 2017 to discuss the development of a common rubric for assessing the graduate qualities. A town hall forum with the same focus was held for all staff on 14 August 2017. A discussion paper was also produced to support a series of dedicated faculty fora on assessment, held between July and September 2017 and made available to staff via the intranet. Finally, a student roundtable on assessment was held on 8 September 2017.
5. Conclusion

There is ample evidence of the conscientiousness, diligence and sustained effort applied by both staff and students to the important task of assessment across the University. To build on these efforts and achieve the vision outlined in the Strategy, the working group found that it will be necessary to adjust some aspects of current policy and governance arrangements, as well as to further support faculties to develop innovative approaches to assessment. The impact of these changes will be to benefit learning through greater clarity of curricular purpose, more pertinent feedback and improved efficiency. It is important that the recommendations in this report are implemented with a focus on freeing up time and resources for learning and research and with an emphasis on excellence rather than compliance. It is recognised that these recommendations are made at a time of transformational change within the University which is itself resource-intensive. However, the working group believes that effective implementation of these recommendations should increase the ease by which staff may create a learning community that is even more productive and rewarding.
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Attachment 1 – The new undergraduate curriculum: a primer

The curriculum framework comprises core components which are essential for every student plus enrichment opportunities that are intended to be available but not required for every student. There are seven core components which vary in form and complexity and can be mapped to the graduate qualities, as outlined in Table A1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core 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>
<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>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>An open learning environment for extension of knowledge and skills</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>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>

The core components are:

- **A major or specialisation in at least one field of study.** Disciplinary expertise requires a sustained and coherent program of study in the discipline or broader field. Such a structure is already well established in Sydney degrees, taking the form of a major, specialisation or professional field (for example, history, chemical engineering, or physiotherapy).

- **A structured approach to the development of knowledge and skills.** The curriculum will offer a coherent set of learning experiences. These structured experiences would typically begin in the first semester of the first year and culminate in a final year project that requires students to integrate knowledge and skills acquired over multiple units of study throughout their degree. In the intervening semesters, learning experiences would include opportunities for students to generate questions and analyse and address novel problems, building skills for the final year project. Ideally, the final project would allow the assessment of a number of course-level learning outcomes including broader skills. This would yield evidence often sought by prospective employers, increasingly required for professional accreditation, and now necessary to demonstrate attainment of Higher Education Standards.

- **Collaborative and group-based learning activities and assessments.** Collaborative learning activities and assessments provide vital opportunities for the development of skills to work with others. These activities take advantage of the diversity of the University student community and contribute to the development of cross-cultural understanding and effective inter-cultural communication. Carefully designed group-based learning activities and assessments build on smaller-scale, collaborative learning activities to ensure that students can fulfil the expectations of
others in team contexts, lead a designated part of a group project and, on occasion, lead the project itself and resolve difficulties that can arise in group contexts.

- **Interdisciplinary and inter-professional learning experiences.** Opportunities to engage in interdisciplinary and inter-professional learning build the capacity for interdisciplinary effectiveness and have the added benefit of further developing critical thinking skills.

- **Authentic problems and assessments.** Authentic problems are those that arise in external or research contexts, for example in organisational or broader commercial and community settings, and whose solutions are of genuine and potentially pressing interest. Authentic problems are important because they challenge students to integrate knowledge and skills in unfamiliar but realistic contexts and reflect circumstances that students are likely to encounter in the future. They are frequently multidisciplinary and novel in form and require that context be taken into account. They therefore require students to work through the uncertainties that these various forms of novelty present, encouraging more inventive, entrepreneurial and contextualised approaches to problem solving. If offered as a group-based activity – and where problems are multidisciplinary in form, this will often be most effective – authentic problems also draw on collaborative skills in order to develop novel approaches, further developing students' abilities to work across cultural, disciplinary or professional boundaries.

- **An open learning environment for extension of knowledge and skills.** The curriculum will provide students opportunities to build novel skill combinations and extend their knowledge by exploring other fields of study. This can be done by providing access to short, modular courses or resources that allow students to acquire, in flexible ways tailored to their specific learning needs, foundational concepts and methods of other disciplines, including basic skills in programming, data science, data analysis, research techniques, systems thinking, design thinking, team leadership, specialised communication skills, and project management, as well as understandings of cultural or broader contextual backgrounds.

- **Project-based learning.** Experiential learning activities have a demonstrably significant impact on course learning outcomes, particularly where they take the form of substantial projects. Projects provide challenge, novelty, and the opportunity to build and integrate knowledge and skills to solve authentic problems. Where group-based, they also build skills in collaboration and in working across cultural, disciplinary or professional boundaries.

**Common course components for liberal studies degrees**

Many of the University's specialist and professional degrees already use a structured approach to the development of knowledge and skills as students progress through their degree and build their specialisation. However, for liberal studies degrees such as the Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Commerce, the breadth of choice available to students has historically made it more difficult both to build a structured program of study and to allow students to easily integrate fields of study offered by different faculties to their home degree.

To address this, common terminology and definitions for course components and common course rules in undergraduate liberal studies degrees were adopted by the University in 2015. The benefit of common course components and rules is predictable inter-changeability of components among degrees in the liberal studies as well in the liberal studies components of some undergraduate double degrees, and hence a more coherent and navigable set of pathways through our degrees. These common structures are summarised in table A1.2. Common course rules, including for degree requirements, requisite structures, and honours, and common approaches for constructing degree combinations, such as double undergraduate and vertical degrees and the combination of degrees and diplomas have also been introduced.

**Table A1.2 Definitions of course components.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stream</th>
<th>A bracketed 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 (e.g. Bachelor of Engineering (Hons)), shared course components and/or shared rules.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>A combination of units of study that develops expertise in a multi-disciplinary domain or a professional or specialist field and includes a recognised major in a field of study. A program comprises up to $4 \times 1000\text{-level} + 4 \times 2000\text{-level} + 6 \times 3000\text{-level} + 8 \times 4000\text{-level}$ units (≤ 30).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are several noteworthy features of these new proposed definitions. First, a minor sequence of study (two units of study at each of 1000-, 2000- and 3000-level) has been introduced. A minor may be embedded in one or more majors in the same disciplinary domain or in a broader domain, but is not required to be embedded in, and therefore extendible to, a major.

A major has been conceptualised as two units of study at each of 1000- and 2000-level and four units of study at 3000-level or two units of study at 1000-level and three units of study at each of 2000- and 3000-level. This is a shift in balance of the major to later year units for some of our degrees (including for the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Commerce) and means that up to half of the required units for the major are taken at a more intensive and senior (3000-) level and largely with a cohort of students who have chosen the same major. This pattern of study should support the development of coherent and challenging curricula in each major.

The concepts of program and stream have been introduced to recognise multidisciplinary, professional or specialist course components that are larger than a major. In several cases, the concept of program is necessary because accreditation requirements cannot be met within a major as just defined (e.g., this is the case for accounting and psychology); in other cases, it is helpful as a means of identifying a multidisciplinary constellation of units that includes a major as just defined but has been constructed to cover a broader program of study for a specified purpose (e.g., a broad program in politics and related social science disciplines).

The concept of a stream within a degree allows us to recognise separate admission pathways for the degree as well as domains of study with distinctive core degree requirements (e.g., Media and Communications within the Bachelor of Arts). At the same time, it recognises that a number of streams belong to a family of degrees with shared nomenclature, shared course components and/or shared course rules.

Finally, the definitions allow that some majors may share units, particularly in the first and second years where careful design of foundational units can prepare students for several different majors. In the sciences, for example, foundational units in biology and chemistry may lead to a number of distinct majors.

The new curriculum thus now provides opportunities within both the liberal studies degrees and the professional and specialist degrees to consider students’ educational experiences in a more holistic way across the duration of the degree. One corollary of this is that it should be possible for the timing and volume of assessment tasks to be reviewed, and to consider the learning outcomes of each unit of study and course component in the context of the unifying graduate qualities.
Attachment 2 – Special consideration and special arrangements: 2016 statistics

Requests at a glance
Throughout 2016:
• 9,715 students (approximately 16%) used the Special Consideration and Special Arrangements (SCandSA) online system.
• These students submitted 24,468 applications relating to 36,604 individual assessment requests (or attendance) relating to 2994 units of study.
• As there were 5,450 units of study (with enrolled students), these requests related to 55% of the total units of study available.
• Of the 9,715 students who submitted a SCandSA application, 65.5% (6,363 students) submitted multiple requests (which could have related to the same or different unit of study).
• In addition, there were 6,363 students (65.5%) who submitted 2 or more applications.

Volume by assessment type
The greatest volume of requests by assessment type in descending order were:
1. Assignment (30.7%)
2. Final exam (22.1%)
3. Attendance (18.8%)

The following table provides an overview of volumes across all assessment types.

Table A2.1. Volume of applications across all assessment types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment types</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>11241</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td>8070</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>6618</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial quiz or small test or small continuous assessment</td>
<td>3752</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-semester exam</td>
<td>2932</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills based evaluation</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written assignment</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional assignment or test</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative assessments/demonstrations</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours thesis</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>36604</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most common forms of consideration
During 2016, the most common forms of consideration in descending order were:
1. Replacement exam (assessment type: exam)
2. Extension of time (assessment type: assignment)
3. Absence noted (assessment type: attendance)

The following table and figure provide the total number of each form of consideration granted and expressed as a percentage.

Table A2.2. Number and proportion of each form of consideration granted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration description</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacement exam</td>
<td>7098</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension of time</td>
<td>6378</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Proportion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence noted</td>
<td>2766</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark adjustment</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New or varied assessment</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No action required</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative assessment</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New or varied placement</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New or varied presentation</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New or varied evaluation</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement session</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinue not to Count as failure (DC)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td>22128</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A2.1. Number and proportion of each form of consideration granted.
Volume by faculty or University school

The following table and figure provide an overview of special consideration and special arrangement assessment requests by faculty or University school in descending order as compared to student load.

**Table A2.3.** Number and proportion of each form of consideration granted in descending order. Agriculture and Veterinary Science are included in SCIE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Requests</th>
<th>Coursework enrolments</th>
<th>Requests per student (EFTSL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NURS</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIE</td>
<td>7836</td>
<td>8402</td>
<td>0.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDI</td>
<td>3173</td>
<td>3832</td>
<td>0.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>8698</td>
<td>11219</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHAR</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>0.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>0.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSW</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>3156</td>
<td>0.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCVA</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>0.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>2489</td>
<td>0.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>0.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSI</td>
<td>4776</td>
<td>11827</td>
<td>0.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSCI</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>4094</td>
<td>0.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGI</td>
<td>2811</td>
<td>7330</td>
<td>0.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>0.265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure A2.2.** Special consideration and special arrangement requests per student (EFTSL).
Volume by academic week
The following figure provides an overview of the volume of special consideration and special arrangement applications throughout 2016 by academic week.

Figure A2.3. Volume of applications received during 2016 by academic week.
The following table provides an overview of the number of special consideration and special arrangement applications throughout 2016 by academic week.

**Table A2.4. Volume of applications received during 2016 by academic week.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1Week 1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>S2Week 1</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1Week 2</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>S2Week 2</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1Week 3</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>S2Week 3</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1Week 4</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>S2Week 4</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1MidSem</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>S2Week 5</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1Week 5</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>S2Week 6</td>
<td>1118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1Week 6</td>
<td>1286</td>
<td>S2Week 7</td>
<td>1482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1Week 7</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>S2Week 8</td>
<td>1266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1Week 8</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>S2Week 9</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1Week 9</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>S2MidSem</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1Week 10</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>S2Week 10</td>
<td>968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1Week 11</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>S2Week 11</td>
<td>1074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1Week 12</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>S2Week 12</td>
<td>1184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1Week 13</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>S2Week 13</td>
<td>1046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1Week 14</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>S2Week 14</td>
<td>837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1Week 15</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>S2Week 15</td>
<td>1494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1Week 16</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>S2Week 16</td>
<td>1484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>Break 1</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>Break 2</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 3</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>Break 3</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 4</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Break 4</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Break 5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Break 6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36604</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard versus non-standard decisions**

Prior to the commencement of each semester, faculties are able to specify variations to the default forms of consideration provided in the special consideration and special arrangements Decisions Matrix.

Faculties are able to specify:

- Skills based assessments that are non-repeatable due to specialised resource requirements;
- In-class assessments where mark adjustments are not allowed; and
- Units of study that have a return date (for submitted work) that varies from the standard 14 calendar days.
In 2016:
- 234 units of study with a skills based assessment were recorded as “non-repeatable”. For these units of study, approved students were offered an alternative evaluation rather than the standard decision of a new or varied evaluation.
- 1,344 units of study with an in-class assessment (tutorial quiz, small test, online task or small continuous assessment) have one or more assessments noted as “Mark Adjustment Not Allowed”. For these units of study, approved students were offered a new or varied assessment.
- 1,043 units of study had an allowable extension duration that was different to the standard 14 calendar days.

At the conclusion of 2016:
- 26,906 (73.5%) of special consideration and special arrangement requests were standard decisions and able to be made without referral to a unit of study coordinator.
- 9,698 requests (26.5%) were non-standard decisions and required referral to a unit of study coordinator. As there are no standard rules for attendance, these requests are referred to unit of study coordinators automatically (unless declined by SAS due to insufficient documentation). Out of the 9,698 requests that were referred to a unit of study coordinator for a non-standard decision 41% (3,986 requests) related to attendance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment types</th>
<th>Standard (SAS)</th>
<th>Non-standard (UoS)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>8230</td>
<td>3011</td>
<td>11241</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>2646</td>
<td>3972</td>
<td>6618</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative assessments/demonstrations</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td>6802</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>8070</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours thesis</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-semester exam</td>
<td>2581</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>2932</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional assignment or test</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills based evaluation</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial quiz, small test or small continuous assessment</td>
<td>3228</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>3752</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written assignment</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26906</td>
<td>9698</td>
<td>36604</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 3 – Report of Student Support Services

Jordi Austin, Director, Student Support Services
Dagmar Kminiak, Manager, Disability Support Services
DVC Registrar Portfolio

Recommendations
1. That the Assessment Working Group Committee notes that Student Support Services strongly supports the aims and initiatives proposed to review the Universities approach to assessment.
2. Student Support Services recommends broader discussion of universal design principles in assessment development.
3. Student Support Services supports development of a cross unit assessment plan that enables deep disciplinary learning, without overloading staff or student workload.
4. Student Support Services is available to provide additional feedback or discussion surrounding universal design or student development trajectory.

Background
Student Support Services strongly support the aims and initiatives proposed by the Assessment Working Group to review the University’s approach to assessment. There are many benefits to be gained from reforming the current assessment practices to reduce the aggregated impact of inadequately planned learning and assessment methodology. We support reforms that will decrease the burdensome load that assessments can place on students, as well as efforts to improve timeliness of feedback to students on their mastery of learning outcomes. We also support the development of assessment planning through disciplinary majors and minors to enhance the student development trajectory.

Patterns of utilisation rates at Counselling and Psychological Services and Disability Services indicates peaks in service demand coinciding with assessment log-jams (notably week 7, 11 and 13 of semester). This is further exacerbated by the complex and bureaucratic process involved in application for special consideration, and the often guillotine application of Fail grades, frequently in professional and clinical programs, that will cause a student to fall out of step with a suitable course progression. This is particularly acute for international students where loss of one or two semesters in sequencing of their studies is highly stressful and detrimental to their overall ability to complete their course. The impact of not meeting a single assessment milestone is disproportionately punitive in these circumstances.

Qualitative feedback from the Academic Honesty report (2016) indicates that students are under time pressure to complete multiple assessments which are often perceived as trivial “jumping through hoops” or at best ancillary to their learning. This increases time and workload pressure without enabling deeper or intrinsically rewarding learning to occur. Students reported that this also increases the temptation to take “short cuts” in producing work to satisfy the assessment task hurdle. From the student feedback, modifications to assessment methodology will simultaneously increase the students desire to comply with academic learning and integrity.

Consideration of students’ desire for to be treated like a member of the learning community should also be taken into account when planning reforms. Data from the Academic Integrity Survey conducted in 2016 supports this with one student commenting:

I think it’s important to help students feel that their work is valuable and contributes to the greater picture of academia, and that they are academics, from the moment they begin at university. This way they will come to see their work as not just a way to pass the course and leave, but as a valuable contribution to their field, and that their academic “peers” (even if they are far senior to them) are worthy of having their work respected, just as they themselves are. Combatting academic dishonesty has to start with changing the culture and mindset of students about academic work.

Student Support Services are currently working with Carers NSW to understand the pressures experienced by students who have dual responsibilities of being a both student and a carer and their need for workload flexibility so as to manage both roles. The Chair, Academic Board, is actively supporting this project to enable equitable access to learning opportunities.

Significant external personal and social responsibilities, flexibility in managing workload, carers responsibility, distance from site of learning, requirements to work to support study (no significant increase in Centrelink entitlements etc).
Application of Universal Design principles
Some of the reforms the working group seeks to implement could be addressed through implementation of universal design (UD) principles (see section below). The Disability Services team currently advocate for the use of universal design principles wherein the delivery of education and teaching practices are adjusted to be more inclusive. UD creates an environment where learning is enabled for specific cohorts which may also benefit other members of the university community. In relation to universal design for assessment, learning outcomes can be evaluated by a variety of assessment mechanisms that allow students to demonstrate their capability and content mastery. This method provides equivalence in learning via multiple means of demonstrating that learning.

Transitioning towards delivering education and assessment with universal design principles will require some upskilling of staff and additional resources in the establishment phase, but the benefits will be vast for student development, equitable opportunity to demonstrate mastery, and in providing students with increased control over how they manage their time.

Disability Services have provided the following commentary on how the current assessment approach impacts on students with disability.

Impact of the current assessment approach on students with disability
The current assessment regime frequently consists of summative assessments which are often high stakes. Specifically, these assessments cumulate to the end of the semester and prior to the formal exam period and as a result of this, some students may experience an exacerbation of their disability, further impacting on their performance in the formal exam period. This can also make the application of reasonable adjustments difficult, as extensions of time for written assessments often cannot be applied to all assessments towards the end of the semester, due to the impact on marking and feedback. This also places pressure on the faculty in terms of implementation of adjustments and accommodation of extraordinary requests for assessment. Units where there is an assessment structure consisting of two assessments which are both heavily weighted places significant pressure on students and can result in an exacerbation of their condition.

Assessment regimes where there is too much assessment with little real-time feedback on performance creates additional workload stress for students. We often find that if a student is struggling to understand core concepts from the beginning, and no feedback has been provided along the way, this increases the likelihood of the student failing the summative assessments.

Inclusive assessment
Inclusive assessment refers to the design and use of fair and effective assessment methods which enable all students to meet the required learning outcomes to their full potential. An inclusive assessment regime offers students different assessment opportunities to demonstrate content mastery. That is, students would be able to select an assessment format which is accessible to them and which does not require modification or the application of a reasonable adjustment from the faculty, for example pre-filming a presentation, poster submissions, viva voce instead of written work/exam.

Inclusive assessment uses the same assessment outcome targets for all students, however provides benefits in workload flexibility and learning management tools for students, reduces staff workload through removing the need for in semester bespoke adjustments for disability conditions.

Track and Connect – student feedback on volume and timing of assessment
Track and Connect is an early intervention retention and student success initiative developed by Student Support Services. It has been running in participating subjects across multiple faculties since a successful pilot in Semester Two 2012. The program has proven effective in helping first year students to access key services and support available to them, resulting in increased student retention and success, and contributing to a valuable feedback loop between students and faculties. It provides students with key information about support services and resources, while also providing detailed de-identified feedback for unit coordinators.

The Track and Connect callers frequently speak to students who indicate that they have difficulty managing their assessment workload. The key piece of feedback received about assessment across all subjects is that students really struggle when their assessment due dates fall at the same time in semester and their difficulty in keeping up with the volume. Timeliness of feedback is also highlighted
by students as supporting their learning - in units of study which have assessments (even if they are small ones) early in the semester have a better sense of their progress; when students have not had any assessments by mid-semester we often hear that they are uncertain as to how they are progressing or what actions they need to take to remain engaged and on top of their studies.

**Universal Design for Learning**

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) provides a blueprint for creating and implementing flexible learning environments, goals, pedagogies, materials, and assessments that accommodate learner differences. (cast.org)

There are three primary principles that guide universal design for learning and provide the framework (see Wakefield, 2011).

**Principle 1: Provide Multiple Means of Representation (the “what” of learning)**

Learners differ in the ways that they perceive and comprehend information that is presented to them. For example, those with sensory disabilities (e.g., visual impairment); learning disabilities (e.g., dyslexia); language or cultural differences, and so forth may all require different ways of approaching content. Others may simply grasp information quicker or more efficiently through visual or auditory means rather than printed text. Also learning, and transfer of learning, occurs when multiple representations are used, because it allows students to make connections within, as well as between, concepts. In short, there is not one means of representation that will be optimal for all learners; providing options for representation is essential.

**Principle 2: Provide Multiple Means of Action and Expression (the “how” of learning)**

Learners differ in the ways that they can navigate a learning environment and express what they know. For example, individuals with significant movement impairments (e.g., cerebral palsy), those who struggle with strategic and organizational abilities (executive function disorders), those who have language barriers, and so forth approach learning tasks very differently. Some may be able to express themselves well in written text but not speech, and vice versa. It should also be recognized that action and expression require a great deal of strategy, practice, and organization, and this is another are in which learners can differ. In reality, there is not one means of action and expression that will be optimal for all learners; providing options for action and expression is essential. This is the principle that has greater relevance for the area of assessment, however all principles need to be in place to ensure universal design for learning.

**Principle 3: Provide Multiple Means of Engagement (the “why” of learning)**

Affect represents a crucial element to learning, and learners differ markedly in the ways in which they can be engaged or motivated to learn. There are a variety of sources that can influence individual variation in affect including neurology, culture, personal relevance, subjectivity, and background knowledge, along with a variety of other factors presented in these guidelines. Some learners are highly engaged by spontaneity and novelty while other are disengaged, even frightened, by those aspects, preferring strict routine. Some learners might like to work alone, while others prefer to work with their peers. In reality, there is not one means of engagement that will be optimal for all learners in all contexts; providing multiple options for engagement is essential.

In the UDL framework, assessment is described as the process of gathering information about a learner’s performance using a variety of methods and materials in order to determine learners’ knowledge, skills, and motivation for the purpose of making informed educational decisions. Within the UDL framework, the goal is to improve the accuracy and timeliness.

**Measurable Outcomes and Assessment Plan**

Prior to planning the instructional experience, establish how learning is going to be measured. Considerations should include:

- previously established lesson goals and learner needs
- embedding checkpoints to ensure all learners are successfully meeting their desired outcomes
- providing learners multiple ways and options to authentically engage in the process, take action, and demonstrate understanding, and
- supporting higher-order skills and encouraging a deeper connection with the content (Lawrence, 2011).
Considerations when planning assessments using a Universal Design for Learning approach (Burgstahler, 2015; Moore, 2013)

- Regular feedback is provided during the course. This could be in the form of formative assessments, peer feedback, students submitting sections of large projects for feedback before the final project is due, and the chance for resubmission.
- Clear expectations around assessments and learning outcomes are set at the beginning of the course. This includes providing a rubric for assessment tasks with clear marking criteria.
- Ask students to identify their preferred learning style early on in the course to assist them to identify which assessment type would best demonstrate their knowledge.
- Provide choice in assessment type to all students, this may reduce the need for adjustments for some students. (see examples below of assessment types).
- Provision of sample or previous tests and study guides.

Examples of alternate assessment types

- Poster board (that you can assemble, take a picture of and post)
- Video recording: video presentation, video portfolio, taped seminar report
- Audio recording
- Journals
- Peer critiques
- Design reports
- Viva with supporting portfolio
- Portfolios with supporting commentary
- Oral presentation of a research report
- Connect cards: student has compulsory readings and summarises content on a card and submits to academic

Matrix of assessment modes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytical exercise</th>
<th>Examinations (unseen)</th>
<th>Placement or exchange reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Briefings</td>
<td>Exhibition and unseen displays</td>
<td>Portfolios and sketchbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer-based assessments and exercises</td>
<td>Extended investigations (e.g. statistical)</td>
<td>Practical reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous assessment</td>
<td>Field-work reports</td>
<td>Problem based learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework with discussion elements</td>
<td>Finding primary source material</td>
<td>Projects, independent or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical diaries, learning logs and journals</td>
<td>Geological mapping</td>
<td>Sandwich year reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critics</td>
<td>&quot;In class&quot; and module tests</td>
<td>Simulation exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data interpretation exercises</td>
<td>Internship diaries</td>
<td>Slide and picture tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design tasks</td>
<td>Laboratory examinations and practical tests</td>
<td>Student-led seminars, presentations and discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>Laboratory practical reports</td>
<td>Synoptic examinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Multiple choice testing</td>
<td>Treatment reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic presentations: CD, web pages, etc.</td>
<td>On-line assessment</td>
<td>Video formats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay assignments</td>
<td>Optical Mark Reader assessments</td>
<td>Viva voce examinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinations (open book)</td>
<td>Oral examinations</td>
<td>Work books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinations (seen)</td>
<td>Peer and self-evaluation</td>
<td>Work experience report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinations (take away)</td>
<td>Personal research projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using a Universal Design for Learning Approach to Assessment

Currently students with disability are provided with reasonable adjustments to enable them to be on a level playing field with their peers. The process of obtaining reasonable adjustments can be time consuming and complex for students and staff alike (Fossey et al., 2017).
If a universal design for learning approach is utilised and there is flexibility built into the assessment methods and schedules, then there would be reduced need for reasonable adjustments for some students with disability. If fewer students had reasonable adjustments for assessment tasks this would reduce the workload for academic and administrative staff within faculties.

Waterfield and West (2006) theorised that universal design could accommodate individual differences between learners without the need for routine categorisation and negative labelling. Flexibility in assessment could therefore also remove the need for disclosure of their disability for some students and protect their privacy.

Best-practice suggests that flexible assessment options should be offered for students as part of the unit of study assessment structure.
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Attachment 4 – Report of the Students’ Representative Council
SRC Casework Service

Introduction
The Students’ Representative Council (SRC) makes this submission for consideration as part of the review into the current assessment regime at the University of Sydney. The SRC appreciates consideration of the issues raised with this submission, and in recent consultation with the Assessment Working Group. We seek to highlight some of the issues students face under the current regime, and recommend the review team take into account the concerns raised by this submission.

When a student utilises the SRC’s Casework Service, it is quite common to see multiple issues stemming from the presenting issue. The impact that the current assessment regime has on students can manifest in various ways and also heavily influence the student’s options and decisions. We see a very real impact of the current timing of assessments on students’ ability to manage deadlines and make informed decisions appropriately. This can impact multiple areas of the student experience including but not limited to discontinue deadlines, future academic integrity issues, and eligibility for financial assistance (e.g., Centrelink, scholarships, etc.).

Timing and volume
With the bulk of assessment due after the deadline for a Discontinue Not Fail (DC) grade, students cite time management and stress as the reason(s) they unintentionally or deliberately plagiarised. The majority of our academic honesty cases begin around week 10 with investigations extending beyond the examination period. During this time we experience an increased demand on our services, impacting on our other areas of work.

The timing of assessments tends to be unevenly skewed towards the second half of the teaching period, and reduces the use or effectiveness of formative learning and assessment. If 25-30% of a unit of study’s weighting had to be submitted before week 7, this would allow students to have access to quality feedback earlier in a course and have a realistic sense of how they are performing in a unit, with scope to build on skills, seek academic support and improve across semester.

We believe the University can afford to be more flexible in determining the nature and timing of adjustments for students. We understand that academics reasonably require enough time after an assessment has been submitted to provide sufficient feedback and accurately apply the marking rubric, but we concerned that students submitting an assessment with an extended deadline may have an excessive delay in feedback. Academics must be afforded sufficient portions of time to allow for high quality marking, even with extensions of submission deadlines, to provide students with the educative value reasonable for an assessment.

Many unit coordinators are not aware of the existence of, or their discretion to allow, simple extensions of up to two working days under the current policy. The SRC strongly supports flexibility for unit of study coordinators to give extensions on assessments, while still maintaining academic integrity. The SRC has received feedback from students that the simple extension and special consideration system seems opaque and in many circumstances adds to their distress.

Formative assessment, timing and feedback, OLEs
Formative assessment is necessary and while it can take time for academics to have the ability to return work to students, this timing can have a significant impact on students. We have seen subjects where a 60% assessment was due the day after the return of the previous 40% assessment. This practice does not allow students to receive feedback on their work in order to improve their learning. The SRC supports increased feedback to students through assessment tasks that align with the learning and teaching outcomes. We also acknowledge that many lecturers and tutors may have competing time demands and have limited support to deliver constructive feedback, which can result in a decline in quality education and teaching.

One hundred percent exams continue to be problematic as there is no room for cumulative feedback and learning across the semester. The benefit of only having one assessment task is then outweighed by the lack of prior feedback on progress in the unit of study. The SRC recommends a decrease in summative assessment, and acknowledges the need for a defined measure for determining credit points and a proportional study load. Many students have reported that first year mathematics subjects are
weighted with 3 credit points, but require the same workload as a 6 credit point subject. The SRC recommends that a benchmark is developed to determine the appropriate workload for 1 credit point, and that this model is applied to existing units as well as units being introduced through the new curriculum’s OLE’s.

**Group work**

Group work urgently needs to be reviewed as an assessment method, and only used for assessment purposes when it is educationally defensible. Too often we see group work used where it is a part of historical suite of assessment styles, or a time efficient measure, rather than holding genuine educative value. Group work is often treated as an assignment divided into small individual assignments, where there is no difference to providing students individual assessments. Clear and realistic objectives need to be developed, together with an understanding that group work needs to be used in a constructive way. We recommend that where group work is to be used for assessment, a template rubric developed to guide effective group work is utilised, unit of study coordinators present a demonstrated need, and the faculty grants approval.

The increased reliance and overuse of group work has also led to widespread stigmatising of certain demographics within the student population. Cultural differences, age gaps, language barriers, and real or perceived (dis)ability can lead to stress and tension amongst student groups, rather than fostering a sense of shared learning. While the intent of group work is often to learn collaborative skills and to work with others, the reality is this outcome is seldom achieved. The SRC has seen many group work assessments lead to bullying, harassment, and students leaving or failing the subject. The effectiveness of group work is further compromised by issues including distribution of work, limited or no class time dedicated to allowing groups to work together, group members with unavoidable commitments, e.g., employment, or caring for dependents, that make prioritising workload challenging. This can lead to academic honesty issues and lacks a truly collaborative approach.

**Administration processes and considerations**

As most disciplines schedule the bulk of assessment deadlines after the DC deadline, students may not have enough indicators to make an informed decision prior to the census date, to avoid academic and financial penalty, or the deadlines to discontinue without academic penalty. As with other special consideration processes, time spent seeking advice and gathering further documentation can have a compounding effect on subsequent deadlines throughout the semester. Many students may struggle to cope with their workload, but may feel the need to remain enrolled full time for the purposes of Centrelink payments; transport concessions; eligibility for student specific accommodation; and scholarships.

Key dates should be included in all unit of study outlines so students are aware of their options and can make informed decisions around managing their workload. A significant portion of the student population are not aware that Discontinue Fail (DF) and Discontinue not to Count as failure (DC) grades even exist. The fact that this information is difficult to access on the university website, and students are often not aware before issues reach crisis point, inhibits students from being proactive in managing study loads. Instead, problems often accumulate then exacerbate and these difficulties manifest in the form of academic integrity issues, fails and absent fails, damage to mental health, and in some cases attrition.

**International students managing study load**

We see a reluctance within some faculties to reduce international students’ study load to part time (below 18 credit points), even where ‘at risk’, or documented medical or compassionate circumstances exist, in compliance with the ESOS Act. This makes it more difficult for international students to manage their studies effectively.

**University’s approach to assessment**

An effective assessment regime will add to the quality of the degree, reinforce the integrity of the students’ candidature, and increase the value of the institution in the marketplace.
Attachment 5 – Report of the Office of Educational Integrity
Tristan Enright, Manager, Educational Integrity
DVC Education Portfolio

Background
A number of new or enhanced initiatives were introduced by the University of Sydney in 2016 to assure the integrity of its educational courses. These initiatives have served to enhance the University’s efforts to promote a strong culture of educational integrity, educate students to high ethical standards, and prevent, detect and report potential breaches of academic honesty.

In 2016, a total of 3,330 incidents involving 2,929 individual students were reported across the University for investigation to faculty Educational Integrity Coordinators and nominated academics. This represented a 220% increase on the average 1,500 incidents reported annually in each of the 6 preceding years. While this is a consequence of the increased use of similarity detection software, it is also a direct result of the more reliable, transparent and consistent reporting procedures made possible by the introduction of an online, University-wide reporting system. This system has enabled the University to capture detailed incident and demographic data to identify patterns in breaches of academic integrity more rapidly, accurately and extensively than was possible in the past.

Timing and volume of assessment
Figure A5.1 on the following page demonstrates overall patterns in incident reporting in 2016. As is evident, there was an initial spike in reporting in the middle third of semester 1, which was then eclipsed by the larger spike in reporting at or after the end of the teaching session. This overall pattern holds for semester 2, although a significantly higher number of incidents were reported in semester 1 following the final day of the session on 25 June 2016 than were reported at or after the end of semester 2.

The time series data presented in figure A5.1 also provides some indication of the timing and volume of assessment across the University in each semester insofar as it relates to peaks and troughs in reporting. As is indicated for each semester, the rate of incident reporting appears to rise around Week 9 of each semester (see 7 May for semester 1 and 1 October for semester 2). The rate of reporting continues to rise for a number of weeks, before dropping off slightly ahead of, and then increase again during, the formal examination period. As there were often problems with the timeliness of incident reporting in 2016 – with reporting typically following assessment deadlines by some 2 to 3 weeks – this indicates that the volume of assessment across the University appears to increase at about Week 6 or 7 in each semester and remains at a relatively high level until the end of the formal examination period.

Impact of the timing and volume of assessment on students
The 2,929 students reported for suspected plagiarism or academic dishonesty in 2016 represented approximately 5% of the University’s total coursework cohort. However, a much smaller proportion (~1.39%) were found to have engaged in either academic dishonesty or misconduct. Even so, there were a number of trends identified through the reporting data in 2016 that are relevant to the strategic review of assessment currently being undertaken by the Assessment Working Group.
Figure A5.1. Educational integrity incidents reported by week in 2016.
**Students studying full time are more at risk**

The reported incidents of suspected plagiarism or academic dishonesty overwhelmingly involved students undertaking full-time study. This trend continued through semester 2, such that 90% of all incidents reported involved students studying full-time.

One reason for this could be related to the volume of work students studying full-time complete relative to students enrolled part-time, which means the chances of being reported for suspected plagiarism or academic dishonesty are substantially higher. However, as demonstrated in the time series data presented in figure A6.1, the noticeable concentration of the incidents reported in each semester is more likely than not to be a result of a concentration of assessment deadlines across a high number of units.

This apparent concentration of assessment is corroborated by feedback the Office has received from faculty educational integrity teams. Many of the students they met with reported having difficulty managing their regular and assessment-related workloads, and expressed feelings of stress and anxiety as a result. The issues and experiences described by students shed some light on what may lead some to making regrettable choices or submitting work of a poorer standard than they may otherwise be able to produce. There is therefore a compelling case to be made for investigating ways to better manage the timing and volume of assessment at the unit of study, major and degree level.

**International students are most at risk**

Overall, international students were more likely than their domestic counterparts to be reported for suspected plagiarism or academic dishonesty, although this varied slightly among faculties. This trend also appears to have continued across the University throughout the second half of 2016, with the incidents involving international students constituting 54.1% of all reported incidents as compared to an overall enrolment ratio of 31.8%.

While international students were more likely to be reported overall, the relevant incidents overwhelmingly involved students in their first or second year of candidature (71% and 21%), which is somewhat higher than the relevant University-wide averages (61% and 23%). International students were also more likely to be enrolled full time than part time (94% and 6%), which is to be expected given that they are required to be engaged in a full course load under the *Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000*. This means that the timing and volume of assessment may have contributed to the higher rate at which international students were reported.

In total, 327 domestic and 221 international students were found to have engaged in plagiarism, representing 0.08% of all domestic and 1.21% of all international coursework students, respectively. A further 288 domestic and 466 international students were also found to have engaged in academic dishonesty, representing 0.07% of all domestic and 2.56% of all international coursework students, respectively. Here, though, it is also worth noting that inappropriate cooperation and the reuse of work previously submitted for assessment are included in the University’s definition of academic dishonesty. While this is in itself concerning, it may also indicate that a culture of peer (albeit illegitimate) cooperation has developed within international cohorts as a strategic response to the challenges posed by studying in a foreign country as second language students.

In sum, the higher rate at which international students were reported indicates that more can be done to support them in their transition to the University and a foreign educational culture. Given that international students now constitute approximately a quarter to a third of the student population, there is also an argument to be made for modifying the current approach to assessment adopted across the University to ensure that international students are given adequate time and opportunities to become accustomed to (or more adequately included within) a new educational environment.
Attachment 6 – Outcomes of student roundtable on assessment

Executive summary
A total of 14 assessment-focussed fora were held across the University between June and September 2017, concluding with a roundtable discussion of assessment with student representatives to the Academic Board on Friday 8 September 2017. While the students present expressed broad support for the assessment-related initiatives of the University Strategy, they raised concerns about the intention to provide a statement of achievement on academic transcripts and whether assessment of the graduate qualities will add to the current volume of assessment. They also provided feedback on current approaches to assessment and the related issues. An overview of key issues and concerns expressed by the students is presented below for the working group’s reference.

Assessing the graduate qualities
The students present were supportive of the University’s intention to begin systematically assessing the graduate qualities as a means of enhancing teaching, learning and assessment across the institution. They were also supportive of the notion of being provided with a statement at graduation indicating their level of attainment of each of the graduate qualities. Despite broad support for these initiatives, a number of questions were raised about the proposed approach. These are summarised as follows.
1. Clarification was sought regarding whether the statement provided at graduation would reflect students’ achievement of the graduate qualities in each assessment and unit of study, or whether the statement would reflect an overall level of achievement. It was emphasised that the intention was to provide students with a description of their overall achievement, but that this description would be based on the highest level of achievement attained by each student.
2. Clarification was sought about who would be developing the descriptions to appear on the statement of achievement. Those present were provided with an overview of the work currently being undertaken to develop a suite of University-level rubrics that will define each of the graduate qualities in broad terms and describe different standards or levels of achievement along a continuum (or scale) of development. As achievement of the graduate qualities will necessarily be dependent on the context of the different fields of study in which students are engaged, these rubrics will be translated or interpreted within each field of study. While the University-level descriptions provide the necessary framework for this, the descriptions of the different levels of achievement for each of the graduate qualities will thus be written or developed by those with expertise in the relevant field or fields of study. It was also noted that these descriptions would not be presented in a manner similar to the bands used to report on achievement in the Higher School Certificate or in terms of the grades commonly used across the University (e.g., Pass, Credit, etc.). Instead, the descriptions will be positive statements about what each student can do individually.
3. Some concern was expressed about the manner in which the statement on the graduate qualities will be provided to students. In particular, concern was expressed about the statement being included on the transcript, with more support being expressed for the provision of a separate statement. Concern was also expressed about whether a generic statement on the standard attained by each graduate quality could adequately capture a student’s achievements, and whether it would be better for any such statement to be written by a trusted member of the academic staff. While the latter approach is not precluded by a provision of a statement on the graduate qualities, it was noted that such an approach is not scalable and would place potentially onerous demands on individual members of staff. It was emphasised that a statement on attainment will likely convey more about what students can do than the current practice of limiting statements of achievement solely through numerical marks and grades, although the statement is envisaged as complimentary to the latter. Despite this, there was still some apprehension about the nature of the statement of achievement, with an opt-in approach or student review of the statement prior to its finalisation being suggested.
4. Beyond reporting students’ achievement of the graduate qualities, a number of questions were asked about how the assessment of the graduate qualities would be undertaken in relation to current assessment in units of study. Questions were asked about whether assessment of the graduate qualities would replace existing unit of study assessment or whether it would be appropriate for assessment of the graduate qualities (and the related learning experiences) to be conducted as separate from units of study. It was emphasised that the graduate qualities should not be seen as separate from the learning outcomes expressed for units and fields of study, but
rather as integral to these. It was also emphasised that much unit of study assessment already includes assessment of the graduate qualities, even if only implicitly, so assessment of the graduate qualities does not necessarily represent a radical departure from existing assessment practices. However, some of the graduate qualities are relatively new (e.g., interdisciplinary effectiveness or influence), so academic staff across the University will need to give careful consideration to how the full suite of qualities can be meaningfully developed and assessed within each field of study. It was noted that this will likely be done within units of study, although there is some latitude to share development and assessment of the graduate qualities across units of study at the level of the relevant major, program or stream.

5. There was also some concern expressed about the potential for individual bias to affect assessment of any student’s achievement of the graduate qualities, particularly in the context of one-to-one teaching. This is an issue that will be given further consideration, although it was emphasised that the final statement on the graduate qualities will be developed on the basis of a composite picture of each student’s level of attainment, although the highest level of attainment will be that which is reported. As students will complete multiple units of study taught by multiple academic staff to complete their degrees, there is already an in-built mechanism for moderating any potential bias on the part of one member of staff incorporated within the proposed model.

**General views on assessment**

Broadly speaking, the students present did not express general dissatisfaction with current approaches to assessment, although there was a diversity of views expressed about what works in different contexts. The students present also recognised that there is unlikely to be an ideal future state or assessment profile that would apply to all students given the diversity of fields of study in which they are engaged. They demonstrated a particularly acute understanding of the context-dependent nature of assessment, which is necessarily related to the specific field of study. However, they also emphasised the importance of all assessment tasks being meaningful, or authentic, to the context and the learning outcomes being sought. Where any assessment appears as unrelated to the learning outcomes and context, and instead appears to be designed to meet other, potentially arbitrary criteria (e.g., word count equivalence), assessment was generally seen as contrary to the aims of a University education.

Specific issues with the way in which assessment is currently conducted are summarised below.

1. **Mixed views were expressed the use of small continuous assessment, usually in the form of weekly tasks or quizzes of low value in the overall weighting of unit of study assessment.** For those in the science-related disciplines, small continuous assessment was viewed as beneficial if it enables students to test their understanding of the material covered and to prepare for final exams of a substantially higher weighting. While other students indicated that small continuous assessment can be beneficial, they emphasised that the weight of such tasks was less important than the feedback they are intended to provide and their meaningfulness in relation to assisting students meet the specific learning outcomes. Where the relationship between small continuous assessment and the learning outcomes of units of study was not apparent or clear, there was little enthusiasm for this style of assessment. Some concern was also expressed regarding assumptions about the volume of work associated with low weighted assessment. Some students indicated that the low weighting does not always reflect the work required or the specific learning context in which the task has been set, particularly where students are required to engage with relevant bodies of literature and attend multiple lectures, tutorials and practical classes.

2. **Mixed views were expressed about what was seen as an appropriate weight associated with individual items of assessment.** There was some support expressed for summative assessment accorded high to very high weighting, usually final examinations, provided that this was appropriately and directly supported by continuous formative assessment. However, there was less support expressed for assessment tasks of high to very high weighting by students studying in non-scientific disciplines. Here, the suggestion was made that the maximum weight for any item of assessment should be capped at around 50% as anything higher potentially represents a significant barrier to progress should anything go wrong or any student not perform at their best level at the time. Higher weighted assessments were also linked to increasing use of special consideration, and were identified as problematic for students living with disability, many of whom do not report their circumstances, or seek assistance from, the University’s Disability Services.

3. There was some support for the idea of enabling students to engage with assessment requirements in a more flexible manner, such as moving away from an emphasis on strict deadlines to a
general period through which students would be encouraged to complete a specific task. However, it was noted that a more structured approach to assessment is beneficial in the first year of candidature in terms of facilitating students’ transition toward more independent modes of study and learning. It was also noted that a more flexible structure could be useful or beneficial in later years of candidature. Students were also asked about whether being able to negotiate the nature of the specific kinds of assessment they could undertake, or the weighting applied to assessment tasks, in units of study would be of interest or value, although there were no strong views expressed for or against this notion.

4. The current conduct of group-based assessment was also raised as an issue. An example of the effective facilitation and assessment of group work was described in relation to this. In this example, students were given time in class to work together on the project, with the product of the group work being afforded a lower weighting than items of assessment that individual students were required to complete, even where these were related to the group work. Support was expressed by other students for this approach. In particular, it was noted that the assumption that students are able, or should be required, to effectively coordinate their schedules outside of teaching contact hours was misplaced and often led to students delegating components of the overall piece of work and combining these immediately ahead of submission without time for adequate discussion and integration.
Attachment 7 – Theoretical foundations of a common approach to assessment

Prof Jim Tognolini, Director, Educational Measurement and Assessment Hub
Sydney School of Education and Social Work, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to outline some steps that should be taken to maximise the chances of producing comparable assessments across the University as it moves towards:

1. developing a University-wide approach (e.g. via shared rubrics) for assessment of graduate qualities to be used by staff and students with a focus on capstone and project units
2. developing aligned assessment plans at the level of course component to ensure effective placing of authentic assessment experiences, educational integrity and achievement of learning outcomes at the appropriate level
3. considering policy and course management options for integrative assessment across units of study and disciplines and in interdisciplinary units embedded in majors, projects and the Sydney Research Seminars
4. recommending optimal processes for effective assessment practice in collaborative and project learning settings, and
5. reviewing policy for streamlining and reducing summative assessment at the unit of study level, making increased use of low credit value and optional no-value formative assessment, and of learning analytics to provide feedback on learning to students and staff and on the learning process as a whole.

In introducing the reforms outlined above into an organisation as diverse as the University it is imperative that there be an overarching assessment theory that enables the various stakeholders (faculties and schools) to build their own assessments and measures while retaining the capacity to report against university wide standards.

Consequently, the first stage in the process involves articulating a theory of assessment predicated upon giving marks more common meaning by referencing them to standards and on a measurement model that will underpin the development of rubrics, interdisciplinary project assessment, the construction of “developmental curricula”, etc.

The basic elements of standards-referenced systems

A standards-referenced system is a model for giving meaning to achievement by referencing it to student learning or standards. This effectively shifts the focus in assessment from notions of rank ordering students (comparing their performance to each other) to those of monitoring growth or progress and measurement along a developmental continuum (Bennett, Tognolini and Pickering, 2012; Davidson and Tognolini, 2013; Tognolini and Stanley, 2007). It requires the articulation of what is meant by growth in a subject or construct. Rather than just a mark in an examination the system provides students with a description of the types of knowledge and skills that they have acquired in a subject at the end of a course.

When talking about assessment it is important to have a common understanding of some of the key terms: assessment, testing, evaluation and measurement. Inside and outside of education circles these terms are often used in overlapping and inconsistent ways (Tognolini and Stanley, 2007).

Assessment involves professional judgment about student performance with respect to a continuum of development and is based upon the image formed of the student by the collection of evidence.

Assessment is an inclusive term, which refers to all those processes used to collect information and make judgments about student achievement (Davidson and Tognolini, 2013; Tognolini and Stanley, 2007). Within each knowledge domain, teaching experience and subject expertise helps develop the image of achievement embodied in the standard. Testing is just one way of collecting information about students. As a formal process, it is a structured form of assessment collected according to specified procedures (question types, answer formats, etc.).

Evaluation is when performance data is summarised by assigning a grade, comment or a mark and a judgement is made regarding the value of the image (it is good or bad; it is worth an A; it is a high
distinction; etc.). Finally, measurement is the process of assigning a number to the performance to represent position with respect to the developmental continuum underlying the performance and indicates how much of the property (construct) being assessed is present (Davidson and Tognolini, 2013).

Standards-referenced systems generally comprise a curriculum (syllabus or framework) that describes through its statement of aims, objectives, learning outcomes and content, what is developed and to be understood in an area of learning (Bennett, Tognolini and Pickering, 2012). Teaching and learning is based on the curriculum. The most important sources of information for the design of assessments and judging attainment of curriculum standards are the learning outcomes and content.

Performance (achievement) standards are explicit statements of student performance that describe the levels of achievement along the developmental path within the learning area (Bennett, Tognolini and Pickering, 2012). The outcomes are developed to enable the students to achieve the performance standards and as such, show growth in relation to the construct being assessed. The performance of students as reflected through the assessment tasks (both formative and summative) is then referenced to these standards.

In the case of the University of Sydney, the graduate qualities (outcomes):  
1. describe what characterises learning within the University and the generic curriculum offerings, and must be developed with these outcomes in mind, and  
2. should be organised in a way that enables student achievement relative to the graduate qualities to be taught and measured.

When constructing assessment tasks, the marking rubrics (and options in the case of multiple choice items) should reflect the theory. In a standards-referenced system, tasks (items or questions) should be set in a way that provides evidence of where the students are located along the developmental continuum. If this is done then every response can be interpreted in terms of location (and hence ability, knowledge and skills) and should give an indication of what needs to be done to improve learning.

Some basic task development requirements would include making sure that:
• the items and tasks (e.g. tests, assignments, practical work, and projects) are aligned to the content standards (outcomes) articulated in the syllabus  
• the items, and tasks that are developed enable students at different stages in their learning to demonstrate what they know and can do, and  
• a range of different tasks is used to generate a reliable and valid estimate of the student’s location along the developmental continuum.

The contemporary interest in reporting against educational ‘benchmarks’ is based on standards referencing. Standards are defined in terms of more global descriptions of achievement and provide valuable information about the relative progress of student performance with respect to knowledge and skill development.

The developmental continuum  
A developmental continuum attempts to capture in words what it means to make progress or to improve in an area of learning or domain of knowledge. The further to the right along a developmental continuum, the more knowledge and higher order levels of cognition and affectivity related to the construct are present (Bloom and Krathwohl, 1956).

Figure A7.1 below gives a schematic representation of a developmental continuum, where GQ1 to GQ6 represent the University of Sydney graduate qualities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GQ1</th>
<th>Depth of disciplinary expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Critical thinking and problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Communication (oral and written)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Information/digital literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Inventiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The developmental continuum attempts to capture in words what it means to make progress or to improve in an area of learning or domain of knowledge. The further to the right along a developmental continuum, the more knowledge and higher order levels of cognition and affectivity related to the construct are present (Bloom and Krathwohl, 1956).
Figure A7.1: Schematic representation of growth of the graduate qualities where increasing levels show increasing higher order of cognition and “affectivity.”

The levels (1, 2, 3, etc.) represent increasing quantities of the various graduate qualities, and are descriptions of what it is students must know, be able to do and “value” to achieve the level. The descriptions are cumulative in the sense that to achieve Level 3, students have Level 2 PLUS some MORE of the property, construct or graduate quality, etc. These descriptions are referred to as the performance standards (Bennett, Tognolini and Pickering, 2012). It is a requirement of the measurement theory that underpins this approach that the Levels are cumulative.

The number of levels can vary across Graduate Qualities and is determined by how many different categories (levels) can be explicitly described in a way that enables the assessors to be able to distinguish between levels of performance within the graduate quality. The aggregate of the performances across the Graduate Qualities comprises “university learning”.

One of the key challenges is to be able to write the performance standards clearly and meaningfully for the students, lecturers and community; each of whom will use them in different ways (Sadler, 2005).

The requirements of the performance standards
The performance standards for the Graduate Qualities should:
- describe performance expectations and proficiency levels in the context of a clear conceptual framework, and be built on sound models of student learning (developmental continuum) and affective domain development;
- be clear, detailed, and complete; reasonable in scope; and both rigorous and well-grounded in the knowledge and affective domains;
- be elaborated so that curriculum, teaching and assessment are all aligned; and
- facilitate the development of curriculum (and associated assessments) that include the Graduate Qualities within all programs across the university.
Figure A7.1 above is indicative of a university-level analytic marking rubric (Sadler, 2005)\(^1\) and the requirements of the performance standards are the same as those of marking rubrics used in assessment at the task level within a unit of study (Lasater, 2007).\(^2\)

**Analytic marking rubrics**

Analytic marking rubrics provide a guide to marking all types of performance based on how the students perform on the separate criteria (graduate qualities in this case) related to the task. In the case of the graduate qualities, the qualities themselves are the criteria for the analytic rubric.\(^3\)

The main advantage of analytic marking rubrics is that they convert performance into a score and in the case of a measurement model, a location on a scale. A second advantage is that they enable everyone (students, lecturers and community) to see what is required of them to achieve the various levels of performance on each of the criteria that comprise the task.

The main disadvantage is that they are more difficult to write because there are more criteria. A second disadvantage is that consistency among the different markers is generally quite low.

It must be stressed that in most, if not all programs, student tasks are already assessed using analytic or holistic rubrics. There is however some variation in the extent to which these rubrics are articulated and the extent to which they meet the developmental requirements of a measurement model that enables them to be effectively evaluated.

One of the first challenges, at the university level, is to develop in a consensus manner rubrics (standards) for each of the graduate qualities that meet the requirements outlined above (appendices A8.2 and A8.3 show the basic process to be used for building rubrics). These rubrics together will define the broader learning that characterises the University of Sydney curriculum. They will also be the basis for field of study level graduate quality rubrics that can be written to reflect the various disciplines within the program, but still enable the reliable reporting of performance against the University standards on each of the graduate qualities.

Within each program, capstone units and project units will also need to show how the content of the unit enables reporting of performance against the program and university wide rubrics.

**Building the university level rubrics for the graduate qualities**

In 2017, the intention is to start the process of building rubrics for the graduate qualities. While the process is relatively generic, establishing rubrics for each graduate quality may be tackled in a slightly different way.

For example, in the case of ‘critical thinking’ (where there has been a significant number of generic and discipline specific rubrics produced) the intention is to carry out a literature review to produce a range of possible rubrics at the university level; and, a similar review to generate examples of rubrics that meet the measurement quality criteria at several discipline-specific levels.

One of the key foci with this approach is to address the research issue associated with the extent to which it is possible to measure critical thinking within a discipline and still make an on-balance judgement against the more generic critical thinking rubric for the purposes of reporting at a university level.

The intention is to develop, by the end of 2017, the critical thinking rubrics, conduct some initial work on equating the discipline-specific and generic rubrics, and design a strategy for validating the rubrics.\(^4\) In 2018, validation work on the rubrics will be carried out and then the critical thinking rubric will be trialled in 2019. The validation work may involve producing and trialling standardised rubric models.

---

\(^1\) See also [http://edglossary.org/rubric/](http://edglossary.org/rubric/).

\(^2\) Some useful examples of university level rubrics from Carnegie Mellon University can be found at [https://www.cmu.edu/teaching/designateach/teach/rubrics.html](https://www.cmu.edu/teaching/designateach/teach/rubrics.html).

\(^3\) See Appendix A8.1 as an example of a critical thinking rubric sourced from the University of Rhode Island.

\(^4\) See appendices A8.2 and A8.3 for indicative rubric models.
measures of critical thinking for validating the rubrics, building a scale and auditing the results across years.

A second example that uses a slightly different process is developing a rubric for ‘cultural competence.’ There are several groups currently building rubrics for cultural competence. The intention is to work with these groups to produce a combined rubric or set of rubrics that meet the needs of the various groups and at the same time meets the measurement requirements outlined above.

The plan is to develop the rubrics and design a strategy for validating them by the end of 2017. One of the focal points for this process is considering how, from a measurement perspective, various aspects (e.g. cultural competence associated with indigenous, SES, disability) of cultural competence can be brought together on a single scale. In 2018, further validation work will be conducted and the rubric trialed in 2019.

The third graduate quality for consideration in 2017 is ‘influence.’ The rubric to assess and measure influence is different to the other two. It requires a lot of conceptual work to define the construct and, once it is defined, it requires a significant amount of work to develop a measurement framework which takes the components of influence and defines growth or progression along the developmental scale. Once this is done, it requires a validation study to be carried out. This study would be carried out in 2018 and 2019.

Similar strategies are currently being developed for building all the graduate qualities at the university level.

**Measurement of student performance against rubrics**

Building the rubrics with the intention of measuring student performance is the first stage of the measurement process. However, once the rubrics are built and validated they must be used to measure student performance (Sadler, 2005; Webb, 2007).

Once again, this process can be carried out in different ways at different levels within the University. At the University level, it would be possible to add some statements related to those qualities that address “values” to the Course Experience Questionnaire and ask graduates to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with the statement. This would give some baseline data and would enable cross-temporal comparisons at a macro level. The self-report measure used here has the same limitations as most self-report measures and as such it would be just one piece of information that would be used to generate some evidence that the University is having an impact on the graduate quality being assessed. Cultural competence is one graduate quality that lends itself to such an assessment.

Scenarios have been used in higher education internationally to assess critical thinking. A similar assessment could be carried out at the university level on a sample of graduate students to provide some baseline data on performance on the graduate quality of critical thinking. Repetition of such an assessment with different samples across years would give some evidence as to the impact that the University is having on this graduate quality. The reliability and validity of such assessments would need to be determined. It is one approach in which the University can get an indication as to the impact of the efforts to incorporate the graduate qualities into the University programs.

In both these cases there would need to be standard setting exercises carried out to establish cut scores on the assessments that align to the performance standards of the University Graduate Quality rubrics and reporting would be done against the rubrics.

Perhaps the best way to ultimately measure performance of students against the University rubrics is to aggregate up the assessments against the discipline specific rubrics from the unit level to the program level and finally to the University level (see figure A7.2). This is the most direct method of assessing performance against the Graduate Qualities and is based on the informed professional judgement of the lecturers themselves.
Figure A7.2: Schematic representation of an articulated university framework.

It may take some time as apart from building the rubrics at the different levels, there is a need to provide professional development for the lecturers who will have to assess against the rubrics in a comparable and fair way. This will also involve supporting the lecturers in developing assessment tasks that enable the students to demonstrate performance on the rubrics across the length of the program.

It may be possible in the meantime to take a sample of Capstone Units and Project Units and support these in an intensive way to generate some measures that will give some baseline data for comparative purposes from 2019 onwards.

Conclusion

Many universities have identified graduate qualities in their strategic plans. Unlike the University of Sydney, few have committed to measuring performance against these qualities. The reality is that if there is no attempt to measure impact, then the chances of the graduate qualities being implanted into the learning environment of the students is doubtful.
In undertaking to measure student performance on these graduate qualities the University has committed itself to the bold task of not only making sure that the measures that are used to report performance against the graduate qualities are as valid and reliable as possible, but also that the graduate qualities themselves are incorporated into the curriculum and assessments of the units that are used to transition knowledge skills and behaviours to its students.

To be successful it requires the support of the academic staff. In addition, the process needs to be founded on a sound measurement model that will maximise the chances of students being assessed on qualities that are critical to success in the 21st century in a fair and consistent way. The same measurement principles can also be used to provide optimal processes for effective assessment practice in collaborative and project learning settings; and, streamline and reduce summative assessment at the unit of study level.
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### Appendix A7.1 – Example of a critical thinking rubric from the University of Rhode Island

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Analysis and Evaluation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unclear on the goals of the analysis. Does not understand the purpose of the information provided. Limited consideration of sources to draw conclusions.</strong></td>
<td>Analyses and assesses the situation with limited awareness of the goals of the analysis. Assumes information is valid. Considers only few perspectives drawn from the book, class discussion, and own experiences to draw conclusions.</td>
<td>Analyses and assesses the situation with awareness of the goals of the analysis. Seeks out information. Considers some diverse perspectives drawn from the book, class discussion, and own experiences to draw conclusions.</td>
<td>Analyses and assesses the situation with a clear awareness of what needs to be accomplished. Views information critically. Considers multiple diverse perspectives drawn from the book, class discussion, and own experiences to draw conclusions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. Information | Recap: Relies on insufficient, irrelevant, or unreliable information. Fails to identify or hastily dismisses strong, relevant counter-arguments. Confuses information and inferences drawn from that information. | Gathers some credible information, but not enough; some information may be irrelevant. Omits significant information, including some strong counter-arguments. Sometimes confusing information and the inferences drawn from it. | Gathers sufficient credible, and relevant information. Includes some information from opposing views. Distinguishes between information and inferences drawn from it. | Gathers sufficient, credible, relevant information: observations, statements, logic, data, facts, questions, graphs, themes, assertions, descriptions, etc. Includes information that opposes as well as supports the argued position. Distinguishes between information and inferences drawn from that information. |

| 3. Problem/Opportunity Definition | Seems to be confused on the problem and fails to identify and summarize the problem/opportunity. Unsuccessful in justifying why the suggested technology is the ideal medium for solving the problem. | Problem/opportunity is identified but is not clear and summarization lacks focus. Partially successful in justifying why the suggested technology is the ideal medium for solving the problem. | Problem/opportunity is identified but is somewhat clear and summarization is basic. Mostly successful in justifying why the suggested technology is the ideal medium for solving the problem. | Clearly identifies and summarises the problem/opportunity. Explains why the suggested technology is the ideal medium for solving this problem. |

| 4. Objective Definition | Most business objectives do not address the problem/opportunity. | Develops business objectives that partially address the problem/opportunity. | Considers and evaluates ideas and incorporates them in developing business objectives that mostly address the problem/opportunity. | Considers and evaluates ideas and incorporates them in developing clear and measurable business objectives aligned with the problem/opportunity. |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 4.2 Assessment - A University-wide Approach - Page 64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Analyse problems using methodology and terminology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not identify most or any issues in a particular fact situation and fails to use appropriate methodology and terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Implications, Consequences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Solution Design Choice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optional</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumptions</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix A7.2 – Basic shell for building a critical thinking and problem solving rubric for the University of Sydney

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Problematisation</td>
<td>Articulation of challenges involved in relation to ideas or topics investigated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inference</td>
<td>The processes to reach a conclusion on the basis of reasoning from evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Analysis</td>
<td>The separating of any material or abstract ideas into its constituent elements. This process as a method of studying the nature of something or of determining its essential features and their relations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Synthesis</td>
<td>The combining of the constituent elements of separate material or ideas into a single, unified, complex whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evidence</td>
<td>Selecting and using information to support one’s views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Evaluation</td>
<td>A systematic determination of the merit, worth and significance of the object or ideas being studied using criteria governed by a set of standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Conclusion and Decision making</td>
<td>A judgment or decision reached by reasoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A7.3 – Basic shell for building a critical thinking and problem solving rubric for the University of Sydney with performance indicators for components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Problematisation** | Articulation of challenges involved in relation to ideas or topics investigated. | – Identifying issues.  
– Reflect on the nature of the issue.  
– Motivation to identify issues.  
– Questioning skills (reading and searching) for problematisation. |
| **Inference** | The processes to reach a conclusion on the basis of reasoning from evidence | – Use logic and association to link knowledge and understanding.  
– Reflect and self-monitoring on how knowledge and understanding can be linked.  
– Use personal and others’ experience to link knowledge and understanding.  
– Use visualization tools to analyse inference |
| **Analysis** | The separating of any material or abstract ideas into its constituent elements. A method of studying the nature of something or of determining its essential features and their relations. | – Systematically examine own and others’ assumptions, methodologies, and statements.  
– Reflect and self-monitoring on how own and others’ assumptions, methodologies, and statements are logically stated.  
– Attitudes towards examination of each component of argumentation or statements to make a sense.  
– Quantitative or/and qualitative skills. |
| **Synthesis** | The combining of the constituent elements of separate material or ideas into a single, unified, complex whole. | – Create and connect complex ideas using imagery, analogies and symbolism  
– Reflect and self-monitoring on how well connect complex ideas.  
– Open-mindedness to seek alternative ideas and adapt better ones from other perspectives.  
– Use visualization tools to show how complex ideas are connected. |
| **Evidence** | Selecting and using information to support one’s views | – Give reasons to support own thinking or refute others’ statements.  
– Reflect and self-monitoring on balance rational and irrational components of a complex or ambiguous problems to evaluate evidence.  
– Enthusiasm toward scientific argumentation or inquiry, which are different from assertion.  
– Search, selection and source evaluation skills |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Judging or Evaluation | A systematic determination of the merit, worth and significance of the object or ideas being studied using criteria governed by a set of standards | - Make judgments about the value of ideas or materials in terms of the effectiveness of ideas, products and performances and implement courses of action to achieve desired outcomes against criteria they have identified.  
- Reflect and self-monitoring on assessment of risks and the processes of evaluation.  
- Consideration of social perspectives on feasibility, risk, cost and time  
- Skills to weigh one argument with another. |
| Conclusion or Decision | A judgment or decision reached by reasoning.                                 | - Use logical and abstract thinking to analyse and synthesise complex information to inform a course of action  
- Reflect and self-monitoring on the processes of selection of the best or feasible idea for a course of action.  
- Motivation to select the best ideas to give feasible solution to the issues or problems.  
- Leadership skills in critical thinking |
Attachment 8 - Industry and community project unit outline

Overview¹
The aim of this unit is to allow undergraduate students to participate in an interdisciplinary group project, working with one of the University’s industry and community partners. Students will work in teams on a real-world problem provided by the partner, applying their disciplinary expertise and gaining valuable experience in working across disciplinary boundaries.

In working on authentic problems, students will encounter richly contextualized issues that will require input from people with a variety of disciplinary backgrounds and experiences. Developing solutions to complex problems requires students to work effectively in interdisciplinary groups.

The unit will provide the opportunity for students to integrate their developing knowledge and experience, and apply them in circumstances of the kind they can expect to encounter in professional life. Interdisciplinary group work will provide the opportunity to build the skills to work across disciplinary, cultural and/or professional boundaries.

Learning outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Qualities²</th>
<th>Learning outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Depth pf disciplinary expertise</td>
<td>Students should be able to apply disciplinary knowledge and/or skills to real-world problems. These may occur in settings outside those for which their discipline has prepared them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Broader skills (critical thinking and problem solving; communication (oral and written); information/digital literacy; inventiveness)</td>
<td>Students should be able to: a. Identify and respond to complexity and uncertainty in real-world problems; b. use and develop interpersonal communication skills, through participation in interdisciplinary group projects; c. develop written, oral and multi-media communication skills through the creation and presentation of reports for mixed audiences. d. Develop inventive and novel solutions to complex problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cultural competence</td>
<td>Students should be able to: a. identify social, political and cultural factors in authentic problem settings; and b. in developing solutions, take account of cultural and social difference that may impact the problem to hand; and c. see broad societal implications of a problem and its solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interdisciplinary effectiveness</td>
<td>Students should be able to: a. recognise the role of different forms of disciplinary or professional expertise in clients and in student groups b. communicate across disciplinary or professional boundaries and c. work productively in interdisciplinary or inter-professional teams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The first paragraph of the overview reflects the common language used in the unit of study outlines prepared in the Faculties of Arts and Social Sciences (INDP3000), Business (BUSS31100), and Science (SCPU3001). It also includes wording that describes the concept and goals of interdisciplinary learning, taking up the language from the DAWG discussion paper Project Units in Undergraduate Degrees.
5. Integrated professional, ethical and personal identity
   a. articulate and analyse dilemmas and difficult choices arising in real world settings
   b. share responsibility for quality, timeliness and thoroughness and
   c. see broad societal and ethical implications of a problem and its solution.

6. Influence
   (To be effective in exercising professional and social responsibility and making a positive contribution to society.)
   Students should be able to:
   a. provide leadership in discipline-relevant areas of a project.
   b. articulate professional and social values and their effect upon practical problem solving
   c. demonstrate a commitment to the role of a professional contributor to community and industry activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>GQ/LO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group plan</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1*, 2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group presentation</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative/reflective task</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1, 3, 4*, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group project report</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1*, 2, 4, 6*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Graduate qualities that may or may not be specifically assessed in this item of work. Decision pending on completion of rubrics.

3 The assessment regime for the 2018 pilot envisages graded assessment for ICP Units. Looking forward to 2020, further discussion would be welcomed on the possibilities for non-graded assessment. This approach is widely thought to be well suited to experiential learning projects, where careful formative assessment frameworks are in place, although some concerns about this approach also persist.
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Author | Hugh O'Dwyer, Policy and Project Officer
Reviewer/Approver | Associate Professor Peter McCallum, Director Educational Strategy
Paper title | Policy changes
Purpose | To endorse policy changes arising from curriculum implementation and from an audit against the Higher Education Standard Framework, and approve the proposed Guidelines on Majors.

RECOMMENDATION

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

1. (1) approve changes to the Learning and Teaching Policy arising from curriculum implementation and an audit against the Higher Education Standards Framework;
2. (2) recommend that the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) approve changes to the Learning and Teaching Procedures arising from curriculum implementation and an audit against the Higher Education Standards Framework; and
3. (3) recommend that Senate rescind the policy Equal Opportunity in Education, with effect from 1 January 2018.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2015-2016, policy amendments were progressively made to capture elements of the new curriculum initiatives in the Strategic Plan 2016-2020. In the main, these were:

- December 2015: Graduate Qualities for Undergraduate Degrees (Learning and Teaching Policy 2015)
- July 2016: Curriculum framework – requirements for Liberal Studies degrees, Specialist degrees and Professional degrees (Coursework Policy 2014) and requirements for Curriculum Components (Learning and Teaching Policy 2015)

In addition, at the meeting of 10 October 2017, the Academic Board approved a separate round of policy initiatives (Learning and Teaching Policy 2015, Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016) Student Placement and Projects Policy 2015, Educational Services Agreements Policy 2017) arising from an audit against the Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF).

Further policy amendments are necessary to address issues arising from implementing the new curriculum, and further initiatives arising from the HESF. Therefore, it is proposed that a further round of adjustments are taken to the Academic Board on 28 November 2017.

In summary the proposed changes to be put to the Academic Board are:

2. Nomenclature of degrees in the Learning and Teaching Procedures (Attachment 1).
3. Governance of transcripts in the Learning and Teaching Policy (Attachment 2) and Learning and Teaching Procedures (Attachment 1).
4. Authority to offer units of study (Attachment 2).
5. Majors in 192 credit point professional and specialist degrees in the Learning and Teaching Policy (Attachment 2).
6. University response the Group of Eight (Go8) Quality Verification System (QVS) review in the Learning and Teaching Procedures (Attachment 1 and Attachment 3).
This paper proposes amendments to the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016 and the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015. The amendments to these documents are based on implementation of the new curriculum and ensuring University alignment with the HESF.

The University of Sydney’s new curriculum will commence in 2018. To align with the curriculum changes from next year, a range of amendments pertaining to the new curriculum are proposed in this paper. Guidelines on majors have been developed for insertion into the Learning and Teaching Procedures in order to guide the development of projects and ensure capacity for a second major where possible, without impinging on other areas of the curriculum. Additionally, the Procedures will contain amendments to Section 12 ‘Academic records on graduation’ to reflect the nomenclature on the title and testamur of Liberal Studies degrees and the title on combined degrees with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies. The default number of testamurs provided for combined (single testamur) and double degrees (separate testamur for each degree) is clarified (unless the degree resolutions state otherwise). Delegation is clarified around authority over the governance of what appears on transcripts in the Learning and Teaching Policy and Procedures. The determination over what is included in the transcript is to occur in consultation with the Chair of the Academic Board, the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education), and the Heads of the Student Model team and Sydney Student team. Ensuring there is further clarity regarding the role of faculties in offering units of study, and the unit level credit point requirements of professional and specialist undergraduate degrees (of 192 credit points or more) is also canvased in the policy changes proposed in this paper.

The 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. Section 5.3 of the HESF requires institutions to subject courses to periodic review, which includes external referencing or other benchmarking activities. Aligning with this section of the HESF, the QVS review provides an externally referenced quality assurance process by reviewing academic standards at all levels of achievement across Go8 institutions. The University has participated in the review process since 2011, providing public assurance that learning outcomes are comparable with world leading universities. The reviews are conducted by academics from Go8 Universities, whereby reviewers evaluate the appropriateness of learning outcomes and assessment tasks for each unit of study provided for review, and assess whether each sampled item of student work received an appropriate grade.

Additionally, Section 2.1 of the HESF highlights the importance of ensuring there are opportunities for academic success regardless of a student’s background. To better reflect the intent of this standard, it is proposed that the Learning and Teaching Policy is amended to include a clause pertaining to equal opportunity.

The proposed amendments to address these issues are summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Policy and Procedure amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy/Procedure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Review Report’ added.

Amendments to existing clauses in Section 12 and insertion of new clauses: 12(5) – 12(9).

Amendments pertaining to nomenclature of degrees.

Clause 12 (2) added.

Amendments pertaining to the governance of transcripts.

Learning and Teaching Policy 2015

Addition to Section 24 (9) and (10).

Amendments pertaining to the governance of transcripts.

New section 8 to part 23

Amendments reflecting authority for offering units of study.

Section 23(3)(c)

Amendment clarifying existing function in approving the forwarding of proposals for new, amended and deleted courses to the Curriculum and Course Planning Committee and the Academic Board.

Amendment to Section 18 (3) (e)

Amendments reflecting changes to majors in 192 credit point, specialist and professional degrees.

Added ‘11A Equality of opportunity’ Clause 10(a) – 10(f)

Amendments pertaining to equal opportunity.

ISSUES


The Learning and Teaching Policy currently specifies the dimensions and characteristics of majors in undergraduate degrees, including the requirement for a 3000 level unit involving the completion of a project that requires the integration of disciplinary knowledge and skill, and for a 3000 level unit in which the student can demonstrate disciplinary expertise in an interdisciplinary context (a note confirms that these can be the same unit and that, where a suitable unit exists, these requirements may be acquitted for two majors through the same unit).

During 2016, additional discussion on the purpose and distinctiveness of majors took place in order to develop guidelines on acceptable levels of overlap between majors. Guidelines on pre-requisites and assumed knowledge were also developed in order to ensure that the requirements of taking a major did not impinge on other areas of the curriculum and to ensure, where appropriate, that the capacity for a second major existed.

The paper, Project Units in Undergraduate Degrees, has developed additional principles around project units and these have been distilled into clauses 5 and 6 of the guidelines for insertion into policy. These clauses are aimed at guiding the development of projects in a way that allows both disciplinary and interdisciplinary projects within a major, and establish a common framework so that, where appropriate multi-faculty projects exist, they can be appropriately coordinated.

The proposed Guidelines are included as a Schedule to the attached Learning and Teaching Procedures (Attachment 1).

The proposed guidelines have been refined to incorporate feedback received by the Degree Advisory Working Group (DAWG) on 21 September including:

- Clause 6(b) removal of the phrase ‘normally outside of the discipline’ as this would prevent students applying disciplinary skills to a broad range of projects.
- Clause 6(e) removal of the clause to enabling students to count one project towards the requirements of two majors as this is contradictory to clause 2(a) which restricts overlap of core units to the first year of two majors. This clause is retained within the Learning and Teaching Policy however if a student wants to count one project towards two majors they will need to seek approval.
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2. Nomenclature of degrees

During 2016, there was discussion at the Generalist Undergraduate Degree Working Party of SEG on the way in which majors, programs and streams would be represented on testamurs and transcripts in Liberal Studies degrees.

In brief up to two majors, programs or streams would be indicated in brackets after the title of the degree or combined degree. Honours would be indicated as ([discipline] Honours). Minors would be recorded on the transcript but not on the testamur.

For example:

- Bachelor of Science (Chemistry).
- Bachelor of Commerce (Banking, Finance).
- Bachelor of Arts/ Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Media and Communications, Linguistics)
- Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Physics Honours, Mathematics)

The proposed change to the Learning and Teaching Procedures (12 (5)-(9)) is given in Attachment 1.

3. Governance of transcript

The Deputy Registrar has identified a need for governance about what can be placed on a student transcript. This would provide an orderly way of considering the addition of educational attainment in the curricular and co-curricular area over and above what is specified in the Learning and Teaching Policy. The principles for including information on a student transcript are that it should be an appropriate representation of a student’s educational achievement, that it should be verifiable so that the University can attest to the achievement with certainty and that it be available in a timely and efficient fashion so as not to interfere with graduation processes. It is proposed that the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Registrar) be given delegated authority in the Learning and Teaching Policy and Procedures to determine what is in the transcript and that this be done in consultation with the Chair of the Academic Board, the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education), and the Heads of the Student Model team and Sydney Student team.

Proposed policy changes to achieve this in Learning and Teaching Policy (24 (9) and (10)) and Learning and Teaching Procedures (12 (2)) are detailed in Attachments 2 and Attachment 1 respectively.

4. The offering of Units of Study

The Learning and Teaching Policy gives responsibility for the management and quality improvement of units of study to faculties. Other University Policies, such as the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule, and the Academic Honesty in Coursework Rule also give authority to faculties and individuals within faculties to hear appeals and manage academic integrity breaches. With the diversification of the curriculum, non-faculty units have contributed to the development of Service Learning and Open Learning Environment units. The proposed changes to Learning and Teaching Policy 23 (8) are provided in Attachment 2.

5. Majors in 192 credit point professional and specialist degrees.

Current resolutions in the Learning and Teaching Policy about majors are designed on the basis of three year degrees. If applied to four year degrees, they would prevent a student taking advantage of the learning in senior units in the development of the disciplinary expertise that the major develops and require that a major be developed exclusively in the first three years.

To allow for a major to be developed in a four- year degree it is proposed that, in specialist and professional degrees of 192 credit points, a minimum of 12 credit points must be taken at 1000 and 2000 level units and that 18 – 36 credit points be taken over 3000 and 4000. The major would be 48 credit points as in 144 credit point degrees.

Proposed amendments to the Learning and Teaching Policy (18 (3) (e)) are provided in Attachment 2.
6. University response to the Go8 QVS

The Go8 quality verification process is a valuable component of the University’s approach to external assessment benchmarking. Additionally, Section 5.3 of the HESF requires institutions to subject courses to periodic review, which includes external referencing or other benchmarking activities. Therefore, it is important that a process for responding to the QVS reports is developed via an effective reporting mechanism to the University Executive (UE) and Academic Board (via UE-Education and ASPC respectively), and that this process is formalised within the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016 (13 (8)-(11) (Attachment 1).

The Procedures do not currently address the QVS reviews and it is proposed that a new clause be included in the document to clarify the requirements for responding to completed Go8 reviews. Through this change, program coordinators for the unit of study reviewed by the Go8 will be asked to complete a pro-forma report template identifying how the feedback could be incorporated in future offerings of the unit of study (or similar units of study) (Attachment 3). The report will also seek advice from Associate Deans (Education) on how the QVS feedback could be utilised to enhance educational offerings across the relevant School or Faculty. Mirroring the QVS review document, the report template for responding to the QVS reviews is intended to be straightforward and accessible, with sufficient scope for program coordinators and Faculty Associate Deans (Education) to provide suggested approaches for addressing reviewer feedback. In addition to responding to QVS review feedback, program coordinators that participated in the review will be asked to develop an action plan for implementing changes recommended in the review. Following the completion of the report, Faculties will be asked to provide advice on the results or outcomes of actions taken to address reviewer feedback.

7. Equal opportunity amendments in the Learning and Teaching Policy

There is an Equal Opportunity in Education Policy (Attachment 4), approved by Senate in 1990, which was aimed at ensuring that all current and potential University students have an equal opportunity to succeed. It is proposed that for the purpose of consolidation and improved clarity, a paper is submitted to Senate seeking the rescinding of the Equal Opportunity in Education Policy, and replacing it with a clause in the Learning and Teaching Policy (Attachment 2), Part 2 ‘The nature of education at the University’ (11A).

CONSULTATION

The consultation timeline for the changes pertaining to the new curriculum is outlined in the table below. In addition to feedback provided via these committees, feedback received from the DAWG on 21 September has informed adjustments to the proposed Guidelines on Majors in the Learning and Teaching Procedures (Attachment 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Date (2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Executive Education Committee</td>
<td>9 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Executive</td>
<td>12 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Studies Committee (for noting)</td>
<td>7 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standards and Policy Committee (for recommendation to the Academic Board)</td>
<td>14 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Board</td>
<td>28 November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The changes proposed in this memo also include amendments to the Learning and Teaching Policy and Procedures to align with the renewed HESF. The procedural amendments pertaining to the Go8 QVS were tabled at the 6 November meeting of the UE Education Committee.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016 – with draft amendments
Attachment 2: Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 – with draft amendments
Attachment 3: Draft Group of Eight (Go8) Quality Verification System (QVS) Review Report template
Attachment 4: Equal Opportunity in Education Policy 1990
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.
- **Group of 8 Quality Verification** Means the benchmarking of student achievement and assessment conducted by the Group of 8 (Go8).
System

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 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;
   (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.

   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;

(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 Australian Higher Education Graduation Statement, must contain information about:

(a) the graduate;

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

(c) the University of Sydney;

(d) the graduate's academic achievements in the form of an academic transcript and/or other achievement;

(e) the Australian Higher Education System.

(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) The inclusion of any additional material on an academic transcript or the issuance of a graduation statement shall be determined by the Deputy Vice Chancellor Registrar on the advice of:

(a) The Chair of the Academic Board or nominee

(b) The Deputy Vice Chancellor Education or nominee

(c) Head, Academic Model Team

(e)(d) Head, Sydney Student Team

(2)(3) A certificate of graduate status must list the degree name and the graduation date but not the units of study.
A degree statement (testamur), is the legal statement of the student's attainment of the degree, and must state:

(a) the degree or combined 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 up to a maximum of two majors; and
(g) where relevant, the honours discipline and the grade of the degree or honours awarded.

The title shown on the testamur and transcript of a Liberal Studies degree shall include the stream, or if no stream, the program, or if not program the Table A major and any second major according to the following style: Bachelor of [insert title] ([insert stream or program or Table A major], [insert any second major]).

The title of a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies shall include the stream, or, if no stream, the program, or, if no program, the Table A major and the second major according to the following style: Bachelor of [insert title]/ Bachelor of Advanced Studies ([insert stream or program or Table A major], [insert second major]).

The title of a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies with honours shall include:

(a) If honours is taken in the discipline of the Table A major, the honours discipline and the second major according to the following style: Bachelor of [insert title]/ Bachelor of Advanced Studies ([insert discipline] honours, [insert second major]); or
(b) if honours discipline is taken in the second major or a major that differs from the stream, or, if no stream, the program, or, if no program the Table A major and the honours discipline of the second major according to the following style: Bachelor of [insert title]/Bachelor of Advanced Studies ([insert stream or program or Table A major, [insert second major or honours discipline] honours).

In the case of combined degrees, a single testamur will be issued for the combined degree, unless otherwise indicated in the degree resolutions.

In the case of double degrees, a separate testamur will be issued for each degree, unless otherwise indicated in the degree resolutions.

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.

(6) 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.

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

(8) To provide an external reference point for the regular review of assessment of student achievement of learning outcomes, the University will use review reports from the Group of 8 (Go8 Quality Verification System) Quality Verification System and other benchmarking reports commissioned by faculties.

(9) Go8 Quality Verification System reviewer reports will be forwarded to the relevant unit of study coordinator, Head of School and Associate Deans, and tabled at University Executive (via the Education Committee) and the Academic Board (via the Academic Standards and Policy Committee).

(10) Faculties respond to Go8 Quality Verification System reviewer reports using the template in Schedule Three.

(7)(11) In situations where the report does not identify issues warranting response or comment, the Academic Standards and Policy Committee may waive the requirement for a response.

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></td>
<td>University rubric to measure against graduate qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Generated by results data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Determined by faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alignment with award/ standard</td>
<td></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>University sets agreed standards and targets</td>
<td>Student surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peer observation of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>Results are included in report to students/ faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational environment</td>
<td>Learning space</td>
<td>Unit of study co-ordinators are responsible for providing students with feedback through the closing the loop process</td>
<td>Standards for physical learning space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Virtual environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of learning spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Formal and informal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective use of existing resources (to teach units of study)</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>Curriculum/ qualification</td>
<td>Educational outcomes</td>
<td>Educational outcomes</td>
<td>Educational outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Qualifications</td>
<td>• Standards and outcomes are determined by the faculty and managed by the Academic Board</td>
<td>• Student survey results are averaged over faculty-administered units of study and used to set agreed standards and targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meet accreditation requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Benchmarking and alignment with standards across the faculty, and other comparable institutions, and with professional, disciplinary and industry expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alignment with institutional, industry, professional and community expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational experience</td>
<td>• Thematically coherent program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Student surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reported to faculty board; reports made public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational environment</td>
<td>• Formal and informal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community of scholars within discipline/ degree program</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Standards for physical learning space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluation of learning spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Effective use of existing resources</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</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meets requirements for accreditation at discipline/professional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meets requirements for Australian Qualifications Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Success in accessing further study</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meets requirements for Higher Education Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meets requirements for professional regulatory bodies e.g. Australian Health Practitioners Regulatory Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rewarding career paths</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cycle of Academic Board/ UE faculty reviews, including learning and teaching processes and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contributing to the community</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meets standards set by Group of Eight (Go8) universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Engagement and enquiry to challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students with novel problems and issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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></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 delivering 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.
# SCHEDULE THREE

## Group of Eight (Go8) Quality Verification System (QVS) Review Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Verification System Review Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit of Study:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean (Education):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of School:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall summary judgement of the subject (unit of study) by Go8 reviewer

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate. Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment.

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate. **HOWEVER,** there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.

There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed. These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.

### Overall response to the review

Do you have any feedback on the review report?

### Review of Specified Learning Objectives

Could the scope and/or clarity of the learning objectives be improved based on QVS feedback?

If so, how should the course learning objectives be amended to reflect the intended outcomes of the unit and its contribution to course learning outcomes, including the University’s graduate qualities?

Response to comparison of learning objectives at other Go8 universities?

### Review of Assessment Tasks

Response to suitability of assessment tasks – could assessments be modified to better align with unit learning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>outcomes?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Could the assessment requirements, standards and rubrics be made clearer to students?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are assessment tasks, criteria and rubrics appropriate to measure unit learning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to comparison of assessment tasks and marking criteria with other Go8 universities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action Plan for Changes in Response to QVS Review**

**Further comments**

**Identify how reviewer feedback could be used to enhance other educational offerings across the School or Faculty**

_To be completed by Faculty Associate Dean (Education)_

**Information for Program Coordinators and Associate Deans**

The Go8 QVS Review Report aligns with the feedback provided in the attached review. Program coordinators are asked to provide a response to the feedback in the review, and identify (if possible) ways in which the feedback could be incorporated in future offerings of the unit (or similar units of study).

Where a course review section receives a grade of ‘Completely’ or no explanation is provided in the feedback box below (‘please list up to three reasons for making this rating’) a response is not required. Program coordinators are also asked to develop an action plan for implementing changes based on feedback in the review, which will be provided to the University Executive and Academic Board.
SCHEDULE FOUR

Guidelines for Majors

1. Purpose of the major
The major should:
   (a) develop depth of expertise in a coherent field of study that is associated with an identifiable community of scholars and is recognised as comprising a distinct and valuable body of scholarship;
   (b) be supported by demonstrated expertise and staff capacity in the area of the major;
   (c) be characterised by a distinctive set of learning outcomes, among which should be depth of disciplinary expertise;
   (d) develop the graduate qualities.

2. Overlap of core units and selectives within different majors.
   (a) Core units that are common to two majors may overlap within the first year of majors (up to 12 credit points) without additional scrutiny by the faculty beyond that which is normally given to ensure cohesion, rigour and appropriate development and alignment of the learning outcomes for the major.
   (b) Where overlap within the major core occurs beyond first year, this should be for sound disciplinary reasons, and an argued case should be considered by the faculty in order to ensure its necessity and that the major retains distinctiveness. With this caveat, both core and selective units offered within majors may overlap.
   (c) For students, while a single unit of major ‘core’ may be counted against two majors, selectives may not be double counted in this way, and a student wishing to complete two majors with overlapping core must choose unique selectives in order to complete the credit point requirements of those majors.

3. Overlaps between major and stream
   (a) units of study may count towards both the requirements of both a stream and the requirements of the major, provided that the major meets these guidelines and requirements of the Learning and Teaching policy.

4. Pre-requisites and assumed knowledge.
   (a) Units of study within a major must not have pre-requisites for units outside the major that would effectively require a student to complete more than 48 credit points to complete requirements for the major:
      (i) Where a major is offered in Table S, units within the major must not have pre-requisites for units outside the major;
      (ii) Where a major is offered in Table A for a degree, or only to students in a particular stream, a unit within the major may have a pre-requisite outside the major, provided those units are core units for the degree or stream;
   (b) Units of study within a major, may specify assumed knowledge outside the major.

5. The 3000 level (or higher for 192 credit point professional or specialist degrees)
   Project unit
   (a) Projects should be designed to explore challenging problems that arise in realistic settings with solutions of clear impact on issues of importance to partners in the project.
(b) The problems on which projects are built should be authentic and offer a rich context that may, depending on the project, also invite interdisciplinary perspectives.

(c) The project should be conceived of as an integrative experience that draws together disciplinary knowledge and demonstrate the learning outcomes of the major in a real-world application. Disciplinary expertise demonstrated in the project should reflect the standards expected in the major.

(d) The project should form the focus of the entire 6 credit point unit and develop the graduate qualities.

(e) Where the project is interdisciplinary, it is recommended that enrolment be through a shell unit specific to each major to enable the appropriate flow of funds to the school or discipline, appropriate ASCED code and a contact point in the discipline.

(f) A single shell unit in the major may be used for both disciplinary and interdisciplinary projects (including multi-faculty projects) to simplify the unit structure.

(g) Interdisciplinary learning is greatly enriched by involving students from other faculties through projects brokered with external partners by the Education, Enterprise and Engagement unit and organised with the assistance of that unit.

6. Unit requiring application of disciplinary expertise in an interdisciplinary context.

(a) Disciplinary knowledge developed in a major involves an understanding of disciplinary assumptions, methodologies and foundational knowledge and an ability to apply that to solve problems encountered within the discipline.

(b) The interdisciplinary unit should provide an opportunity for students to apply disciplinary knowledge to problems, to work or communicate with people with different disciplinary expertise and to demonstrate interdisciplinary effectiveness.

(c) The interdisciplinary context may involve cross-disciplinary, inter-disciplinary or trans-disciplinary interactions.

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

Note: See also Good Practice Guidelines for the Development of Students Academic and Professional Communication Skills and Implementation Guidelines

8 Educational excellence

(1) All award courses must be designed towards the achievement of excellence in outcomes, experience and environment.
(2) Educational programs and the management of learning and teaching must be designed and managed to ensure excellence in:

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

(b) educational experience, as shown through:
   (i) the impact of teachers and their capacity to engage students productively in the teaching and learning process; and
   (ii) students’ mastery of the meta-cognitive skills that form the basis for self-directed learning;

and

(c) educational environment, consisting of the physical learning spaces, virtual learning environment, and support, which:
   (i) facilitates excellent outcomes and experience;
   (ii) fosters innovation; and
   (iii) seeks continuous improvement through systematic monitoring.

(3) To ensure excellent outcomes, faculties must design processes in which:

(a) curricula provide continuous and well-co-ordinated sequences of learning experiences leading to well defined learning outcomes, involving expert guidance through well designed learning activities;

(b) students:
   (i) are actively engaged in learning;
   (ii) are challenged, guided and supported to reach a high standard of learning; and
   (iii) become increasingly aware of, and responsible for, their learning;

and

(c) students and staff demonstrate a commitment to working together to achieve excellence in educational experience and outcomes.

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

9 Engaged enquiry

(1) Learning programs must be designed to:

(a) enable students to acquire and apply knowledge and skills through engaged enquiry;

(b) challenge students with novel problems; and

(c) enable students to demonstrate increasing awareness of, and responsibility for, their learning.

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

11A Equality of opportunity

(1) The University is committed to equality of opportunity in education and gives effect to that commitment through:

(a) Special admission schemes that make allowance for educational disadvantage through alternative pathways as set out in the Coursework Policy

(b) Support schemes to assist certain student admitted under Special Admission Schemes to succeed;

(c) Accessible examination and assessment arrangements supported by the University’s Disability Services
(d) Special consideration and special arrangements for examinations.
(e) Aboriginal and Torres Straight Islander Support
(f) Counselling and Psychological services.

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

(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:
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

\[\text{Note} \quad \text{See clause 11.}\]

(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>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>
17 Curriculum framework for postgraduate coursework education

(1) The curriculum framework for postgraduate coursework awards must include:
   (a) advanced specialisation in a field of knowledge;
   (b) research skills;
   (c) a structured approach to the development of knowledge and skills;
   (d) a capstone experience in research, scholarship or professional project.

(2) The curriculum framework for postgraduate coursework units may include one or more of the following:
   (a) a major;
   (b) a minor;
   (c) interdisciplinary study;
   (d) exchange and work based projects;
   (e) professional or industry experience;
   (f) authentic problems and assessments;
   (g) elective units; and
   (h) project-based learning.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Graduate qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 |
### Table 3

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

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

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

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

(2) Programs:
(a) are a combination of units of study that develop expertise in a multidisciplinary 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 all undergraduate degrees, must require exactly 48 credit points; as specified in this sub clause;

(d) in liberal studies undergraduate degrees and degrees of 144 credit points, 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 professional and specialist undergraduate degrees of 192 credit points or more, must include
   
   (i) A minimum of 12 credit points of 1000 or 2000-level units of study
   
   (ii) A minimum of 18 credit points and a maximum of 36 credit points at 3000-level or higher.

(f) 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

(g) 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.

Guidelines on majors are contained in Schedule 4 of the *Learning and Teaching Procedure 2016*.

(4) **Minors:**

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

(b) in undergraduate degrees, comprise units to the value of exactly 36 credit points including:
   
   (i) exactly 12 credit points at 1000-level;
   
   (ii) a minimum of 12 and a maximum of 18 credit points at 2000-level;
   
   (iii) a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 12 credit points at 3000-level; and

(c) are recorded on the student’s transcript.
(5) **A degree core:**
   (a) is a set of units of study that develops required knowledge and skills for the degree and which is required to be completed by all students within an award course or a stream or specialisation within an award course;
   (b) in Liberal Studies Degrees, comprises no more than 24 credit points at 1000- or 2000-level.

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

**Note:** See [Coursework Policy 2014](#).

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

(8) **Award courses** may achieve depth and breadth of learning by the specification of core units and elective units.
   (a) Units of study may be specified as core units if the faculty determines them to be essential to achieve the learning outcomes of the award course, stream, program, major, minor or specialisation. Core units must be completed by all students enrolled in the award course or relevant curriculum component or specialisation.
   (b) Elective units are units chosen by students in order to extend their degree requirements according to their need or interests and contribute to graduate qualities. Electives are chosen from a list defined by the faculty and approved by the Academic Board.

(9) **Units of study**
   (a) Units of study:
      (i) follow a programmed set of coherent learning experiences and assessments that lead progressively to the achievement of the learning outcomes for the unit; and
      (ii) must be completed over one or two teaching sessions.
   (b) Faculties must define learning outcomes for each unit of study which are aligned with those of the award courses in which the unit of study is offered and those of other components of award courses of which it is a part.
   (c) Except in the case of ‘shell’ units used for students undertaking study at another institution and other purposes, the learning outcomes, requirements and assessment framework and standards of a unit of study must be the same for all students taking that unit of study, regardless of the award course in which they are enrolled.
   (d) Student transcripts and student record files must record a single result and a single credit point value for each unit of study attempted by a student.
   (e) Units of study must be identified by an eight character alpha-numeric code, of which the first four are letters identifying the relevant school, department or discipline and the final four are integers identifying the unit of study and the level at which it is offered.
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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

Credit points and student workload

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

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.

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

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

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

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.

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.

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

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;
   (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, streams, 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.
   (b)(c) approves the forwarding of proposals for new, amended and deleted courses to the Curriculum and Course Planning Committee and the Academic Board.

(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) **Award courses, streams, programs, majors, minors and units of study may only be offered by faculties or through the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies and only after approval by the Academic Board as specified in section 1 to 7 above.**

(9) **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.

(10) **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.

(11) **Supervisors**

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

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

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

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

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

(12) **Heads of School**

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

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

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

(iii) act in relation to staff performance and effective allocation of quality resources; and
(iv) if requested to do so by the Dean, consider and, if appropriate, approve requests by unit of study co-ordinators to opt out of the recording of lectures in University-managed lecture theatres.

(v) appoint a unit of study co-ordinator for each unit of study for which the 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.

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

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

(b) The Unit of study co-ordinator:

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

(ii) should inform the relevant Head of 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.

(14) Individual teachers

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

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

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

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

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

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

(15) Students

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

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

(ii) satisfy attendance and assessment requirements.

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

24 Documentation and communication

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

(a) communicating with students and staff;

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

(c) institutional record keeping.

Note: See University Recordkeeping Policy and Recordkeeping Manual

(2) Unit of study co-ordinators, together with the faculty, must provide a unit of study website on the LMS which contains, at a minimum:
(a) the unit of study outline;
(b) relevant curriculum resources; and
(c) any other material specified in the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016.

Note: See clause 11 of those procedures.

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

(4) After publication of the unit of study outline, changes may only be made to the nature, weighting or due date of assessment tasks in exceptional circumstances.

(5) Each faculty must publish an annual handbook, containing the minimum information specified in the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016.

Note: See clause 9 of those procedures.

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

Note: See clause 8 of those procedures.

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

(8) Upon each student’s graduation the University will provide each of the following documents, which will provide the information required by the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016:

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

Note: See clause 12 of those procedures.

(9) Inclusion of addition information on student transcripts over and above the content determined by this policy must be approved by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Registrar) in consultation with the Chair of the Academic Board, the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education) and head of the Academic Model team and Sydney Student team.

(10) In determining additional information on student transcripts the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Registrar) must consider:

(a) whether the additional information is an appropriate representation of educational achievement;
(b) whether the additional information can be verified by the University;
(c) whether the additional information can be collected in a timely and efficient manner.

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 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;
   (c) equivalent professional experience; or
   (d) appropriate training, and 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).

(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 co-ordinate units of study or as the sole-teacher.

(4) 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 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).

(5) 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.

PART 5 QUALITY ASSURANCE

25 Quality assurance processes

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

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

Note: See Part 2.

(3) Excellence in educational outcomes is measured through systematic assessment which ensures that students achieve course learning outcomes at a high standard, and through the assessment of graduate qualities.

(a) Faculties and their Associate Deans - Education must arrange for assessments to be subject to peer feedback and periodic benchmarking.

(4) Excellence in educational experience is measured through students’ reports of their experience. Feedback should be formal and informal and captured at unit of study, major, program or degree level. University, national and international surveys should be used to collect formal feedback.

(a) Unit of study co-ordinators and Associate Deans - Education must administer surveys of educational experience each time a unit of study is offered.
(b) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) must implement surveys of students’ experience of their learning at a University-wide level at least annually.

(5) Excellence in educational environment is measured through students’ responses to University, national and international surveys, and targeted ad hoc assessments of learning spaces.

(a) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) must implement surveys of educational environment at a University-wide level at least annually.

(6) At unit of study level

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

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

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

(7) **At the curriculum level**

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

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

(c) Educational experience is provided through a thematically coherent program. Evaluation methods include student surveys, benchmarking reports, reports from accrediting bodies, and Go8 Standards Verification reports.
   (i) The Associate Dean - Education must provide annual reports on students' educational experience to the faculty.
   (ii) Faculties must provide copies of formal benchmarking reports to the Academic Board.
   (iii) Deans must provide copies of accreditation reports from external organisations to the Academic Board on receipt.
   (iv) The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education) must provide Go8 Standards Verification reports to the Academic Board on receipt.

(d) The quality of the educational environment is measured by the provision of formal and informal learning spaces, where students belong to a community of scholars within discipline and degree programs. Physical learning spaces are measured against:
   (i) accepted learning space standards; and
   (ii) student and teacher evaluations, including the effective use of existing resources.

(8) **At the University level**

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

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

(c) Educational environment is measured in terms of the provision of physical spaces and equipment, and virtual learning environments. The environment should support working together to achieve excellence.
(d) The University must evaluate the quality of outcomes, experience and environment using methods which include:

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

(ii) accreditation reports;

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

(iv) Academic Board and UE faculty reviews.

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

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

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

26 Rescissions, replacements and transitional provisions

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

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

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

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

(d) Academic Board Resolutions: Generic Attributes of Graduates of the University of Sydney which commenced in 1997

(e) Distance, Alternative and Flexible Modes of Delivery in Postgraduate Courses Policy

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

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

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

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

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

(k) Written and Oral Communication Skills of Students Policy which commenced in 2002
(1) 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 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>
</table>
| Students              | 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.  
                       | Satisfy attendance and assessment requirements.                                                        | Participate in evaluations of their experience, to ensure that educational excellence is achieved.  
<pre><code>                   |                                                                                                      | Encouraged to participate in the development and review of courses and units of study.            |
</code></pre>
<p>| Individual teachers   | Support and lead student learning of the curriculum as specified, and to the agreed standard.        | Participate as part of the unit of study team (if appropriate) to support the roles and responsibilities of the unit of study co-ordinator. |
| Design and prepare assessment tasks as specified in the curriculum and in accordance with the standards in the relevant policy. |                                                                                                 |
| Monitor and implement academic standards.                                                              |                                                                                                 |
| Educate students on academic integrity and report any breaches of academic integrity.                  |                                                                                                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</th>
<th>Responsibility: Operational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Unit of study co-ordinators | 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. | 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.                                                                                                                                                                      |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</th>
<th>Responsibility: Operational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Provide leadership, guidance and mentorship to students undertaking research projects. Provide academic advice to students on the reporting of research findings in a dissertation, treatise or long essay. 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>Support the student in the research project, including providing timely feedback and advice. Monitor progress within the context of the overall research plan. 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>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. On behalf of the Dean establish effective processes for achieving graduate outcomes through engaged enquiry. Align educational standards and quality within the faculty with the University policy and strategy.</td>
<td>Co-ordinate teaching across the faculty to deliver excellence in educational outcomes and experience. Review and act on data on educational quality. Establish and implement collegial governance, as set out in Clause 11, in the creation and review of educational programs within the faculty. Support quality of learning and teaching across the faculty as set out in Part 5.</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). Review and act on data relating to educational quality. Consistently with the <em>Coursework Policy 2014</em>, set operational parameters for teaching and curriculum (e.g. teaching workloads, staff profile, fees, student numbers.) Make arrangements for quality assurance of teaching and learning within the faculty as set out in Part 5. Include, where appropriate, student representatives on standard governance committees and provide them with same information as other committee members to enable effective participation. Ensure that faculty offices maintain and update all documentation for policy and procedures relating to the faculty’s academic programs, including documentation for units of study.</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. Advise the Academic Board of any changes to degree level curricula. This may include creation, variation or deletion of courses and changes to tables of units of study. Ratify assessment results with degrees and monitor and act to ensure quality of standards and quality of assessment practices. (See the <em>Coursework Policy 2014</em> and the <em>Assessment Procedures 2011</em>). Review and act on data on educational quality and ensure educational excellence. Entrench academic integrity within the assessment framework of each award course at each stage of the program. Monitor breaches of academic integrity within the faculty, review the assessment framework to eliminate or minimise the possibility of such breaches, and report breaches of academic integrity each year to the Academic Board as set out in the <em>Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015</em>.</td>
<td>Monitor the framework for the management of learning and teaching within the faculty and the processes for ensuring educational excellence in all programs. May devolve their responsibilities for standards and operational matters to degree, major and program committees and to degree co-ordinators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</td>
<td>Responsibility: Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Vice-Chancellor 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).</td>
<td>Deliber quality assurance measures as set out in Part 5.</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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<td>References to faculty board changed to faculty.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20(3); 20A</td>
<td>New subclause added.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>New clause added.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Clause deleted and replaced.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Heading amended: “in managing learning and teaching” added. Subclauses (b)(i) to (b)(iv) added. Subclauses 23(2)(c)-(d) deleted. New subclauses 23(2)(c)-(h) added, remaining subclauses renumbered. 23(5); 23(6)</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23(7); 23(8); 23(11)</td>
<td>Subclause (a) deleted and replaced. New subclause (a)(viii) added. Subclause (a)(i) deleted, remaining subclauses renumbered. New subclause (a)(iv) added.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23(12); 23(13)</td>
<td>New subclause added. Subclause (a) deleted and replaced. New subclauses (b)(i) and (b)(ii) added and remaining subclauses renumbered.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Subclauses (1) to (10) deleted and replaced.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25(9); 26(2)</td>
<td>Subclause deleted. New subclause added.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule One</td>
<td>Amended to reflect changes to clause 23.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Two</td>
<td>Deleted.</td>
<td>25 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Commencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24(2); 24(5); 24(6); 24(12)</td>
<td>Correction to sub-clause cross references in the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016</td>
<td>26 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule One</td>
<td>Correction of typographical error in Operational responsibilities for Head of Department</td>
<td>26 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23(5); 23(5)(b); 25(8)(d)(iv); 25(8)(e); 25(8)(g); Schedule One</td>
<td>References to Senior Executive Group (SEG) changed to University Executive (UE)</td>
<td>27 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23(1)</td>
<td>Amending references to <em>University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016</em> and <em>University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule 2016</em></td>
<td>Insert date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6; 23(12); 23(13); Schedule One</td>
<td>Amendments arising from organisational design change</td>
<td>Insert date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23(8)(iii); 23(11)(i)</td>
<td>Additional text</td>
<td>Insert date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23(12)</td>
<td>Deleted; consequential clauses renumbered</td>
<td>Insert date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23(11)(v) – (vii)</td>
<td>New clauses; previously in 23(12)</td>
<td>Insert date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24(8)(a); 24(9)</td>
<td>References to AHEGS deleted</td>
<td>Insert date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24A</td>
<td>New clause added</td>
<td>Insert date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>New definition added</td>
<td>Insert date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26(3)</td>
<td>Additional clause relating to transitional provisions</td>
<td>Insert date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10(2)</td>
<td>Additional policy document added</td>
<td>Insert date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14(2); 23(7)(xi) note</td>
<td>Amended hyperlinks</td>
<td>Insert date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18(12(b); 20A(3); 25(8)(b); 25(8)(f)</td>
<td>Minor typographical errors corrected</td>
<td>Insert date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Commencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24A</td>
<td>New clause added</td>
<td>Insert date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Group of Eight (Go8) Quality Verification System (QVS) Review Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Verification System Review Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit of Study:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean (Education):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of School:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall summary judgement of the subject (unit of study) by Go8 reviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate. Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate. HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed. These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall response to the review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any feedback on the review report?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Specified Learning Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could the scope and/or clarity of the learning objectives be improved based on QVS feedback?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, how should the course learning objectives be amended to reflect the intended outcomes of the unit and its contribution to course learning outcomes, including the University’s graduate qualities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to comparison of learning objectives at other Go8 universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Assessment Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to suitability of assessment tasks – could assessments be modified to better align with unit learning outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could the assessment requirements, standards and rubrics be made clearer to students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are assessment tasks, criteria and rubrics appropriate to measure unit learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Response to comparison of assessment tasks and marking criteria with other Go8 universities.**

---

**Action Plan for Changes in Response to QVS Review**

---

**Further comments**

---

**Identify how reviewer feedback could be used to enhance other educational offerings across the School or Faculty**

To be completed by Faculty Associate Dean (Education)

---

**Information for Program Coordinators and Associate Deans**

The Go8 QVS Review Report aligns with the feedback provided in the attached review. Program coordinators are asked to provide a response to the feedback in the review, and identify (if possible) ways in which the feedback could be incorporated in future offerings of the unit (or similar units of study). Where a course review section receives a grade of ‘Completely’ or no explanation is provided in the feedback box below (‘please list up to three reasons for making this rating’) a response is not required. Program coordinators are also asked to develop an action plan for implementing changes based on feedback in the review, which will be provided to the University Executive and Academic Board.
The University has a policy of equal opportunity in education. It is important that individuals inside and outside the University are aware of this and of their rights and responsibilities with respect to the achievement of the aims of this policy.

**What is Equal Opportunity in Education?**

Equal opportunity in education provides the conditions of access to and participation in higher education in which all current and potential university students have an equal opportunity to succeed. It is the foundation for effective participation in higher education and hence for equal opportunity in employment. Equality of opportunity in education is also a precondition for a just and equitable society.

Equal opportunity in education aims to give all students a fair chance of admission and of realising their full potential in the courses to which they are admitted.

The Equal Opportunity in Education Policy is currently effected through the University's Equity Plan.
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board approve the Continuing and Extra-Curricular Education Policy 2017, as proposed, with effect from 1 January 2018.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Continuing and Extra-Curricular Education Policy 2017 (Attachment 1) has been prepared following consultation with the Continuing Education Strategy Working Party, the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies’ Non-Award Subcommittee (BIS NASC); faculty Deans, and relevant centre Directors (or representatives).

The Policy gives effect to governance arrangements for continuing and extra-curricular education outlined in the Continuing Education Working Party report of November 2015. In keeping with the recommendations of the 2015 Working Party Report, the Policy gives Deans and Heads of Academic Units and Specialist Units authority to approve and manage continuing and extra-curricular education courses and requires them to submit an annual report on activity to the Non Award Subcommittee of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies (BIS Non-Award Subcommittee) which in turn reports to the DVC Education and the Provost. The Centre for Continuing Education (CCE) acts as a partner with faculties in the delivery of courses and may also offer its own continuing education courses subject to the approval of the BIS Non-Award Subcommittee and subject to annual reporting to that Subcommittee. Under the Policy, the DVC Education has responsibility for oversight of quality and strategic alignment of Continuing and Extra-Curricular Education and the Provost has responsibility for sustainability.

Following agreement on the Policy, a set of Procedures will be developed which specify further details of the approval and reporting process, outline the risk framework for approving and managing courses and provide templates for approval and reporting.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

The development of a continuing education policy was recommended by the Continuing Education Working Party in November 2015 and endorsed by the (then) Senior Executive Group (SEG). During 2016, the Continuing Education Steering Committee, jointly established by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) and the Provost, undertook background work to understand the scope and potential of continuing education activities within the University and, along with the (then) SEG Education Committee, endorsed proceeding with the recommendation for policy development.

As part of the implementation of the Continuing Education Working Party, a draft policy on Continuing and Extra-Curricular Education was prepared in early 2017. The policy is intended to describe the governance and quality framework for continuing and extra-curricular education. An earlier draft was provided to the 29 May 2017 UE Education Committee meeting and subsequently circulated for feedback in June. Following consultation on the first draft and recasting by the Policy Management Unit, a second draft (Attachment 1) has been prepared based on feedback received from the previous circulation. Simultaneously with the
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preparation of the second draft, an internal audit on continuing education has been conducted, and the revised version incorporates outcomes of the discussion arising from that audit.

Appropriate feedback from previous consultation has been incorporated into the second draft policy. However, some feedback, while important, was considered out of scope for this policy. In particular, it was considered that the responsibility to set and charge fees is covered in the existing University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority Academic Functions) Rule and the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule, and therefore should not be part of this policy.

Additionally, the second draft policy removes the Academic Board from having a role in monitoring quality of continuing education. Overarching responsibility for quality, strategic alignment and sustainability rests with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education). Responsibility for the sustainability of continuing education lies with the Provost. The revised draft also contains the following approval and quality assurance provisions:

- Continuing education courses that are offered by a faculty, or an academic unit or specialist unit within a faculty (including courses offered in partnership with the Centre for Continuing Education), require approval by the Faculty Dean;
- Continuing education that is offered by the Centre for Continuing Education and is not approved by a Dean within a faculty, requires approval from the BIS NASC;
- Continuing education that is offered by academic units and specialist units that are not within a faculty, requires approval by the head of the academic or specialist unit.
- Where continuing education is under the governance of a Dean within a Faculty or University School, the Faculty Board is required to report annually on quality, strategic alignment and sustainability to the BIS NASC;
- Where continuing education is offered by an academic unit or a specialist unit that is not under the governance of a Faculty, the head of the academic or specialist unit will report annually on quality, strategic alignment and sustainability to the BIS NASC.

To ensure compliance with the nomenclature standards of the AQF Qualifications Issuance Policy, the draft policy also includes a section stating that continuing education courses must not use titles that would suggest an AQF qualification. Moreover, where a continuing education course delivers training or competencies on behalf of an external partner, the policy requires certificates that may be provided to students on completion of a continuing education course to specify the professional body, employer or other organisation that determines the standards.

CONSULTATION

The second version of the Draft Continuing and Extra-Curricular Education Policy 2017 has been provided to members of the Continuing Education Strategy Working Party, including:

- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)
- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar)
- Vice-Principal (Strategy)
- Deputy Dean (Strategy), Faculty of Health Sciences
- Director of Executive Education, Management Education
- Director of Marketing and Communications
- Director of Professional Medical Education, Sydney Medical School
- Director of the Centre for Veterinary Education
- Associate Director of Continuing Education, Faculty of Dentistry

The draft policy has also been provided to Faculty Deans, the BIS NASC, the (Acting) Deputy Vice Chancellor (Indigenous Strategy and Services), Director of University Libraries, Director of Educational Innovation, Director of Talent, Organisational Development and Diversity, Director of Student Support Services, Head of Academic Enrichment, Head of Counselling and Psychological Services, and the following centres:

- Centre for Continuing Education
- Centre for English Teaching
- Charles Perkins Centre
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- Sydney Southeast Asia Centre
- John Grill Centre
- Mathematics Learning Centre

Consultation will also be sought on the final draft policy as it is provided to the following Committees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-award Subcommittee</td>
<td>22 August 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Executive Education Committee</td>
<td>9 October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Executive</td>
<td>12 October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Policy and Standards Committee</td>
<td>14 November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Board</td>
<td>28 November 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Continuing and Extra-Curricular Education Policy 2017
CONTINUING AND EXTRA-CURRICULAR EDUCATION POLICY 2017

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

Dated: 

Last amended: 

Signature: 

Position: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)
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1 Name of policy

This is the Continuing and Extra-Curricular Education Policy 2017

2 Commencement

This policy commences on [date].

3 Policy is binding

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

This policy:

(1) prescribes the nature and scope of continuing and extra-curricular education at the University;
(2) establishes governance, approval and quality assurance arrangements for continuing and extra-curricular education in the University;
(3) supports educational excellence, strategic development and innovation;
(4) provides a framework for aligning the continuing education strategies of academic and specialist units with the University’s strategic priorities.

5 Application

(1) This policy applies to:
   (a) continuing education; and
   (b) extra-curricular education.
(2) This policy does not apply to:
   (a) higher education award courses and their components (including units of study in the Open Learning Environment);
   (b) courses leading to a qualification (including non-AQF courses) approved the Academic Board; or
   (c) public lectures.

6 Definitions

In this policy:

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

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

In this policy academic unit only refers to units employing qualified academics on an ongoing basis as University staff members to teach courses in their area of expertise. It does not refer to Specialist Units as defined below.

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

AQF qualification means a qualification, accredited by the Australian Skills Quality Authority or the Tertiary Education Quality Standards Agency or by a self-accrediting institution as meeting standards and criteria specified
in the AQF, using titles regulated by the AQF.

**award course** has the meaning given in the Coursework Policy 2014, 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.

**Centre for Continuing Education** means the department of that name within the portfolio of the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor. The Centre for Continuing Education is not an academic or a specialist unit as defined in this policy.

**continuing education** Means any formal or informal learning, which is not part of a course of study for a qualification approved by the Academic Board. This includes but is not limited to:

- continuing professional development courses
- corporate training courses
- executive education courses
- open courses
- pathway courses
- personal interest courses
- professional development courses
- staff development and support courses
- continuing education courses offered together with other providers

**continuing professional development** means a continuing education course of learning undertaken to maintain professional knowledge and skills related to a profession, as part of a professional accreditation obligation.

**corporate training course** means a continuing education course commissioned by an employer to address a skill or knowledge gap in a workforce. Corporate training courses are normally customised to the workplace and may or may not lead to the award of a qualification.

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

**Deputy Vice Chancellor (Registrar)** Refers to the person or persons exercising the relevant delegations of the Deputy Vice Chancellor Registrar.

**exchange student** has the meaning given in the Coursework Policy 2014 which, as at the date of this policy is:

- a person who is:
  - not an Australian citizen;
  - not admitted to an award course at the University;
  - admitted to a formally approved program of study at an overseas institution with which the University has an exchange agreement; and
  - enrolled in one or more units of study at the University.
**executive education program** means an academic program targeted at business leaders and senior executives. These programs normally do not lead to a qualification but may be taken for credit in a postgraduate award course subject to the approval of a faculty and the Academic Board.

**extra-curricular education** means education provided to students of the University which is not an approved component of an award course (whether credit-bearing or given a zero-credit point weighting). This includes but is not limited to:

- student support courses
- compliance courses

**faculty** includes, where appropriate, a University school.

**higher education award** means an award course at the levels of:

- diploma,
- bachelor,
- bachelor with honours,
- graduate certificate,
- graduate diploma,
- master
- doctorate.

It does not include an honorary award.


**open course** means a course without admission requirements or prerequisites offered online to people who are not necessarily enrolled in an award course.

**Open Learning Environment** has the meaning given in the [Coursework Policy 2014](http://www.usyd.edu.au), which as at the date of this policy is:

- means 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.

**pathway program** means a program that provides bridging preparation for tertiary study following, or in conjunction with, secondary study.

**personal** means a course that does not lead to a qualification and which is offered to expand the knowledge or skills of the learner in an area
interest course  
not directly or necessarily related to an occupation.

professional development course  
means a course undertaken by an individual to improve professional knowledge, skills and abilities.

specialist unit  
means a unit within the University that is not an academic unit but which may provide continuing or extra curricular courses in a specialist area related to the unit’s operations.

staff development and support course  
means a course offered to University staff. A staff development and support course may be a component in an award course leading to a qualification but is not required to be.

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

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.

student support course  
means a course providing extra-curricular education to students enrolled in an award course, but which is not accredited by the Academic Board as a component of that award course.

7 Purposes and principles

(1) The purpose of continuing education is to provide flexible opportunities for lifelong learning, skill development and training to participants.

(2) The purpose of extra-curricular education is to provide opportunities to award course students, outside the curriculum, for:

(a) learning support;
(b) compliance training
(c) safety standards training; and
(d) other educational enrichment.

(3) Continuing education and extra-curricular education should:

(a) be informed by expertise within the University; and
(b) be aligned with the University's strategic objectives.

(4) Continuing education and extracurricular education must:

(a) be approved as specified in clause 9
(b) be subject to quality assurance, review and reporting as specified in clause 10.

8 Requirements for offering courses

(1) Continuing education and extra-curricular education courses may only be offered as specified in this clause.
(2) Continuing education and extra-curricular courses may be offered by:
(a) a faculty;
(b) an academic unit or specialist unit that reports to a Dean or Deputy Vice Chancellor;
(c) the Centre for Continuing Education.

(3) Subject to the approval of the Dean Faculties, University Schools and academic and specialist units under the governance of a faculty and reporting to a Dean may offer the following courses, consistently with the requirements of this clause and clause 7:
(a) continuing professional development courses;
(b) corporate training courses;
(c) executive education courses;
(d) extra curricular courses;
(e) personal interest courses;
(f) professional development courses;
(g) open courses;
(h) pathway courses;
(i) staff development courses;
(j) student support courses;
(k) research development courses;
(l) extra-curricular courses.

(4) Subject to the approval of the head of the academic unit, academic units within the portfolio of a Deputy Vice Chancellor may offer courses within their area of academic expertise may offer courses as listed in 3 (a)-(l).

(5) The Centre for Continuing Education may offer courses approved by a Dean in partnership with a Faculty as specified in 8 (3) or with the approval of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.

(6) In addition to approval by a dean or head of specialist or academic unit, the following courses also require the prior approval of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education);
(a) open courses;
(b) research training courses;
(c) continuing education courses conducted jointly with another institution.

(7) Where a Pathway Course fulfils all or part of an admission requirement for a University of Sydney award course, including requirements specified in a conditional offer to the University of Sydney, the use of the course as an admission pathway must be approved by the Admissions Committee and the Academic Board in addition to approval of the pathway course itself as specified in this section.

(8) Continuing education courses conducted jointly with another institution but which lead to a university qualification also require execution of a formal agreement as specified in the Agreements for Educational Services Policy.
9 Nomenclature of continuing education courses

(1) A continuing education course must not use a title in the Australian Qualifications framework and must not include words which suggest a qualification including:
   (a) Certificate (except as specified in 9 (2));
   (b) Diploma;
   (c) Bachelor;
   (d) Master;

(2) At the conclusion of a continuing education course, a student may be issued with a certificate of attendance or a certificate of completion provided that:
   (a) the certificate contains a statement that the course of study is not a higher education award and not a qualification recognised under the Australian Qualifications Framework; and
   (b) where the continuing education course delivers training or competencies on behalf of an external partner, the certificate specifies the professional body, employer or other organisation that determines the standards.

10 Approval of continuing and extra curricular education courses

(1) Continuing education courses and extra-curricular courses must be approved by:
   (a) for courses offered by a faculty, or an academic unit or specialist unit within a faculty, including courses offered in partnership with the Centre for Continuing Education, a Dean;
   (b) for courses offered by the Centre for Continuing Education that are not offered in partnership with a faculty, the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies; or
   (c) for academic units and specialist units not within a faculty, by the head of academic or specialist unit.

(2) In approving a continuing education course a dean or head of specialist or professional unit must consider:
   (a) Quality;
   (b) Nomenclature of course and certificate given to students
   (c) Rationale, design and outcomes;
   (d) If the course contains assessment, the rationale for having assessment, the method of assessment and the standards framework for the assessment;
   (e) Alignment with University and, where appropriate, faculty strategy;
   (f) Qualifications, expertise and experience of the person or persons delivering the course;
   (g) safety and risk;
   (h) Compliance including with legislation on working with children, where relevant;
   (i) demand and financial sustainability;
   (j) where the continuing education course involves assessment, how competencies and standards are established and monitored;
the terms of any agreement with external parties, including, where appropriate, whether competencies and standards for training or continuing professional development have been specified appropriately in an agreement.

Approval to offer a course should be for a specified period not exceeding four years, after which a course may be re-approved as described in this section.

11 Quality assurance

(1) Continuing and extra-curricular education courses should meet the educational excellence requirements for award courses specified in clause 8 of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

(2) At the course level, student experience must be:
   (a) measured through surveys and other appropriate instruments each time a course is offered;
   (b) reviewed in the light of student feedback and outcomes each time the course is offered; and
   (c) reported as directed by the Dean or head of academic or specialist unit;

(3) The head of an academic or specialist unit must provide a report on the unit’s continuing and extra-curricular education to the relevant Dean or, if the academic centre is not under the governance of a Faculty, to the Non-Award Subcommittee of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies on a date to be determined by the Non-Award Subcommittee.

(4) The Dean must provide a report on the faculty's continuing and extra-curricular education activity, quality, strategic alignment and sustainability to the faculty leadership group and faculty board on a date to be determined by the Non-Award Subcommittee;

(5) The faculty board must consider the Dean’s report and forward it, with appropriate comments, to the Non-Award Subcommittee of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.

(6) The Board of Interdisciplinary Studies must report the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education) and the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Provost) on the previous year’s continuing and extra-curricular education activity, and its quality, strategic alignment and sustainability on a date to be determined by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education).

(7) The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education) must consider the report of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies and, if appropriate, make recommendations to the University Executive, to faculties, and academic and specialist units on quality, strategic alignment and sustainability.

12 Roles and responsibilities

(1) The Academic Board approves pathway courses completed to fulfil admission requirements for study at the University of Sydney.

(1) The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education):
   (a) approves the offering of courses specified in subclause 8(6);
   (b) is responsible for overseeing the quality of continuing and extra-curricular education, including by:
(i) monitoring its quality and strategic alignment;
(ii) monitoring collection of information on quality, student experience and outcomes;
(iii) making recommendations on quality, strategic alignment of continuing education to the University Executive; and
(iv) providing strategic leadership in educational excellence and innovation.

(c) approves learning management systems;
(d) approves student support courses and extra-curricular education for University students.

(2) The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Provost):
(a) is responsible for monitoring the sustainability of continuing and extra-curricular education within faculties, centres, academic units and specialist units;
(b) making recommendations on sustainability of continuing and extra-curricular education to Deans, Heads of Units and the University Executive.

(3) The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Registrar) is responsible for the institutional systems for admission and candidature management.

(4) Deans:
(a) approve the educational approach and offering of continuing education courses within their area of responsibility;
(b) provide for the appointment of appropriately qualified staff to teach continuing and extra-curricular education within their areas of responsibility;
(c) are responsible for:
   (i) the strategic alignment, quality and sustainability of continuing education courses in their areas of responsibility;
   (ii) monitoring information on quality, outcomes and feedback; and
   (iii) reporting the results of such monitoring, to the faculty and to the Non-Award Subcommittee of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.

(5) The Board of Interdisciplinary Studies:
(a) approves the offering of interdisciplinary continuing education courses, on the recommendation of relevant Deans;
(b) approves continuing education courses offered by the Centre for Continuing Education that have not been approved by a Dean;
(c) is jointly responsible with relevant Deans and Deputy Vice-Chancellors for:
   (i) the strategic alignment and quality of interdisciplinary continuing education courses;
   (ii) monitoring information on quality, outcomes and feedback through reports to its non-award subcommittee; and
   (iii) reporting the results of such monitoring to the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education).

(6) Heads of academic and specialist centres:
(a) approve the educational approach and offering of continuing education courses within their area of responsibility;
(b) are responsible for:
   (i) monitoring the quality of continuing education offered by the academic or specialist centre; and
   (ii) reporting on its outcomes, activities and quality to the relevant Dean and the Non-Award Subcommittee of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies;
(c) overseeing the organisation, management and quality of continuing education within the academic or specialist centre.

(7) Individual teachers:
   (a) support and lead learning to the standards specified by the relevant Dean or Head of Specialist or Academic Centre;
   (b) prepare the educational content and conduct educational activities of the course; and
   (c) monitor and support educational quality and academic integrity.
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**RECOMMENDATION**

*That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board:*
1. approve the proposed curriculum framework for a research-pathway Masters degree;
2. note the name Master of Advanced Studies ([discipline]) for the research-pathway Masters degree;
3. approve the proposed curriculum framework for vertically-integrated research-pathway and professional/specialist Bachelor/Master combined degrees; and
4. approve changes to the Coursework Policy 2014 incorporating the curriculum framework for a research-pathway Masters degree and vertically integrated degrees.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This paper outlines a curriculum framework for a research-pathway Masters degree and for vertically integrated Bachelor/Masters degrees (VIMs) *(Attachment 1)* and recommends associated changes to the Coursework Policy 2014 *(Attachment 2)*.

The curriculum framework has been revised in response to feedback from the University's committees, and in response to indications that the distribution of postgraduate Commonwealth Supported Places (CSPs) might be reconfigured to become a merit-based scholarship scheme for students. The possibility of this change was signalled in the Federal budget and by the introduction of the *Higher Education Support Legislation Amendment (A More Sustainable, Responsive and Transparent Higher Education System) Bill 2017* *(the Bill)* and subsequent discussions with the Department of Education and Training held during September and October 2017.

Although the Bill was not supported when considered by the Senate on October 18 2017, there remains a possibility that the CSP scholarship scheme could go ahead. As the details of the scheme are not known, this paper proposes fast-tracking the development of the standalone research-pathway degree to 2019 in order to position the University for the start of this scheme should it go ahead. The paper also proposes maintaining flexibility about the entry pathway into the VIMs degrees, so as to allow the University to respond to any changes to the availability of CSPs for postgraduate students as a result of future action from the Government. At the moment, the proposed admission pathway is via transfer at the end of the second year of the Bachelor degree, rather than admission straight from school. This change will also address prior concerns of the Curriculum and Course Planning Committee (CCPC) regarding degree profile. If the CSP scholarship scheme does not go ahead for 2019, the commencement date for the standalone research-pathway degree will be reconsidered.

The Academic and Policy Standard Committee is also asked to note a single-name approach for the research-pathway Masters, the Master of Advanced Studies, which would enable agility in responding to market and simplicity of profile, including across vertically-integrated and standalone forms. This is contrary to the marginal preference shown for multiple, discipline-based names in the market research. However, that marginal preference appears outweighed by the benefits of a single name, particularly in light of uncertainty over the Government’s proposed changes.
The Strategic Plan (Initiative 4.1 and 4.2) sets out plans to establish a new curriculum framework (Initiative 4.1), new vertically integrated degree pathways for careers requiring specialist professional training will (Initiative 4.2) and a new 72-credit point research Masters degree (Initiative 2.1). This curriculum framework is set out in the University of Sydney 2016-2020 Strategic Plan (Strategic Plan), the Next Steps discussion paper (April 2016), developed and endorsed by the Degree Advisory Working Group (meeting 8 June 2017), and the discussion paper on Vertically Integrated Bachelor/Masters degrees (Attachment 1). The Coursework Policy 2014 sets out the curriculum framework for coursework degrees at the University of Sydney. It is proposed that this policy be amended to include the curriculum framework for a research-pathway Masters degree and vertically integrated Bachelor/Master degrees (Attachment 2).

Both the research-pathway and professional/specialist VIMs models are designed to ensure increasing levels of challenge at the senior levels of combined degrees, while allowing for appropriate development of breadth and depth within a minimal timeframe. Although degrees of this type are currently defined as undergraduate degrees and therefore can be undertaken by domestic students on a CSP basis, the recent proposed Bill sought to redefine them as postgraduate awards. Under this new definition, VIMs would be available on a CSP basis only to those students who successfully secure a postgraduate (PG) CSP scholarship under a newly proposed scholarship scheme that will replace PG CSP allocations to specific university courses.

The place of these two pathways in the degree profile is captured in the following graphic (see also figure 1, page 33 of the Strategic Plan).
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ISSUES

Postgraduate CSP scholarship scheme

The new definition of postgraduate in the Bill would have given effect to the proposal included in the Budget to allocate postgraduate CSP places via a centralised scholarship scheme based on merit. Although the Bill was not supported, there is a possibility that the intended postgraduate CSP scholarship scheme will be. The details of the scheme are unavailable. However, the Department of Education and Training has indicated that students entering into a CSP place in a Bachelor degree may be able to gain access to a postgraduate CSP scholarship for the Masters component of a vertically integrated combined or double degree by applying at the end of the second year of the Bachelor degree and transferring into the combined or double degree. The University is currently making representations that some CSP scholarships be available for vertically-integrated combined degrees and double degrees on the basis of an ATAR. The Government has not yet indicated how it will proceed on this matter.

The proposal to restrict entry to transferring students addresses the concerns regarding degree profile that were raised at the 26 June 2017 CCPC meeting at which this proposal was originally considered. It is proposed that entry be restricted to Dalyell students who would be offered the option of enrolling in a VIM after accepting a Dalyell place, and to students who transfer to Dalyell on the basis of achieving a threshold Annual Average Mark (AAM). These courses would, therefore, not be listed as separate UAC entry points, but optional entry to selected VIMs would be listed among the other advantages granted by the Dalyell stream. The model proposed here would not apply to existing Bachelor/Master combinations.

Resolution of the points at which CSP scholarships may be awarded will influence the admission pathways into the stand-alone research-pathway Masters, and the VIMs degrees for both research-pathway and professional programs. The University’s current approach is predicated on the assumption that places in VIMs can be applied for at the end of second year and at the end of the completed degree. This would create a viable funding situation for a VIM by transfer, for both professional and research-pathway degrees, and for a standalone research-pathway Masters degree. Adjustments will be made on the basis of further developments.

It is also proposed that the University fast-track the introduction of a standalone research-pathway Masters degree. Indications from the Department suggest that the Government is open to including research-pathway coursework Masters degrees in the postgraduate CSP scholarship scheme. This is in-line with the Minister’s previous support for the findings of the ACOLA Review of Australia’s Research Training System (2016), which recommended flexibility in funding structures to allow universities to develop flexible pathways to HDR training. A curriculum framework is now included here for a stand-alone research track coursework Masters degree.

Nomenclature

Discussion during 2016 identified a preference for specialist titles for the Masters component in the case of specialist/professional integrated bachelor/masters combined degrees. In the case of the research-pathway Masters a University-wide nomenclature has some advantages:

- faster approval time allowing for agility in responding to market changes;
- consistency and easier external recognition for students moving on to take a PhD at another institution;
- profile simplicity;
- a common name would avoid confusion of the research-pathway Masters (which would be by coursework) with existing Masters degrees by research.

Market research was undertaken testing the names:

- Master of Advanced Studies ([Discipline]);

The research indicated a small preference for the second title, but did not provide evidence that the title would influence a student’s decision to enrol. Since the conclusion of this research, the potential of the government’s current proposed changes to increase the attractiveness of the standalone Masters of Advanced Studies
degree for domestic students has become clear. Together with the increased simplicity of degree profiles and management of course proposals that would result from a single name for the research-pathway degree, the benefits of a single name outweigh the slight preference for the multiple names.

Coursework Policy 2014 changes

The Coursework Policy 2014 contains the curriculum framework for the University's degrees. Attachment 2 sets out proposed amendments, as follows:

- Part 1, Section 5:
  - Change to definition of combined degree adding reference to vertically integrated degrees;
  - Change to definition of Masters degree adding 'research-pathway Masters degrees';
  - Change to definition of 'specialisation' adding specialisation for research-pathway Masters degrees;
  - Addition of definition of 'vertically integrated degree'.

- Part 17, Section 87A:
  - Addition of definition of research-pathway Masters degrees.

- Part 17, Section 91:
  - Addition of sections 91A, B, and C setting out the curriculum framework for VIMs.

The amendments to the Coursework Policy 2014 also include changes recommended by the Policy Unit as a result of changes to Delegations and the University of Sydney (Governance of Faculties and University Schools) Rule 2016.

PROPOSED CURRICULUM FRAMEWORK

For the standalone research-pathway Masters, the Master of Advanced Studies (discipline):

- The viability for domestic students would be contingent on the availability of CSP scholarships. However, the degree may be attractive to International Students and could be developed as a separate entry point alongside the vertically integrated Bachelor/Master vertically integrated combined degrees.

- Requirements for the standalone research-pathway degree would be as follows:
  - a 96 credit point coursework Masters degree;
  - admission on the basis of a completed Bachelor Degree with WAM of 65 or higher;
  - up to 24 points of credit can be given for advanced (3000-level) Bachelor study in a cognate area
  - a Specialisation including:
    - a research project of 24-36 credit points;
    - coursework developing advanced knowledge and research skills at 4000 and 5000 level and above.
  - a minimum of 72 credit points, including any Masters core units at 4000 level or higher;
  - a minimum of 36 credit points in total must be at 5000-level;
  - at least 6 and no more than 12 credit points at 5000 level in the Open Learning Environment
  - governance of the stand-alone degree through the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies, with governance, management and delivery of Masters Specialisation by the faculty offering the specialisation.

The models proposed for VIMs in the discussion paper (Attachment 1) are for combined degrees built on 144 credit point Bachelor degrees. Discussion have taken place with faculties offering 192 credit point Bachelor degrees to determine interest and develop potential models for those programs and this model has been allowed for in the curriculum framework in the Coursework Policy 2014 (Attachment 2).

For 144 credit point Bachelor degrees, the curriculum framework for the professional/specialist combined degree and the research-pathway combined degree have a number of similarities, but differ over the project requirement (the former requiring a 12 – 36 5000 level capstone which may be a research or other capstone experience, the latter requiring a 24 – 36 credit point research project at 4000 level and above). The curriculum frameworks are described below.
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For the research-pathway integrated Bachelor/Master combined degrees:

- They would be designed for high-achieving students with an ATAR of 98+, with equity equivalents and comparable transfer pathways at the end of second year.
- Admission would be for Dalyell students only (depending on outcome of government action). Students achieving an AAM threshold of 75 would be able to transfer to the vertically integrated combined degree at the end of the second year. This would enable students to apply for a CSP scholarship and transfer if successful. Students could also transfer without a CSP scholarship if they met the threshold. Depending on the outcome of government action, admission may also be possible with CSP scholarship on the basis of an ATAR.
- Requirements for the vertically integrated degree would be as follows:
  - for 144 credit point Bachelor degrees, a 216 credit point combined Bachelor/Master degree:
    - a Bachelor degree of 144 credit points;
    - a Master of Advanced Studies ([discipline]) degree of 96 credit points (though effectively 72 credit points with cross-crediting); the Masters specialisation to build on a discipline studied to major level or higher in the Bachelor degree;
    - 24 credit points cross-credited between the Bachelor and Master degree;
    - a Specialisation including:
      - a research project of 24-36 credit points;
      - coursework developing advanced knowledge and research skills at 4000 and 5000 level and above.
    - a minimum of 72 credit points, including any Masters core units at 4000 level or higher;
    - a minimum of 36 credit points at 5000 level;
    - at least 6 and no more than 12 credit points at 5000 level in the Open Learning Environment in addition to the Open Learning Environment units required in the Bachelor degree;
  - for 192 credit point Bachelor degrees, a 240 credit point combined Bachelor/Master degree:
    - a Bachelor degree of 192 credit points;
    - a Master of Advanced Studies ([discipline]) degree of 96 credit points (though effectively 48 credit points with cross-crediting); the Masters specialisation to build on a discipline studied to major level or higher in the Bachelor degree;
    - 48 credit points cross-credited between the Bachelor and Master degree;
    - a Specialisation including:
      - a research project of 24-36 credit points;
      - coursework developing advanced knowledge and research skills at 4000 and 5000 level and above.
    - a minimum of 72 credit points, including any Masters core units at 4000 level or higher;
    - a minimum of 36 credit points at 5000 level;
    - at least 6 and no more than 12 credit points at 5000 level in the Open Learning Environment in addition to the Open Learning Environment units required in the Bachelor degree.

- A single set of Bachelor/Master resolutions would be created. Faculties that wished to offer the program would develop a curriculum for the Masters specialisation (pre-requisite major, 4000 and 5000 level units, core and research project) and submit to the Academic Board as an amendment to the University-wide degree resolutions (thus creating a shorter, more agile approval process).
- The Masters specialisation would be built upon a major not a specific degree, enabling students to pursue masters level specialisation in a major taken from the shared pool as well as from a Table A major from their home degree;
- The combined degree must achieve learning outcomes of at least AQF level 9, should develop the (proposed) graduate qualities for PhD students (including through the Open Learning Environment).

Specialist/professional integrated Bachelor/Master combined degrees:

- They would be designed for high-achieving students with an ATAR of 98+ or at a level to be determined, with equity equivalents and comparable transfer pathways at the end of first and second year.
- Admission to Dalyell students only (depending on outcome of government action). Students achieving an AAM threshold of 75 would also be able to transfer to the vertically integrated combined degree at
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the end of second year. Depending on the outcome of government action, admission may also be possible with CSP scholarship on the basis of an ATAR.

- Requirements for the vertically integrated degree would be as follows:
  - for 144 credit point Bachelor degrees, a 216 credit point combined Bachelor/Master degree:
    - a Bachelor degree of 144 credit points;
    - a Masters degree in a cognate discipline to one of the majors of 96 credit points (effectively 72 with cross-crediting);
    - 24 credit points cross-credited between the Bachelor and Master degree;
    - a minimum of 72 credit points, including any masters core units at 4000 level or higher;
    - a minimum of 36 credit points at 5000 level;
    - a 5000-level capstone project of at least 12 and no more than 36 credit points;
    - at least 6 and no more than 12 credit points at 5000 level in the Open Learning Environment in addition to the Open Learning Environment units required in the Bachelor degree;
  - for 192 credit point Bachelor degrees, a 240 credit point combined Bachelor/Master degree:
    - a Bachelor degree of 192 credit points;
    - a Masters degree in a cognate discipline to one of the majors of 96 credit points (effectively 48 with cross-crediting);
    - 48 credit points cross-credited between the Bachelor and Master degree;
    - a minimum of 72 credit points, including any masters core units at 4000 level or higher;
    - a minimum of 36 credit points at 5000 level;
    - a 5000-level capstone project of at least 12 and no more than 36 credit points;
    - at least 6 and no more than 12 credit points at 5000 level in the Open Learning Environment in addition to the Open Learning Environment units required in the Bachelor degree.

- The title of the combined degree would combine the bachelor title (with specialisation) and a discipline specific Master title: e.g. Bachelor of Arts (Economics)/Master of Economics;
- The approval process would be that each combined Bachelor/Master specialist coursework degree would develop a curriculum based on the framework and submit a course proposal with separate resolutions to the Academic Board;
- The degree must achieve learning outcomes of at least AQF level 9 and provide specialist or professional education in the designated field (including through the Open Learning Environment).

CONSULTATION

In April 2016, the discussion paper, Next Steps set out a rationale and framework for vertically integrated Bachelor/Masters degrees for both professional/specialist and research track pathways. These were developed into the discussion paper, Vertically Integrated Bachelor/Masters degrees (Attachment 1). Changes since last version are highlighted.

The meeting schedule for the approval of the curriculum framework and amendments to the Coursework Policy 2014 is:

- CCPC: 23 October 2017
- UE: 2 November 2017
- UE Ed: 6 November 2017
- USC and GSC: 7 November 2017
- ASPC: 14 November 2017

IMPLEMENTATION

Following agreement and approval of framework and policy amendments, degree proposals for the research track integrated Bachelor/Master combined degree will be developed in the second half of 2017 and the first half of 2018 for commencement in 2020. If thought feasible by faculties, development of the standalone research-pathway Masters degrees will proceed on the same timeline but for commencement in 2019.
Pending evaluation of market research faculties will develop proposals for professional/specialist integrated bachelor/masters combined degrees in the second half of the year for commencement in 2020. Proposals should include options for 2018 commencing Bachelor students who meet the required standard to transfer into the program in 2020 or 2021.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Discussion paper on Vertically Integrated Bachelor/Masters degrees.
Attachment 2 – Policy amendments to the University of Sydney Coursework Policy 2014 to incorporate the curriculum framework for research-pathway Masters degree, and vertically integrated research-pathway and professional/specialist Bachelor/Master combined degrees.
Vertically integrated Bachelor/Master degrees
27 October 2017

Background

The University’s 2016-2020 Strategic Plan¹ envisages vertically integrated Masters degrees
for three purposes:

• To provide Masters level learning outcomes in a professional field by replacing
double undergraduate degrees involving a professional qualification with vertically
integrated Bachelor/Master options of approximately the same length;
• To provide an accelerated pathway to training for a specialist field requiring Masters
level preparation; and
• To provide an accelerated and enriched pathway via a research-track coursework
Master’s that will serve as the University’s preferred preparation for a PhD.

In the case of professional pathways via double degrees, the vertically integrated Masters
(VIM) model is attractive because it offers Masters level professional learning outcomes with no
or limited increase in degree length. For specialist fields, students likewise gain greater depth
of learning in their field together with the broader benefits of the University’s new curriculum
framework, and again, this can be achieved in minimum time. Importantly, in both cases, the
vertical model ensures that students are increasingly challenged each year, and build on
advancing knowledge and skills to attain deeper and more advanced learning outcomes,
increasing the likelihood of a successful transition to the next stage of their careers. Since the
VIM form offers higher level outcomes for no or minimal increase to degree length compared
to an existing double Bachelor degree, it also optimises the educational value of double
degrees to students and the community.

For research pathways, the vertically integrated model offers a type of ‘super-Honours’
experience, supporting an expanded program of coursework to advance knowledge in a
student’s chosen field and build the broader skills that are now seen as essential for a
successful research career. In the latter case, the VIM model also supports a substantial
experiential component in the form of a research project, and can be designed to enable
completion in 216 credit points (4.5 EFTSL) which, with a manageable level of acceleration,
can be completed in 4 calendar years. The additional preparation for the PhD afforded by
this Master’s pathway should also ensure higher PhD completion rates and free up space within
the PhD itself for realization of the aspirations for industry engagement in PhD programs set
out in the Watt and ACOLA review reports.

CSP Places in Vertically Integrated Masters programs

The availability of CSP places for vertically integrated masters programs is considered by the
University community as vital to their success. The University therefore sought advice about
CSP availability from the Commonwealth Department of Education and Training in July 2016
and noted that it was seeking to develop vertically integrated Masters degrees in three
specific circumstances:

• in the case of some specific professional programs, to replace existing
  Bachelor/professional Bachelor double degree combinations by integrated
  Bachelor/professional Masters double degree combinations;
• to offer high achieving students accelerated access to research-track Masters
  coursework programs and hence provide an optimal pathway to the PhD and a
career founded on research excellence; and
• to offer high achieving students accelerated access to specialist Masters coursework
  programs and hence outstanding depth of disciplinary learning, breadth of skills and
  perspective, and fast access to a specialist career

¹ See pages 24, 36 of the 2016-2020 Strategic Plan
The Department confirmed in July that, under current legislation, all such programs would fall under the demand driven system and that CSP places would therefore be available. As discussed later in the paper, the Government unsuccessfully sought to change this situation in October. At the time of writing vertically integrated Bachelor/Master programs are eligible for CSP funding but the Government’s plans to realise its plans to change this remain unclear.

Accelerated structure

In the April 2016 Next Steps Update paper, a possible structure for an accelerated 216 credit point vertically integrated Bachelor/Master program that could be completed in 4 calendar years was proposed. Table 1 below sets out an illustrative course structure for a VIM that could serve as a research pathway, modified here from the Next Steps paper version to allow between 12 and 48 credit points of research project work at Master’s (that is, 4000- and 5000-level) and between 24 and 60 credit points of coursework at the same level. It is assumed in this model that the field of the Master’s program is cognate with one of the undergraduate majors completed in the Bachelors degree and it is therefore appropriate to conceptualise the full stand-alone Master’s degree as a 96 credit point degree with 24 credit points credited to Bachelor level study in the cognate major.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Major 1</th>
<th>Major 1</th>
<th>Major 1</th>
<th>Core/Elective</th>
<th>Core/elective</th>
<th>OLE</th>
<th>Elective</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Major 1</td>
<td>Major 1</td>
<td>Major 1</td>
<td>Core/Elective</td>
<td>Core/elective</td>
<td>OLE</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Major 1 (project)</td>
<td>Major 1 (interdisc)</td>
<td>AdvCW</td>
<td>AdvCW</td>
<td>AdvCW</td>
<td>Elective/ Major 2</td>
<td>Elective/ Major 2</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project/ AdvCW</td>
<td>Project/ AdvCW</td>
<td>Project/ AdvCW</td>
<td>Project/ AdvCW</td>
<td>Project/ AdvCW</td>
<td>AdvCW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Illustrative course structure for an accelerated 216cp Bachelor/Master degree*

The structure shown in Table 1 affords completion of a major as well as 72 credit points of Masters (4000 and 5000) level course and project work. It also includes an extra 6cp of study in each year; this requirement could be completed in the summer semester and would be offered to all students in the accelerated program. Students who have completed at least 48 credit points with a WAM of 75 or more could be offered the opportunity to transfer laterally into the program. A progression requirement could also be set for students to remain in the program: for example a WAM of at least 65 could be required. The requirements for the Masters degree could be as set out in Table 2.

Table 2. Coursework Master’s degree requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course requirements for a Masters degree</th>
<th>The degree comprises 72-96 credit points of which at least 72 credit points should be completed at level 4000 or higher including:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the degree’s core units offered at 4000-level or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• elective units at 4000-level or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a minimum of 36 credit points in total at 5000-level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a 5000-level capstone project of at least 12 and no more than 48 credit points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The degree must meet the requirements of an AQF level 9 degree.

A non-accelerated structure

A non-accelerated version of the course would also be available; an illustrative course structure is shown in Table 3.

---

2 This aspect of the legislation is not proposed to change in the draft legislative changes proposed following the May 2017 Federal Budget.
Table 3. Illustrative course structure for vertically integrated 216cp Bachelor/Master degree undertaken at a standard rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Major 1</th>
<th>Major 1</th>
<th>Core/Elective</th>
<th>Core/Elective</th>
<th>Core/Elective</th>
<th>OLE</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Major 1 (project)</td>
<td>Major 1 (interdisc)</td>
<td>Major 1</td>
<td>AdvCW</td>
<td>AdvCW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Project/AdvCW</td>
<td>Project/AdvCW</td>
<td>Project/AdvCW</td>
<td>Project/AdvCW</td>
<td>AdvCW</td>
<td>AdvCW</td>
<td>Elective/Major 2</td>
<td>Elective/Major 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project/AdvCW</td>
<td>Project/AdvCW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The eight right-most columns indicate units of study; Core= degree core if required; AdvCW = 4000- or 5000-level coursework units; OLE = Open Learning Environment units.

What do we mean by ‘integrated’?

An integrated combined degree program is one offered as a single combined course of study. Both degrees are awarded on completion of the entire program of study, and there is a substantial level (e.g. 24-48 credit points) of cross-crediting from each of the constituent degrees to the other. The combined program is vertical when the degree constituents sit at different AQF levels (e.g. Bachelor/Master or Master/PhD) and horizontal when the degree constituents are at the same level (e.g. Bachelor/Bachelor or Master/Master).

For the purposes of the Higher Education Support Act 2003, an integrated combined degree program that includes a Bachelor degree is an undergraduate course of study and therefore eligible for CSP funding.3

Admission

Legislation considered and rejected by the Australian Senate in October concerning the definition of “postgraduate” and the allocation of CSP places in postgraduate courses via a central CSP scholarship pool (including, according to the proposed definition, vertically integrated combined degrees) would have an impact on viable admission pathways into this degree. As noted earlier (CSP Places in Vertically Integrated Masters Programs), under current

3 The relevant definitions are:

**course of study** means:
(a) an enabling course; or
(b) a single course leading to a higher education award; or
(c) a course recognised by the higher education provider at which the course is undertaken as a combined or double course leading to 1 or more higher education awards;

**enabling course** means a course of instruction provided to a person for the purpose of enabling the person to undertake a course leading to a higher education award, but does not include:
(a) a course leading to a higher education award; or
(b) any course that the Minister determines is not an enabling course for the purposes of this Act.

**undergraduate course of study** means a course of study that is neither an enabling course nor a postgraduate course of study.

**postgraduate course of study** means a course of study that:
(a) leads to one or more of the following higher education awards:
(i) a graduate diploma;
(ii) a graduate certificate;
(iii) a master’s degree;
(iv) a doctoral degree; and
(b) does not lead to any other higher education award.
legislation, CSP places would be available for vertically integrated combined degrees but not for a stand-alone research pathway Masters degree by coursework. As near as could be gauged the Government's intention was:

The Government will allocate CSP places in postgraduate degrees according to a centrally administered merit-based system of CSP scholarships.

CSP scholarships will be available for research track degrees, professional degrees and for the Master component of vertically integrated Bachelor/Master degrees (by transfer).

Allocation of CSP scholarships will be made on the basis of 2nd year results (for students wishing to transfer to a vertically integrated Bachelor/Masters program from a single Bachelor degree), and on the basis of completed Bachelor degrees.

However, with the failure of the legislation in the Senate in October it is currently not clear how much of this intention will be realized. The University is therefore proceeding to develop the Vertically Integrated research-pathway Bachelor/Masters degree for 2020 commencement and a stand-alone research pathway Masters degree for commencement in 2019 based on the assumption that the Government's intentions will eventually be implemented.

Adjustments will be made in the light of changing circumstances.

Admission to vertically integrated professional and research track combined Bachelor/Master degrees would be by transfer at the end of second year on the basis of having achieved an WAM of 75 over the first 96 credit points. Students would have the chance to apply for a CSP scholarship and know the outcome of that application before applying. The accelerated research track and professional master programs for high achieving students would be offered to commencing Dalyell students only.

Admission to the stand-alone research track masters would be made on the basis of a completed tertiary degree and require a credit average.

A proposed research-track coursework Masters degree

Using the broad approach above it is proposed to create a new research-track coursework Masters degree that can be vertically integrated with a Bachelor degree and offered in an accelerated or non-accelerated form according to the structures proposed in Tables 4 and 5 below.

The core requirements of the Masters degree would be:

- A 96 credit point degree
- Up to 24 points of credit can be given for advanced (3000-level) Bachelor study in a cognate area
- A research project of 24-48 credit points is required
- Advanced (4000- or 5000-level) coursework of 24-36 credit points is also required,
- A minimum of 36 credit points in total must be at 5000-level.
Table 4. Illustrative course structure for an accelerated 216cp research-track Bachelor/Master degree*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Major 1</th>
<th>Major 1</th>
<th>Major 1</th>
<th>Core/Elective</th>
<th>Core/elective</th>
<th>OLE</th>
<th>Elective</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Major 1</td>
<td>Major 1</td>
<td>Major 1</td>
<td>Core/Elective</td>
<td>Core/elective</td>
<td>OLE</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Major 1</td>
<td>Major 1</td>
<td>Major 1</td>
<td>Core/Elective</td>
<td>Core/elective</td>
<td>OLE</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 (project)</td>
<td>Major 1 (interdisc)</td>
<td>AdvCW</td>
<td>AdvCW</td>
<td>AdvCW</td>
<td>Elective/Major 2</td>
<td>Elective/Major 2</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project/AdvCW</td>
<td>Project/AdvCW</td>
<td>Project/AdvCW</td>
<td>AdvCW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The nine right-most columns indicate units of study; Core= degree core if required; AdvCW = 4000- or 5000-level coursework units; OLE = Open Learning Environment units.

Table 5. Illustrative course structure for vertically integrated research-track 216cp Bachelor/Master degree undertaken at a standard rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Major 1</th>
<th>Major 1</th>
<th>Core/Elective</th>
<th>Core/Elective</th>
<th>Core/Elective</th>
<th>OLE</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Major 1</td>
<td>Major 1</td>
<td>Core/Elective</td>
<td>Core/Elective</td>
<td>Core/Elective</td>
<td>OLE</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Major 1</td>
<td>Major 1</td>
<td>Major 1</td>
<td>Core/Elective</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>OLE</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 (project)</td>
<td>Major 1 (interdisc)</td>
<td>Major 1</td>
<td>AdvCW</td>
<td>AdvCW</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>AdvCW</td>
<td>AdvCW</td>
<td>Elective/Major 2</td>
<td>Elective/Major 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>Project/AdvCW</td>
<td>Project/AdvCW</td>
<td>Project/AdvCW</td>
<td>Project/AdvCW</td>
<td>AdvCW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The eight right-most columns indicate units of study; Core= degree core if required; AdvCW = 4000- or 5000-level coursework units; OLE = Open Learning Environment units.

It is also proposed that up to 12 credit points could come from a pool of OLE units intended to provide broader skills for research and research track students (e.g., modules in research methods, data analysis, advanced communication skills).

**Nomenclature of the research-track coursework Masters degree**

The name of the degree has been the subject of market research. Following earlier discussion at CCPC and UE Education, the market research tested two naming options:

- **Bachelor/Master of Advanced Studies ([discipline])**
- A suite consisting of Bachelor of Arts/Master of Arts([discipline] Honours), Bachelor of Commerce/Master of Commerce ([discipline] Honours), Bachelor of Science/Master of Science([discipline] Honours).

The research indicated a small preference for the second title though the research did not provide evidence that the title would influence a student's decision to enrol. It was noted that the reputation of the Master of Advanced Studies and the Bachelor of Advanced Studies would reinforce each other and that the benefits for agility of approval for faculties would be considerable.

A University-wide single name Master of Advanced Studies ([discipline]) has advantages:

- faster approval time and improved capacity to respond to institutions level to developments arising from the ACOLA and WATT reviews;
- consistency and easier external recognition for students moving on to take a PhD in another institution;
- profile simplicity;
• consistency with Bachelor/Bachelor of Advanced Studies for combined undergraduate degrees;
• avoidance of confusion with existing masters degrees by research.
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PART 1 PRELIMINARY

1 Name of policy

This is the Coursework Policy 2014.

2 Commencement

This Policy commences on the day after the day on which it is registered.

3 Statement of intent

This Policy governs all coursework award courses leading to the following qualifications:

(a) Diplomas;
(b) Advanced Diplomas;
(c) Bachelor Degrees;
(d) Bachelor Honours Degrees;
(e) Graduate Certificates;
(f) Graduate Diplomas; and
(g) Masters Degrees.

Note: These are the only coursework qualifications awarded or conferred by the University. See clause 1.3(2) of the Coursework Rule.
Note: ‘Masters Degrees’ includes the following exceptions endorsed under the Issuance Policy of the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) relating to AQF level 9 qualifications that contain the word ‘doctor’ rather than ‘master’ in their title: Juris Doctor, Doctor of Dental Medicine, Doctor of Medicine and Doctor of Veterinary Medicine.

4 Application

(1) Except to the extent that a contrary intention is expressed:
   (a) this policy applies to:
      (i) staff, affiliates, students and applicants for coursework award courses; and
      (ii) non-award students, exchange students and study abroad students enrolled in a unit of study at the University;
   (b) it is a condition of each student’s admission to candidature that the student complies with his or her obligations under this policy.

(2) Authorities and responsibilities set out in this policy are also defined in the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016

5 Definitions

(1) In this policy:

academic adviser means an academic employee nominated by the Dean of a faculty or the Head of School and Dean of a University school to provide advice on student progression matters.

academic progression register means the record of all students whose academic progression is being monitored by a faculty in accordance with this policy.

academic progression requirements means the requirements for academic progression in an award course, set out in faculty resolutions, award course resolutions or this policy.

academic transcript means a written statement setting out a student’s academic record at the University.

admission means admission to candidature in a coursework award course at the University.

advanced standing means acknowledgement by the University of relevant prior academic achievement or relevant experience, usually in the form of a reduced volume of learning, or credit points that count towards the requirements of an award course.

appended honours course means a course that leads to an award of a degree with honours where the honours component is undertaken after the student has met the course requirements for the degree (without honours).
applicant means an applicant for admission to a coursework award course at 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 means the Associate Dean of a faculty or a University school with responsibility for coursework award courses at the relevant level, or the deputy chairperson of a board of studies or a person appointed by the Dean to have responsibility for coursework award courses at the relevant level.

Australian Tertiary Admissions Rank (ATAR) for an applicant, means:

• the applicant’s rank in relation to the applicant’s secondary cohort, as provided to the University by UAC; or
• the applicant’s results in a school leaving examination in another State, Territory or country, converted to an ATAR equivalent, as provided to the University by UAC.

ATAR cut off for a course, means the ATAR fixed by the relevant faculty as the minimum ATAR that an applicant must achieve to be eligible for admission to the course, unless the applicant is eligible for admission to the course through an educational access scheme.

Australian citizen has the meaning it has under the Australian Citizenship Act 2007 (Cth).

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

authentic assessment means assessment tasks that relate the application of knowledge to problems, skills and performances that are found in general or disciplinary practices or professional contexts. It includes but is not limited to projects, investigations and report writing.

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.

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.
Bachelor degree means 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.

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

Note: See clause 83C.

barrier unit of study means a unit of study that the faculty has determined must be passed before a student is permitted to progress.

candidature means the period during which a student is eligible to enrol in units of study in a coursework award course at the University.

capstone experience means 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.

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

combined degree course means a combination of two degree programs structured to enable students to count a specified number of credit points 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 and vertically integrated combined degree.

Commonwealth supported place means a place in an award course in respect of which the student and the Commonwealth government both contribute towards the cost of the student’s education.
compulsory unit of study  means a unit of study that must be completed before the award of a degree, but which does not constitute a barrier unit of study.

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

course requirements  means the requirements for an award course set out in any relevant faculty resolutions and the award course resolutions.

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.

Coursework Rule  means the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014.

credit  means advanced standing based on previous attainment in another award course at the University or at another institution, or in a non-award course approved by the Academic Board. The advanced standing is expressed as credit points granted towards the award course. Credit may be granted as specific credit or non-specific credit.

credit point  means a measure of value indicating the contribution that each unit of study provides towards meeting award course completion requirements, stated as a total credit point value.

criteria  means statements that identify the key characteristics or qualities of student performance in an assessment task.

cross-credited unit of study  means a unit of study that, on completion, is credited towards the requirements of two awards, or two component parts of a combined award.

cross-institutional study  means enrolment by a student in a unit or units of study at another university or institution.

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

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

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

department  means an academic disciplinary grouping established within a
disability has the meaning prescribed in Section 4 of the \textit{Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Cth)}. At the date of this policy the definition is:

disability, in relation to a person, means:

(a) total or partial loss of the person’s bodily or mental functions; or
(b) total or partial loss of a part of the body; or
(c) the presence in the body of organisms causing disease or illness; or
(d) the presence in the body of organisms capable of causing disease or illness; or
(e) the malfunction, malformation or disfigurement of a part of the person’s body; or
(f) a disorder or malfunction that results in the person learning differently from a person without the disorder or malfunction; or
(g) a disorder, illness or disease that affects a person’s thought processes, perception of reality, emotions or judgment or that results in disturbed behaviour;

and includes a disability that:

(a) presently exists; or
(b) previously existed but no longer exists; or
(c) may exist in the future (including because of a genetic predisposition to that disability); or
(d) is imputed to a person.

To avoid doubt, a disability that is otherwise covered by this definition includes behaviour that is a symptom or manifestation of the disability.

domestic applicant means an applicant who is:

- an Australian citizen;
- a permanent resident of Australia; or
- a New Zealand citizen.

domestic student means a student who is:

- an Australian citizen;
- a permanent resident of Australia; or
- a New Zealand citizen.

double degree 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.
educational access scheme means an entry scheme approved by the Academic Board in accordance Part 7 of this policy.

embedded program means a sequence of linked courses in closely related academic or professional areas that:
- allows for consequential and incrementally higher levels of academic achievement;
- specifies in the award course resolutions conditions for transfer from one linked award to a higher linked award; and
- allows credit points for a unit of study to count towards more than one of the linked awards.

enrolment means enrolment in a coursework award course at the University. A person is not enrolled until the person has completed, to the satisfaction of the University, all requirements for enrolment or re-enrolment in the award course concerned.

exchange student means a person who is:
- not an Australian citizen;
- not admitted to an award course at the University;
- admitted to a formally approved program of study at an overseas institution with which the University has an exchange agreement; and
- enrolled in one or more units of study at the University.

exemption means an exemption given by a faculty to a student from the requirement to complete parts of the prescribed work for a particular unit of study within a course, including attendance at prescribed lectures, seminars, tutorials and practical work.

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

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

feedback means information provided to students on the quality of their learning in relation to an assessment activity, which forms the basis of improved student learning.

flexible entry scheme means an entry scheme for Australian recent school leavers, approved by the Academic Board in accordance with clause 26 of this Policy.

Graduate Certificate means an advanced program of study that builds on prior undergraduate study or, where approved by the faculty, prior experience that is considered by the faculty to demonstrate the required knowledge and aptitude.

Graduate Diploma means an advanced program of study that builds on either or both of prior undergraduate or postgraduate study.
graduate qualities means the qualities demonstrated by all graduates of award courses on completion of the requirements of the award course. At the date of this policy, for undergraduate award courses, Part 2 of Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 details these as:

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

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

Higher School Certificate (HSC) means a Higher School Certificate granted by the NSW Board of Studies under the Education Act 1990.

International English Language Testing System (IELTS) means the test jointly administered by British Council, IDP Education Pty Ltd and the University of Cambridge.

integrated honours course means a course that leads to the award of a degree with honours that is not an appended honours course. The honours component of the course is integrated within the overall course without extending the time for completion of the course.

international applicant means an applicant who is **not**:  
- an Australian citizen;
- a permanent resident of Australia; or
- a New Zealand citizen.

International Baccalaureate means the diploma awarded to a person who successfully completes the International Baccalaureate program, developed and administered by the International Baccalaureate Organisation.

international student means a student who is **not**:
- an Australian citizen;
- a permanent resident of Australia; or
- a New Zealand citizen.
**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**  means a degree 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.

*Note:* See clause 83B.

**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 Part 3 of the *Learning and Teaching Policy 2015*.

**Masters degree by coursework**  means a program of advanced learning and professional training that builds on undergraduate study, achieves at least the learning outcomes specified for level 9 of the AQF and normally leads to a capstone experience. The University offers four types of Masters degree by coursework:

- **Advanced Learning Masters**: a minimum one year full-time advanced study course that builds on prior undergraduate study in the same discipline or in a relevant discipline;
- **Professional Masters degree**: a Masters degree that prepares the student for accreditation or recognition in a specific profession, building either on prior undergraduate study in the discipline or on undergraduate study in another appropriate discipline;
- **Research pathway Masters Degree**: a Masters degree that develops advanced knowledge and research skills in a discipline to prepare a student to undertake a Doctor of Philosophy;
- **Masters Degree (Extended)**: a Professional Masters Degree of extended duration, typically three or four years full-time. The degree of Doctor of Dental Medicine, Juris Doctor, Doctor of Medicine and Doctor of Veterinary Medicine are referred to in the AQF as ‘Masters Degree (Extended)’.

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

*Note:* See Part 3 of the *Learning and Teaching Policy 2015*.

**misadventure**  means an unforeseen accident, mishap or personal misfortune.

**moderation**  means the process by which the validity and reliability of assessment marks are verified.

**non-award student**  means a person who is not admitted to an award course at the University, and who is not an exchange student or study abroad.
student, but is enrolled in a unit of study at the University.

**non-specific credit** means a 'block credit' for a specified number of credit points at a particular level. These credit points may be in a particular subject area but are not linked to a specific unit of study.

**New Zealand Qualifications framework (NZQF)** means the New Zealand national framework for recognition and endorsement of education qualifications.

**open learning environment** means 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.

**principal examiner** means the designated person responsible for the assignment of final marks and grades in a unit of study.

**Professional or Specialist Bachelor Degree** means a degree that develops disciplinary or professional expertise for a specific profession or career specialisation and graduate qualities.

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

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

**progression profile** means the record of all relevant documentation relating to a student's academic progression, including correspondence and interview records.

**progression rate** means the rate at which a student accrues credit in their award course over a defined period, measured as a credit point progression rate and a unit of study progression rate.

**progression requirements** means the requirements for academic progression set out in the faculty resolutions, award course resolutions and this Policy.
recent school leaver means a person who completed the HSC or equivalent in the year immediately prior to admission or proposed admission to an award course, or who completed their HSC in the year immediately prior to that if the person has not undertaken any tertiary study.

Registrar means the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar)

semester average mark means the average mark obtained by a student for all units of study attempted in a semester, weighted according to credit point value.

simple extension means an informal arrangement between a student and a unit of study co-ordinator to permit late submission of work, as provided in clause 66A of this policy.

special admission program means a flexible entry scheme or an educational access scheme approved by the Academic Board and listed in Part 7 of this policy.

specialisation Has the meaning given in the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 which, at the time of approval was:

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

or:

the research specialisation developed in a research pathway Masters or vertically integrated degree

specific credit means the recognition of previously completed studies as directly equivalent to specific units of study.

Staying on Track information session means an information session held intensively, for a full week in each semester, to assist students who are failing to meet academic progression requirements.

Staying on Track survey means a self-reflective survey designed to assist students to identify why they are having difficulties meeting academic progression requirements.

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.

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.
study abroad student means a person who is:
• not an Australian citizen;
• not admitted to an award course at the University;
• admitted to a formally approved program of study at an overseas institution with which the University does not have an exchange agreement; and
• enrolled in units of study at the University.

Summer School means the intensive teaching period (split into three separate sessions) between December and January of each year, in which students may elect to undertake one or more units of study.

Technical and Further Education college (TAFE) means a college operated by TAFE NSW.

testamur means a certificate or award provided to a graduate, usually at a graduation ceremony.

Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) means the test administered by Educational Testing Service or its licensees.

Unit of Study Coordinator means the academic staff member with overall responsibility for the planning and delivery of a unit of study.

Universities Admission Centre (UAC) means the Universities Admissions Centre (NSW & ACT) Pty Limited, which processes applications for admission to most undergraduate courses at the University of Sydney and other participating institutions.

university means a body that is established as a university or recognised as a university, by or under a law of the Commonwealth or a State or Territory, and meets nationally agreed criteria for a university.

University means the University of Sydney, established under the University of Sydney Act 1989.

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

undergraduate degree means an undergraduate award course at Bachelor level that achieves at a minimum the learning outcomes specified for AQF level 7.

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 also Part 3 of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.
vertically integrated combined degree means a combined degree across two adjacent AQF levels, for example, Bachelor/Masters, or Masters/Doctorate.

waiver means an exemption given by a faculty to a student from the requirement to complete a prescribed unit of study.

Winter School means the intensive teaching period in July of each year, in which students may elect to undertake one or more units of study.

working day means a day on which the University is usually open for business. This does not include any Saturday, Sunday, public holiday or any day designated as part of the University’s Christmas shutdown period.

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

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

PART 2 ADMISSION TO AWARD COURSES

6 Quotas

On the recommendation of the Dean, the Registrar may determine:

(a) the maximum number of applicants who may be admitted to a specified award course in a specified academic year;

(b) the maximum number of applicants who may be admitted to a specified award course under a special admission program in a specified academic year;

(c) the maximum number of students who may enrol in a specified unit of study in a specified academic year; and

(d) the maximum number of continuing students who may enrol in a specified unit of study in a specified academic year.

7 Admission by Dean

Note: The Dean is responsible for the admission of candidates to courses within their faculty. See clause 2.5 of the Coursework Rule and Part 8 of this Policy.

(1) Subject to and in accordance with the Coursework Rule and this Policy, the Dean Program Director of a faculty may permit any person to enrol as a non-award student in a specified unit of study within that Faculty.

(2) Subject to anti-discrimination legislation, the Dean may decline to admit an applicant, or to offer to admit an applicant, to an award course if, in the opinion of the Dean, appropriate and satisfactory provision cannot be made for the applicant.
8 General requirements

A person is eligible for admission to an award course only if:

(a) the person meets the requirements in the Coursework Rule, this Policy and the relevant award course resolutions for admission to the award course;
(b) the person has not made a material misrepresentation in applying for admission to the award course; and
(c) if the person is an international applicant who will study in Australia, the person holds a visa enabling them to undertake courses of study in Australia.

9 Admission and candidature

(1) The admissions process commences when an applicant accepts the University’s offer of admission to an award course.

(2) A person is admitted to candidature on the date on which he or she completes the admissions process.

(a) Domestic students are admitted to candidature on the date of their first enrolment.

(b) International students are admitted to candidature on the date on which they:

(i) complete their acceptance online, or complete their acceptance of offer form;
(ii) pay the applicable fees to the University; and
(iii) enrol for the first time.

(3) Enrolment may be deferred in accordance with clause 38 of this Policy.

(4) Candidature ceases when an award is conferred or candidature is otherwise terminated by the University.

PART 3 ELIGIBILITY FOR ADMISSION TO UNDERGRADUATE COURSES

10 Domestic applicants – secondary studies

(1) To be eligible for admission to candidature in an undergraduate award course on the basis of secondary studies, a domestic applicant must have successfully completed:

(a) a NSW Higher School Certificate examination, leading to the calculation of an ATAR, in accordance with procedures prescribed by the NSW Vice-Chancellor’s Conference from time to time;

(b) a State or Territory leaving examination considered by the Academic Board to be equivalent to the HSC; or
(c) any other school leaving examination, provided that the program of study and the standard of the examination are considered by the Academic Board to be equivalent to the program and the standard required of candidates for the HSC.

(2) The University will convert interstate or overseas school-leaving results in the manner determined by the Academic Board from time to time.

Note: The University will convert interstate and New Zealand results in accordance with the Interstate Transfer Index endorsed by the New South Wales Vice-Chancellors’ Conference.

(3) The University will use the better of either the most recent ATAR or any other accepted secondary qualification.

(4) If, following any offer of admission, the results of an applicant are found to be incorrect, the University:

(a) if the applicant achieved a higher ATAR or equivalent than originally awarded, will endeavour to admit the applicant to the award course to which the correct ATAR or equivalent would have earned admission;

(b) if the applicant achieved a lower ATAR or equivalent than originally awarded:

(i) reserves its right to withdraw its offer of admission at any time within the first four weeks of the student’s first semester; and

(ii) will endeavour to admit the applicant to a course for which the applicant would have qualified with the lower ATAR.

(5) No offer of admission to an award course will be made or withdrawn pursuant to subclause (4) without the approval of the Dean of the relevant faculty, who will report the offer or withdrawal to the Registrar as soon as possible thereafter.

Note: In giving his or her approval for subclause (5), the Dean Registrar will take into account whether it is too late in the year for the student to commence studies in a new course effectively.

11 Domestic applicants – tertiary studies

(1) To be eligible for admission to candidature in an undergraduate award course on the basis of tertiary studies, a domestic applicant must have successfully completed the equivalent of at least one full-time year of tertiary study at Bachelor level or higher.

Note: For subclause (1), one full-time year of tertiary study means 48 credit points of study at the University, or the part-time equivalent.

(2) Subject to the award course resolutions, consideration will be given to the applicant’s record of both tertiary and secondary studies, with the better of either record being used to determine their eligibility for admission.

(3) Where the applicant does not have recognised secondary qualifications, only the tertiary record will be considered.

(4) Where the applicant has made more than one attempt at tertiary study, only the best attempt at tertiary study will be considered.

(5) Subject to clause 81, an applicant who:
(a) has been excluded from a diploma or degree program for failure to meet progression requirements; and
(b) following the exclusion, passes at least one semester of study at degree level; or
(c) provides to the Associate Dean a satisfactory explanation of the circumstances for the exclusion;

is eligible for admission on the basis of tertiary studies.

(6) Subject to clause 81, an applicant who:
(a) has a record of failure and exclusion from tertiary study; and
(b) believes that his or her studies have been affected by circumstances beyond his or her control;

may apply for special consideration for admission by the relevant faculty.

Note: For information on the Special Consideration for Admission Scheme see clause 34.

Note: Clause 81 deals with applications for readmission to a course following exclusion from the same course due to failure to meet progression requirements.

12 Domestic applicants – other qualifications

To be eligible for admission to candidature in an undergraduate award course on the basis of other qualifications, a domestic applicant must have successfully completed:

(a) a preparation program approved by the Academic Board in accordance with clause 15 that was commenced by the applicant as an international student;
(b) the Diploma of Tertiary Preparation offered through the University’s Centre for Continuing Education provided that applicants under the age of 21 at the date of commencement of the course to which they seek admission also have an HSC or equivalent;
(c) an AQF diploma that provides appropriate academic preparation approved by the faculty provided that applicants under the age of 21 at the date of commencement of the course to which they seek admission also have an HSC or equivalent;
(d) another preparation program determined by the Academic Board to have a program of study and standard required of applicants equivalent to the HSC; or
(e) some other form of prior learning approved by the Academic Board.

12A Domestic applicants – transitional provisions

(1) A domestic applicant who commenced an AQF diploma between 1 January and 25 March 2015 is eligible for admission to candidature in an award course on the basis of that diploma.

(2) Other applicants with an AQF diploma completed during 2015 are eligible for admission to candidature in an award course on the basis of that diploma only with
approval of the Chair of the Admissions Committee, the Chair of the Academic
Board and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar).

13 International applicants

(1) To be eligible for admission to candidature in an undergraduate award course, an
international applicant must have:

(a) met one or more of the requirements for admission to an undergraduate
award course in clauses 10-12 above; or
(b) successfully completed a preparation program approved by the Academic
Board in accordance with clause 15.

(2) Subject to approval by the Academic Board, international applicants may be
admitted on the basis of forecast scores.

(3) International applicants, other than exchange students, will be considered for
admission on a fee-paying basis only. Local student quotas will not apply.

14 Domestic and international applicants – special entry
requirements

(1) Faculties may, with the approval of the Academic Board, impose special entry
requirements.

(2) Domestic and international applicants for admission to an undergraduate award
course must meet any special entry requirements approved by the Academic
Board and prescribed in the award course resolutions.

15 Approved preparation programs

(1) The preparation programs approved by the Academic Board for international
students are:

(a) foundation programs offered by public higher education providers in
Australia who are authorised to self-accredit their courses under the AQF;
(b) foundation programs offered by public higher education providers in New
Zealand who are authorised to self-accredit their courses under the New
Zealand Qualifications Framework; and
(c) the Advanced International Certificate of Education, University of
Cambridge.

(2) The Academic Board may approve foundation and preparation programs offered
by private higher education providers in Australia and New Zealand for
international students, provided that:

(a) the courses offered in Australia are accredited under the AQF at Certificate
IV level or above; and
(b) the courses offered in New Zealand are accredited under the NZQF at
Certificate IV level or above.
(3) The Academic Board may approve foundation and preparation programs offered by overseas higher education providers for international students on a case-by-case basis.

(4) The preparation program approved by the Academic Board for domestic students is the Diploma of Tertiary Preparation offered through the University’s Centre for Continuing Education (see also clause 12(b) above).

(5) Unless otherwise specified in a particular course resolution, admission standards for foundation and preparation programs that are recognised for admission by the Academic Board will be set in accordance with the relevant UAC schedule.

### PART 4 ELIGIBILITY FOR ADMISSION TO POSTGRADUATE COURSES

#### 16 Graduate Certificate

To be eligible for admission to a Graduate Certificate, an applicant must:

- (a) have a Bachelor degree or higher award from the University in a relevant discipline, as determined by the Dean of Program Director; or
- (b) have a Bachelor degree or higher award from another university or institution that the Dean of Program Director determines to be equivalent to a degree or award mentioned in subclause (a); and
- (c) meet other requirements specified in the faculty resolutions and relevant award course resolutions.

#### 17 Graduate Diploma

To be eligible for admission to a Graduate Diploma, an applicant must:

- (a) have a Bachelor degree or higher award from the University in a relevant discipline, as determined by the Dean of Program Director;
- (b) have a Graduate Certificate from the University in a relevant discipline, as determined by the Dean of Program Director;
- (c) have a Bachelor degree or higher award from another university or institution that the Dean of Program Director determines to be equivalent to a degree, award or certificate mentioned in subclause (a) or (b); or
- (d) if the applicant does not satisfy subclauses (a) - (c), have completed the requirements for an award course leading to:
  - (i) an embedded graduate certificate in the appropriate discipline at the University, as determined by the Dean of Program Director; or
  - (ii) a program at another tertiary institution that the Dean of Program Director determines to be the equivalent of such a course; and
(e) meet other requirements specified in the faculty resolutions and relevant award course resolutions.

18 Masters Degree (Advanced Learning Masters degree)

To be eligible for admission to an Advanced Learning Masters degree, an applicant must:

(a) have a Masters degree, a Graduate Diploma, a Bachelor degree (Honours), or a Bachelor degree (Pass) with a credit average, from the University in a relevant discipline, as determined by the Dean Program Director;

(b) have a degree, diploma or award from another university or institution that the Dean Program Director determines to be equivalent to a degree or diploma mentioned in subclause (a); or

(c) if the applicant does not satisfy subclauses (a) or (b), have completed:
   (i) the requirements for an award course leading to an embedded Graduate Diploma or Graduate Certificate in the appropriate discipline at the University of Sydney, as determined by the Dean Program Director; or
   (ii) a program at another tertiary education institution, being a program that the Dean Program Director determines to be the equivalent of an embedded course mentioned in subclause (i);

(d) meet other requirements specified in the faculty resolutions and relevant award course resolutions.

19 Masters degree (Professional Masters degree)

To be eligible for admission to a Professional Masters degree, an applicant must:

(a) have a Masters degree, a Bachelor degree, or a Graduate Diploma from the University in a relevant discipline, as determined by the Dean Program Director;

(b) have a degree from another university or institution that the Dean Program Director determines to be equivalent to a degree or award mentioned in subclause (a); or

(c) if the applicant does not satisfy subclause (a) or (b), have completed:
   (i) the requirements for an award course leading to an embedded Graduate Diploma or Graduate Certificate in the appropriate discipline at the University of Sydney, as determined by the Dean Program Director; or
   (ii) a program at another tertiary education institution that the Dean Program Director determines to be the equivalent of an embedded course mentioned in subclause (i);

without graduating from the course; and
(d) meet other requirements specified in the faculty resolutions and relevant award course resolutions.

Note: The Masters Degree (Extended) is a form of Professional Masters degree – see the definition of Masters degree by coursework.

20 Exemption from eligibility requirements in exceptional circumstances

(1) Subject to subclause (2) below, a Dean may, in writing, grant an exemption from the eligibility requirements in clauses 16, 17 and 19 for an applicant for admission to:

(a) a Graduate Certificate;
(b) a Graduate Diploma; or
(c) a Professional Masters degree.

(2) A Dean may only grant an exemption from the eligibility requirements in clauses 16, 17 and 19 if satisfied that the applicant:

(a) has qualifications and experience equivalent to those eligibility requirements; and
(b) has provided evidence of experience and achievement sufficient to demonstrate mastery of the subject matter and graduate qualities equivalent to those gained by applicants who meet the eligibility requirements.

Note: For subclause (2)(b), evidence of experience and achievement could be provided through publications or authorship of official documents.

PART 5 ENGLISH LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS – UNDERGRADUATE COURSES

21 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 an undergraduate award course.

(2) Subject to this Part, any applicant for admission to an undergraduate award course whose first language is not English, must have:

(a) an Australian educational qualification; or
(b) a record of satisfactory achievement in secondary or tertiary studies:
   (i) in an English speaking country; or
   (ii) in which the language of instruction was English; or
(c) satisfactorily completed an appropriate course at the University’s Centre for English Teaching; or
(d) within two years of the date on which the applicant will commence the course, achieved:
(i) an IELTS overall band score of 6.5, with at least 6.0 in each band;
(ii) a paper based TOEFL score of 550 plus a Test of Written English (TWE) score of 4.5;
(iii) an internet based TOEFL score of 79 plus a score of 23 for Writing and 22 for Reading, Speaking and Listening;
(iv) a Pearson Test of English (Academic) (PTE) score of 58;
(v) a Cambridge English: Advanced (CAE) score of 58; or
(e) within the past two years, achieved an International Baccalaureate diploma having, as part of the studies for that diploma, successfully completed:
   (i) English A1 at Higher or Standard Level, or A: Literature;
   (ii) English A2 at Higher or Standard Level, or A: Language and Literature;
   (iii) English B at Higher Level with Grade 4 or more; or
   (iv) English B at Standard Level with Grade 5 or more.

(3) An applicant for admission to an undergraduate award course in a faculty that has set English language requirements above the minimum requirements set out in subclause (2) must meet the faculty’s requirements as approved by the Academic Board.

Note: These faculty requirements must be approved by the Academic Board in accordance with the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016.

(4) Applicants seeking admission to an undergraduate award course on the basis of satisfactory achievement in secondary or tertiary studies in accordance with subclause (2)(b) must have completed either:
   (a) senior secondary study; or
   (b) at least one year of full-time university study;
   in which the language of instruction was English.

(5) Where an applicant has provided insufficient evidence of current English competency relevant to a particular award course, a faculty the Associate Dean may require the applicant to undergo further assessment of either or both of written or spoken English.

(6) A faculty The Associate Dean who that requires an applicant to undergo a further assessment for the purposes of subclause (5) above will report the circumstances and the form of the assessment to the Registrar as soon as possible thereafter.

(7) The Head of School and Dean of the Sydney College of the Arts may, on application and at his or her discretion, admit to the Bachelor of Visual Arts an applicant who has achieved an IELTS overall band score of 6.0.

(8) The Head of School and Dean of the Sydney Conservatorium of Music may, on application and at his or her discretion, admit to the Diploma of Music an applicant who has achieved an IELTS overall band score of 6.0.

(9) If the Academic Board has prescribed qualifications accepted as proof of English language proficiency for applicants who have undertaken study in specified countries, an applicant who holds the prescribed qualifications will be considered
by the Faculty Associate Dean to have met the minimum English language requirements for all undergraduate courses.

Note: A conversion table for English Language Skills Tests is available on the Academic Board standards website.

22 International applicants whose first language is not English

Where an international applicant:

(a) is required by the Commonwealth government to provide IELTS or TOEFL results in order to obtain a student visa; and

(b) does not have a record of satisfactory achievement in secondary or tertiary studies in an English speaking country;

the University will use the IELTS or TOEFL results as the primary tool for assessing whether the applicant has satisfied English language requirements.

PART 6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS – POSTGRADUATE COURSES

23 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 postgraduate award course.

(2) Subject to this Part, any applicant for admission to a postgraduate award 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:

(i) 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 postgraduate award course in a faculty that has set English language requirements above the minimum requirements set out in
subclause (2) must meet the faculty’s requirements as approved by the Academic Board.

24 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 postgraduate 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 Policy; and
   (ii) any individual band score is no more than 1.0 below the individual band score otherwise required by this Policy; or

(b) the applicant has a score on another test permitted by this Policy and the applicant's score was no more than a corresponding amount below the score otherwise required by this Policy; 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 subclause (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 relevant Associate Dean; 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) any appropriate work experience that the applicant has had in an English language environment; and
   (iv) any oral discussions between faculty members and the applicant.

(4) The Dean must record in writing on the student file any approval to waive 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 7  SPECIAL ADMISSION PROGRAMS

25 Application for a special admission program

(1) While eligibility for admission to the University is based on academic merit, the University recognises that, for many reasons, some domestic applicants are unable to demonstrate their full potential for success at tertiary level study through the normal qualifying processes. The University has established flexible entry schemes and educational access schemes to assist these domestic applicants to gain admission to undergraduate courses.

(2) Special admission programs may be faculty or course specific and must be approved by the Academic Board. All approved special admission programs must be set out in the relevant faculty resolutions or award course resolutions.

(3) Domestic applicants may apply for admission under more than one flexible entry scheme and educational access scheme, provided that their ATAR or equivalent lies within the approved eligibility band for each scheme. Except for Conditional Early Offers Schemes, the Cadigal Program and the Future Leaders Scheme, no such applicant will be admitted to a course if his or her ATAR or equivalent is more than five rank points below the relevant cut-off for the course. For the Future Leaders Scheme, no applicant will be admitted to a course if his or her ATAR is below the Minimum Eligibility Score for that course.

(4) Despite anything in this Part, flexible entry schemes and educational access schemes are subject to any quota set in accordance with clause 6 of this Policy.

26 Flexible entry schemes

(1) The Academic Board may by resolution, on the recommendation of a faculty, establish or amend a flexible entry scheme for an undergraduate award course.

(2) A flexible entry scheme must set a flexible entry band for ATARs, and otherwise be consistent with this clause.

(3) Flexible entry schemes for specified courses are available to domestic applicants who:

(a) are eligible Australian recent school leavers, including applicants who hold an International Baccalaureate;

(b) have an ATAR or ATAR equivalent that lies below the ATAR cut-off for that course; and

(c) do not have a tertiary record.

(4) Flexible entry schemes comprise two components:

(a) a flexible entry ATAR band, lying between the ATAR cut-off and a lower limit that is not more than 5 rank points below the ATAR cut-off; and

(b) a flexible entry criterion or criteria, selected from the list approved by the Academic Board in clause 26(5), that allows admission of eligible applicants whose ATAR lies within the flexible entry band.

(5) The Academic Board approved flexible entry criteria are:
(a) satisfactory performance in the HSC, or HSC equivalent, in subjects relevant to the course;
(b) satisfactory performance in extra-curricular academic activities relevant to the course;

Note: For subclause (5)(b), extra-curricular activities might, for example, include Science Olympiads.

(c) aptitude for the award course, demonstrated by:
(i) relevant work or other experience;
(ii) submission of a portfolio; or
(iii) submission of a statement of interest in the course.

Note: For subclause (5)(c), faculties may use written submissions, interviews or other methods to obtain information about aptitude.

(6) A flexible entry scheme in force at the commencement of this Policy continues in force. It may be terminated by resolution of the Academic Board, but must not be amended if the scheme, as amended, would be inconsistent with this clause.

26A Future Leaders Scheme

(1) The University recognises that appointment to certain school leadership roles indicates abilities in a student, beyond those identified by their ATAR, that are also relevant to the university environment. In recognition of this, school leaders may be admitted to a course with an ATAR below that required for normal admission to that course.

(2) The Future Leaders Scheme is available, for specified courses, to domestic and international applicants who:
(a) are eligible current school leavers attending a secondary school registered with the relevant state or territory Department of Education, including applicants who hold an International Baccalaureate;
(b) are nominated by their school principal or nominee as dux or captain of the school;
(c) have an ATAR or ATAR equivalent that lies between the previous year’s ATAR cut-off for that course and a lower limit determined by the faculty for that course; and;
(d) meet all other applicable course entry requirements.

27 Broadway Scheme

(1) The purpose of the Broadway Scheme is to help domestic applicants who have experienced educational disadvantage to gain admission to undergraduate award courses.

(2) Domestic applicants who are eligible for admission under the Broadway Scheme are permitted to compete for admission with an ATAR or equivalent of up to five rank points below the ATAR cut-off for the award course, or equivalent.
(3) The Broadway Scheme is available to domestic applicants who:

(a) have successfully completed Year 12 or equivalent interstate or overseas secondary education (including at a high school or a technical and further education college, or an equivalent education institution); and

(b) have suffered:

(i) long-term educational disadvantage; or

(ii) severe disadvantage during the final two years of their secondary education.

(4) The Broadway Scheme is not available to applicants who have a record of tertiary study.

(5) For the purposes of determining whether an applicant has suffered educational disadvantage, the Associate Dean of the relevant faculty may consider:

(a) whether the home environment or conditions for study for the applicant were adverse;

(b) any chronic illness, disability or personal trauma, the applicant suffered;

(c) whether the applicant's schooling or family life has been disrupted;

(d) whether the applicant has English language difficulties;

(e) whether the applicant's family responsibilities are or were excessive;

(f) any financial hardship affecting the applicant;

(g) whether the applicant was in a remote or isolated location;

(h) whether the applicant has suffered physical or psychological abuse.

28 Cadigal Program

(1) The purpose of the Cadigal Program is to address the educational disadvantage experienced by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, by facilitating and supporting their participation in University courses. It comprises:

(a) provision of preparatory studies for Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islanders who want to undertake degree courses at the University;

(b) provision for reduced academic eligibility requirements for admission to courses for Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander applicants;

(c) provision for a reduced first year load for Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander students; and

(d) a continuing support program for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students.

(2) The Cadigal Program involves a commitment by the University that up to 5% of student places will be available to Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander applicants.

(3) The Cadigal Program is available to applicants of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent.

(4) An applicant will be taken to be of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent only if he or she complies with the Confirmation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Identity Policy 2015.
Selection of applicants for admission under the Cadigal Program will be on the basis of application and academic assessment.

The Associate Dean of a faculty may admit an applicant to an undergraduate award course under the Cadigal Program only if:

(a) where the applicant will be under 21 years old on 31 March in the academic year after the year in which the application is made:
   (i) the applicant has an ATAR of equal to or higher than the rank determined jointly for the award course by the faculty and the administrator of the Cadigal Program; or
   (ii) the applicant has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Associate Dean his or her capacity to succeed in coursework at a university level;

(b) where the applicant will be over 21 years old on 31 March in the academic year after the year in which the application is made:
   (i) the applicant has successfully completed a tertiary education preparation course that the Associate Dean determines to be relevant to the course;
   (ii) the applicant has successfully completed, or has partly completed, an accredited course at diploma level or above; or
   (iii) the applicant has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Associate Dean his or her capacity to succeed in coursework at a university level.

An Associate Dean may, for a maximum period of one year, place requirements and restrictions on the enrolment of a student who is offered admission to an undergraduate award course under the Cadigal Program, including:

(a) requiring a student to complete a unit or units of study within a specified time;
(b) prohibiting enrolment by the student in a unit or units of study;
(c) restricting the maximum unit of study load in which a student can enrol.

Note: For subclause 6(a)(i): the minimum ATAR will be lower than that required for mainstream entry.

29 Conditional Early Offers Schemes

The purpose of a Conditional Early Offers Scheme is to enable the University to identify, prior to completion of the HSC or equivalent, domestic students with academic promise who have suffered educational disadvantage and would benefit from additional support and early engagement with the University.

The Associate Dean of a faculty may, under a Conditional Early Offers Scheme, make a prospective domestic student a conditional offer of admission to an undergraduate award course at the end of Year 10, or during year 11 or 12.

The Associate Dean of a faculty may admit a domestic applicant to candidature in an undergraduate award course under the Conditional Early Offers Scheme only if:
the applicant has an ATAR of equal to or higher than the rank determined jointly for the award course by the faculty and the administrator of the Conditional Early Offers Scheme; and
(b) the student maintains the level of academic performance demonstrated in accordance with subclause (5) below.

(4) For the purposes of determining whether an applicant has suffered educational disadvantage, the Associate Dean of the relevant faculty may consider:
(a) whether the home environment or conditions for study for the applicant were adverse;
(b) any chronic illness, disability or personal trauma, the applicant suffered;
(c) whether the applicant’s schooling or family life has been disrupted;
(d) whether the applicant has English language difficulties;
(e) whether the applicant’s family responsibilities are or were excessive;
(f) any financial hardship affecting the applicant;
(g) whether the applicant was in a remote or isolated location;
(h) whether the applicant has suffered physical or psychological abuse.

(5) For the purposes of determining whether an applicant has demonstrated early academic promise, the Associate Dean may, with the approval of the Academic Board, consider:
(a) evidence provided by the Principal of the applicant’s school;
(b) performance in the Record of School Achievement;
(c) performance in a test approved by the Academic Board;
(d) other measures of promise approved by the Academic Board, including an interview or portfolio.

Note: For subclause 3(a): the minimum ATAR will be lower than that required for mainstream entry.

30 Principal’s Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme (E12)

(1) The purpose of the Principal’s Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme is to enable the University to identify, prior to completion of the HSC or equivalent, domestic students from low socio-economic backgrounds who are motivated and demonstrate potential to successfully undertake studies at the University.

(2) The Associate Dean of a faculty may, under the Principal’s Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme, make a prospective domestic student a conditional offer of admission to an undergraduate award course before the end of Year 12.

(3) Domestic applicants are eligible for the Principal’s Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme if:
(a) they have a written recommendation from their Principal; and
(b) they are completing their HSC in the year immediately prior to the year in which admission to an undergraduate award course at the University is sought; and
(c) they attend a school that is identified by the State or Commonwealth government as disadvantaged: or
(d) they are from a low socio-economic status background, as determined by the Academic Board from time to time.

(4) For their application for admission under the Principal’s Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme to be considered, applicants must complete the application form, including a statement of motivation demonstrating:
(a) their interest in and motivation for applying for one of the undergraduate award courses offered by the University; and
(b) their reasons for applying to the University.

(5) Applicants may be required to attend an interview.

(6) Applicants will be assessed against the following criteria:
(a) demonstrated interest in and motivation for the course of study;
(b) ability to set and meet long term goals;
(c) undertaking any prerequisite subjects;
(d) likelihood of meeting the required ATAR cut off score and succeeding in their studies at the University; and
(e) demonstrated leadership or citizenship skills.

(7) An assessment panel with at least two representatives from each participating faculty will evaluate all applications against the eligibility and selection criteria, and make a recommendation to the relevant Associate Dean.

(8) On receipt of a recommendation from the assessment panel, the Associate Dean may authorise a conditional offer of admission to an award course to be made to an applicant.

(9) The Associate Dean may admit an applicant to an undergraduate award course under the Principal's Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme only if the applicant has an ATAR of equal to or higher than the rank specified by the faculty for admission to the award course under the Scheme.

(10) Applicants who are admitted under the Principal's Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme will receive academic and other support.

Note: For subclause (9): the minimum ATAR will be lower than that required for mainstream entry.

31 Mature Age Applicants Scheme

(1) The purpose of the Mature Age Applicants Scheme is to help domestic applicants who are over 21 years of age, and who would not normally meet the academic eligibility requirements, to gain admission to undergraduate courses.

(2) The Dean of the relevant faculty may determine that the Mature Age Applicants Scheme does not apply to a specified undergraduate course.

(3) Domestic applicants who are eligible for admission under the Mature Age Applicants Scheme are permitted to compete for admission, provided that they meet the minimum level of academic merit set by the faculty for the relevant undergraduate award course.
(4) Applicants are eligible for admission under the Mature Age Applicants Scheme if:

(a) they are at least 21 years old on 1 March of the year of admission to the University;

(b) they do not have an ATAR or equivalent that would enable them to compete for mainstream admission;

(c) they have not completed at least one year of study (or part-time equivalent) in a Bachelor degree or higher level qualification at a recognised tertiary institution; and

(d) they have, within the previous two years, completed one of the following approved preparation courses:

(i) a preparation course offered by the University’s Centre for Continuing Education;

(ii) the Tertiary Preparation Certificate Course offered at a NSW TAFE college;

(iii) an HSC that does not lead to an ATAR;

(iv) the Open Foundation Course or NEWSTEP Program offered by the University of Newcastle;

(v) the University Preparation Program offered by the University of New South Wales; or

(e) for admission to the Bachelor of Nursing, they have completed enrolled nursing qualifications; or

(f) they have completed an AQF Diploma or Advanced Diploma at a recognised tertiary institution that satisfied the University’s requirements for admission, or at least one year of study (or part-time equivalent) in an approved Associate Diploma or Diploma at a recognised tertiary institution that satisfied the University’s requirements for admission.

(5) Faculties Deans will determine the minimum level of academic merit required for admission to an undergraduate course under the Mature Age Applicants Scheme.

(6) Applicants may be required to:

(a) attend an interview;

(b) provide a work portfolio; or

(c) successfully complete a practical examination.

(7) When deciding whether to make an offer of admission under the Mature Age Applicants Scheme, the Associate Dean may take into account:

(a) the applicant’s personal qualities;

(b) whether the applicant is likely to complete the course successfully;

(c) the applicant’s work experience;

(d) any relevant TAFE or AQF courses successfully completed by the applicant.

(8) Levels of assumed knowledge specified for each award course or equivalent are normally considered as prerequisites for applicants for admission through the Mature Age Applicants Scheme.
32 Elite Athletes or Performers Scheme

(1) The training that elite athletes and performers have to undertake, and their competitive and performance commitments, can detrimentally affect their secondary school studies. The purpose of the Elite Athletes and Performers Scheme is to address that detriment.

(2) Domestic applicants who are eligible for admission under the Elite Athletes and Performers Scheme are permitted to compete for admission with an ATAR or equivalent of up to five rank points below the ATAR cut-off for the award course, or equivalent.

(3) The Elite Athletes and Performers Scheme is available to domestic applicants who:

(a) have been assessed by the Elite Athletes Assessment Panel or the Elite Performers Assessment Panel, as relevant, as being elite; and

(b) can demonstrate that their sporting or performance commitments have impeded their HSC performance.

(4) For their application for admission under the Elite Athletes and Performers Scheme to be considered, applicants must complete and submit an application form prior to the last day of business in October of each year.

(5) The Elite Athletes Assessment Panel or the Elite Performers Assessment Panel, as relevant, will assess whether an applicant is an elite athlete or performer, normally prior to the publication of HSC results.

(6) The Elite Athletes Assessment Panel will set and follow standard criteria for determining whether an applicant is an elite athlete, and will seek advice about each applicant from referees and appropriate experts.

(7) The Elite Performers Assessment Panel will set and follow standard criteria for determining whether an applicant is an elite performer, and will seek advice about each applicant from referees and appropriate experts.

(8) The Elite Athletes and Performers Selection Committee will review assessments made by the Elite Athletes Assessment Panel and the Elite Performers Assessment Panel.

(9) Where the Elite Athletes and Performers Selection Committee endorses an assessment of an applicant, the Committee will forward the application to the relevant faculty for consideration.

34 Special Consideration for Admission Scheme

(1) The purpose of the Special Consideration for Admission Scheme is to help applicants who have experienced serious disadvantage during secondary study, or a previous attempt at tertiary study, to gain admission to undergraduate courses.

(2) Applicants who are eligible for admission under the Special Consideration for Admission Scheme are permitted to compete for admission with an ATAR or equivalent of up to five rank points below the relevant cut-off for the award course.

(3) The Special Consideration for Admission Scheme is available to applicants who:

(a) have successfully completed Year 12 or equivalent secondary education (including at a high school or a technical and further education college, or an equivalent educational institution); or
(b) have a record of previous tertiary study; and
(c) have suffered serious disadvantage during the course of those studies.

PART 8 ADMISSION DECISIONS AND OFFERS

35 Basis for admission decisions

(1) Admission decisions must be made in accordance with the Coursework Rule and this policy.

(2) Subject to this policy, when deciding whether to make an offer of admission to an award course to an applicant, the Dean must adopt the principle that offers are to be made on the basis of the applicant's academic merit.

(3) For admission to undergraduate award courses, applicants' academic merit is to be measured principally by their secondary or tertiary results.

(4) The University may make more than one round of offers to applicants for an award course. The ATAR cut off points may be different for different rounds of offers.

Note: See also clause 2.5 of the Coursework Rule and clause 7 of this Policy.

36 Conditional offers

(1) An offer of admission to an award course may be made subject to specified conditions.

(2) Examples of conditions that might be imposed include conditions relating to:
   (a) health screening of the applicant;
   (b) criminal record checks;
   (c) child protection checks;
   (d) verification of the applicant's academic record;
   (e) visa requirements;
   (f) English language requirements; and
   (g) completion of prior study.

37 Accepting an offer

(1) An offer of admission to an award course can be accepted only in the manner described in the offer.

(2) An applicant is not considered to be admitted to an award course at the University until he or she has completed, to the satisfaction of the University, all requirements for enrolment in the course.

(3) An applicant who has accepted an offer of admission to an undergraduate award course and, prior to commencing that course, wishes to transfer to a different award course, may apply for and be admitted to the new course, provided that:
the applicant has met the minimum admission requirements for the new course at a standard equal to or higher than applicants who were offered admission to the course in the main round of offers made by the UAC;

(b) a place is available in the course;

(c) all available places are offered on the basis of merit; and

(d) the offer is made and accepted before the commencement of teaching in the new course.

PART 9 DEFERRAL

38 Deferred admission by commencing undergraduate applicants

(1) An applicant offered a place in an award course may defer admission to that course, but only as provided in this Part.

(2) The University may permit an applicant to defer admission provided that the offer of admission has not lapsed or been withdrawn by the University due to the applicant’s actions prior or subsequent to the offer being made.

(3) Subject to subclause (4) below, the maximum period of deferral is one year.

(4) The Associate Dean of the relevant faculty may extend the period of deferral for an individual applicant to a maximum of two years.

(5) Applicants who are offered a place in an undergraduate award course at the Sydney Conservatorium of Music must undertake a further satisfactory audition prior to admission.

(6) The Associate Dean of the relevant faculty may decline to allow deferral for a particular course.

PART 10 CHANGE OF RESIDENCY

39 International applicants and students changing from international to domestic status

(1) If an international undergraduate applicant changes from international to domestic status prior to enrolling in his or her course and:

(a) his or her ATAR or equivalent is equal to or higher than the ATAR required for domestic applicants to be admitted to the same course; and

(b) there are places available in the course;

the applicant will be transferred to a Commonwealth supported place.

(2) If an international undergraduate applicant changes from international to domestic status prior to enrolling in his or her course and either or both of the requirements in subclauses 39(1)(a) and (b) are not met, the applicant’s offer of admission will be cancelled and withdrawn.
(3) If an international undergraduate student changes from international to domestic status prior to the census date for his or her course and:
   (a) his or her ATAR or equivalent is equal to or higher than the ATAR required for domestic applicants to be admitted to the same course; and
   (b) there are places available in the course;
the applicant will be transferred to a Commonwealth supported place.

(4) If an international undergraduate student changes from international to domestic status prior to the census date for his or her course and either or both of the requirements in clauses 39(3)(a) and (b) are not met, the applicant will be transferred to a domestic fee-paying place.

(5) If an international undergraduate student changes from international to domestic status after the census date for his or her course and:
   (a) his or her ATAR or equivalent is equal to or higher than the ATAR required for domestic applicants to be admitted to the same course; and
   (b) there are places available in the course;
the applicant will continue as an international fee paying student for that semester and transfer to a Commonwealth supported place in the subsequent semester.

(6) If an international undergraduate student changes from international to domestic status after the census date for his or her course and either or both of the requirements in clauses 39(5)(a) and (b) are not met, the applicant will continue as an international fee paying student for that semester and transfer to a domestic fee-paying place in the subsequent semester.

(7) Subject to this clause, if an international postgraduate applicant changes from international to domestic status prior to enrolling in his or her course, the applicant will be transferred to a domestic fee-paying place.

(8) If an international postgraduate student changes from international to domestic status before the census date for his or her course, the student will be transferred to a domestic fee-paying place.

(9) If an international postgraduate student changes from international to domestic status after the census date for his or her course, the student will continue as an international fee paying student for that semester and transfer to a domestic fee-paying place in the subsequent semester.

(10) International students who are transferred to a domestic fee-paying place are permitted to compete for any available Commonwealth supported places in subsequent semesters.

(11) International applicants for the Doctor of Medicine will not be transferred to a domestic fee-paying place in accordance with subclause (7).

PART 11 RECOGNITION OF PRIOR LEARNING

40 Forms of recognition of prior learning

(1) The University recognises that students commence courses with different levels, areas and forms or prior learning.
(2) The University may recognise prior learning by granting:

(a) credit, which may take the form of:
   (i) specific credit;
   (ii) non-specific credit;
   (iii) reduced volume of learning for an award course; or

(b) a waiver of a requirement to undertake a compulsory or a pre-requisite unit of study.

41 Specific credit, non-specific credit and reduced volume of learning

(1) Specific credit is the recognition of previously completed studies as directly equivalent to specific units of study offered by the University.

(2) Subject to this Policy and the award course resolutions, specific credit may be granted for a unit of study where there is a substantial overlap of skills, knowledge and experience at a level deemed by the Associate Dean to be equivalent to a specific University of Sydney unit of study.

(3) Non-specific credit is ‘block credit’ given for a specified number of credit points at a particular level, in accordance with the award course resolutions. These credit points may be in a particular subject area but are not linked to a specific unit of study.

(4) Reduced volume of learning is a reduction in the number of credit points required for a student to complete his or her award course, in recognition of the student’s:
   (a) level and subject area of qualifications completed prior to admission; or
   (b) equivalent professional experience.

Note: An example of specific credit is credit given for Physics 1 [PHYS1001] at the University of Sydney for Physics 1 undertaken at the University of Adelaide.

Note: Examples of non-specific credit are: the University of Sydney does not teach Russian but a student may be granted credit for a full first year of study in Russian undertaken at the University of New South Wales, as 12 junior credit points; a student may be granted 48 junior credit points for the first year of an Arts degree completed at another Australian university.

Note: Where possible, the University will assess credit before making an offer of admission. Where possible, the University will make an offer of credit to an applicant concurrently with his or her offer of admission. If accepted, credit offered to an applicant prior to enrolment will be granted at the time he or she is admitted to the award course. See the Coursework Credit Procedures 2015.

42 Awarding specific credit and non-specific credit for previous studies

(1) An Associate Dean may, in accordance with this Policy, the faculty resolutions and the award course resolutions, grant specific credit or non-specific credit to an undergraduate or postgraduate student for study undertaken:
(a) in another award course at the University;
(b) in an award course at another Australian tertiary institution;
(c) at a recognised overseas tertiary institution;
(d) in an accredited higher education course offered by a registered private provider;
(e) in a course offered by the Vocational Education and Training Sector;
(f) in another award program approved by the Dean following an evaluation process; or
(g) in a non-award program approved by the Academic Board.

(2) Factors to be taken into account by an Associate Dean when evaluating a program for the purposes of subclause (1) include:
(a) the general educational practices and standards of the institution or system;
(b) the objectives of the particular course and the methods adopted to achieve those objectives;
(c) the duration of the course;
(d) the breadth, depth and balance of the course material;
(e) the methods of assessment in the course;
(f) the teaching staff conducting the course, including the numbers of teachers, and their professional qualifications, experience and educational expertise; and
(g) the accommodation and facilities offered to students undertaking the course, including equipment, library, laboratories, workshops and other instructional or research resources.

(3) Entry to the University’s courses is competitive and eligibility for credit does not guarantee an applicant a place in a course.

(4) Credit will not be granted:
(a) for units of study completed more than:
   (i) 10 years ago; or
   (ii) if the faculty resolutions prescribe a shorter period, the prescribed period;
   prior to admission to candidature in the course that the credit is applied to;
(b) for units of study in an uncompleted course, unless the student provides evidence that he or she has abandoned credit in respect of that course;
(c) except with the permission of the Associate Dean, for units of study undertaken at another tertiary institution from which the student has been excluded;
(d) except with the permission of the Associate Dean, for units of study or non-specific credit listed in an offer of credit made by the University prior to enrolment or during candidature, and declined by the applicant or student in accordance with subclause 43A(2); or
(e) except with the permission of the Associate Dean, to reinstate specific credit or non-specific credit that has previously been rescinded, on request by the student in accordance with clause 43B.

(5) When granting credit, an Associate Dean may impose requirements on a student with respect to:

(a) progression to more advanced units of study within a particular course; and
(b) time limits for completion of the course.

(6) Regardless of any credit granted, a student must meet any pre-requisite or co-requisite requirements for an award course, unless the unit of study co-ordinator gives the student a waiver for those requirements.

(7) Regardless of any credit granted, a student must achieve and demonstrate the learning outcomes for the award course.

Note: See clause 46 regarding waivers.

43 Awarding reduced volume of learning

(1) An Associate Dean Program Director may, in accordance with this Policy and the award course resolutions, and on request by a student, approve a reduction in the volume of learning required for the student to complete his or her award course, in recognition of:

(a) a prior qualification in the same discipline as the award course;
(b) a prior qualification in a cognate discipline deemed by the Associate Dean Program Director to provide comparable preparation to subclause (a);
(c) relevant professional experience deemed by the Associate Dean Program Director to provide comparable preparation to subclause (a); or
(d) a prior qualification in an appropriate discipline at AQF level 8 or above.

(2) Factors to be taken into account by an Associate Dean for the purposes of subclause (1) include:

(a) the factors set out in subclause 42(2) above;
(b) whether the student’s experience is documented;
(c) whether any documentation provided by the student demonstrates skills, knowledge or understanding that are equivalent to those that would be gained in relevant University studies.

(3) The onus will be on the student to provide appropriate documentation or other evidence.

(4) Reduced volume of learning will not be granted, except with the permission of the Associate Dean Program Director:

(a) where the reduced volume of learning was previously listed in an offer of credit made by the University prior to enrolment or during candidature, and declined by the applicant or student in accordance with subclause 43A(2); or
(b) to reinstate reduced volume of learning that has previously been rescinded, on request by the student in accordance with clause 43B.
43A Accepting and declining offers of specific credit, non-specific credit and reduced volume of learning

(1) The University may make offers to grant specific credit, non-specific credit and reduced volume of learning prior to enrolment or during candidature.

(2) An applicant or student must accept or decline (in whole or in part) any offer of credit made by the University:
   (a) prior to enrolment, on or before the date of his or her first enrolment in the award course for which credit is being offered;
   (b) during candidature, within twelve months of the date of the offer of credit.

(3) If an applicant or student does not accept or decline the offer of credit within the timeframe specified in subclause (2), the credit will not be processed and the University will regard the offer as having lapsed.

(4) The University may vary any offer to grant credit made to an applicant prior to enrolment, if the Dean/Associate Dean has authorised a period of deferral of greater than one year.

Note: See clause 38 regarding deferral.

43B Rescinding specific credit, non-specific credit and reduced volume of learning

(1) An Associate Dean/Program Director may, in accordance with this policy and the award course resolutions, and on request by a student, rescind any specific credit, non-specific credit or reduced volume of learning previously granted to the student in accordance with this policy.

(2) Except with the permission of the Associate Dean/Program Director, once any specific credit, non-specific credit or reduced volume of learning has been rescinded in accordance with this clause, a student may not seek to have it reinstated.

44 Limits on credit and reduced volume of learning

(1) Subject to this clause, and notwithstanding any credit or reduced volume of learning granted in order to qualify for an award:
   (a) an undergraduate student must complete a minimum of:
      (i) one year (or part-time equivalent) of the award course at the University; and
      (ii) 48 credit points of the award course at the University;
   (b) a postgraduate student must complete at least 50 per cent of the course requirements at the University; and
   (c) a student enrolled in a Masters degree must complete a minimum of 48 credit points of postgraduate study (including any postgraduate study at another university) in order to qualify for the award.
(2) The Associate Dean may vary the requirements in subclause (1) where the work was completed:

(a) as part of an embedded program at the University;
(b) as part of another award course undertaken at the University; or
(c) as part of an award course approved by the University as part of an approved conjoint venture with another institution.

(3) Except with the approval of the Academic Board at course level, credit granted on the basis of work completed at an institution other than a university will not exceed one third of the course requirements.

(4) Except as provided for in subclause (6), credit towards postgraduate awards will not be granted for undergraduate units of study.

(5) Except as provided for in subclause (6), credit towards postgraduate awards will not be granted for previously completed postgraduate awards, except in the case of awards:

(a) in an embedded program at the University; or
(b) in a program completed at another university or institution deemed by the relevant Associate Dean to be the equivalent of a University of Sydney embedded program.

(6) Despite subclauses (4) and (5), an Associate Dean may grant credit in the form of a reduced volume of learning in recognition of completed undergraduate and postgraduate award courses in accordance with clause 43 and the award course resolutions.

(7) An Associate Dean or Program Director may grant a graduate a limited amount of credit for a completed undergraduate course. Subject to this policy and the award course resolutions, a graduate who is admitted to candidature for the degree of Bachelor with credit for units of study in the completed course must complete a minimum of two years (or part-time equivalent) in the award course, unless additional credit from an uncompleted course or courses has also been granted.

Note: The provisions for granting credit in an award course offered as part of an approved conjoint venture are prescribed in the award course resolutions and the relevant faculty resolutions.

45 Credit in embedded programs, including embedded honours

Note: Faculties have authority to establish embedded programs in closely related academic or professional areas, to establish incrementally higher levels of attainment at Graduate Certificate, Graduate Diploma and Masters level. Faculties may specify in the award course resolutions or faculty resolutions conditions for transfer from one award in the embedded program to another.

(1) Students enrolled in an embedded program who have met the conditions for, and elect to, transfer to a longer award course in that embedded program:

(a) may transfer their enrolment to the longer award course; and
(b) will receive credit for all of the units of study completed in the shorter award course, provided that the units of study are approved as a requirement for the longer award course; and
(c) will not be permitted to graduate from the shorter award course.
Subject to the relevant course requirements, graduates of a course in an embedded program who subsequently become candidates for a longer award course in the same embedded program may be granted credit for units of study completed in the shorter award course.

Students enrolled in an embedded program who have completed the requirements for any award course in that embedded program may elect to discontinue their enrolment and graduate from that award course.

A student who has met the requirements for a Bachelor degree at pass level may, subject to the award course resolutions:

(a) receive credit for completed units of study; and

(b) enrol in the same Bachelor degree award course at honours level.

Note: For information on admission to a Bachelor degree award course at honours level, see clause 93.

46 Awarding waivers

| (1) An Associate Dean A Program Director may, having regard to a student’s previous learning or experience, waive the requirement that the student undertake a compulsory unit of study. |
| (2) A unit of study co-ordinator Program Director may waive the requirement that a student meet a prerequisite requirement or a co-requisite requirement for a unit of study. |
| (3) A waiver given under subclause (1) or (2) may be subject to conditions set out in the waiver. |

Note: For subclause (1); as the student will not have passed the compulsory unit of study, the student will have to make up the credit points by undertaking other units of study.

PART 12 ENROLMENT IN AND UNDERTAKING UNITS OF STUDY

47 Units of study

(1) In this Part, ‘table of units’ means a table of the units of study, as set out in the award course resolutions.

(2) Each unit of study is assigned a specified number of credit points by the faculty responsible for the unit of study.

(3) A student must pass a unit of study to acquire the credit points for that unit of study.

(4) The total number of credit points required for completion of an award course, including a combined degree or double degree course, is specified in the Senate resolutions and the award course resolutions.
(5) Subject to this Policy, a student completes a unit of study if the student:
(a) participates in the learning experiences for the unit of study;
(b) meets the standards required by the University for academic honesty;
(c) meets all examination, assessment and attendance requirements for the unit of study; and
(d) demonstrates learning outcomes for the unit of study to a standard equivalent to a pass level or higher.

(6) An Associate Dean/Program Director may, subject to the award course resolutions and with the approval of the Associate Dean/Program Director in the faculty in which the unit of study is offered, permit a student to enrol in and obtain credit for a unit of study that is not listed in the table of units for the course.

48 Students must enrol in units of study

(1) Subject to this Policy, each student must, for each semester, enrol in units of study offered in his or her award course.

(2) The enrolments must be consistent with the requirements of this policy, the faculty resolutions and the award course resolutions.

Note: See also Part 13.

49 Assumed knowledge

(1) The University assumes that students enrolling in some first year units of study have successfully acquired a certain level of knowledge, expressed in terms of program studies and performance achieved in the HSC or equivalent.

(2) The Academic Board may, on the recommendation of the relevant faculty, specify assumed knowledge and recommended study areas for undergraduate courses.

(3) Students who have not acquired the assumed knowledge may enrol in any unit of study in their award course, but should undertake any recommended supplementary work before the unit of study commences.

Note: For the current list of assumed knowledge and recommended study areas for undergraduate courses, see the Academic Board standards website.

50 Prerequisite and co-requisite requirements

(1) Faculties may determine prerequisite and co-requisite requirements for enrolment in a unit of study.

(2) Subject to subclause 46(2), a student may not enrol in a unit of study unless he or she has met the prerequisite requirements for the unit of study.

(3) Subject to subclause 46(2), a student may not enrol in a unit of study for which there is a co-requisite requirement unless he or she also enrolls in or has already completed the co-requisite unit of study.

Note: For details of prerequisite and co-requisite requirements for courses, see the relevant faculty handbook.
51 Enrolment restrictions

(1) Except with the permission of the Associate Dean or in accordance with the award course resolutions, a student may not:

(a) enrol in a unit of study that he or she has already completed towards the requirements for an award course;

(b) enrol in any unit of study that overlaps substantially in content with a unit of study that has already been completed by the student, or for which credit or a waiver or exemption has been granted;

(c) enrol in units of study additional to award course requirements;

(d) enrol in units of study with a total credit point value exceeding:
   (i) for enrolments in any one semester – 30 credit points;
   (ii) for enrolments in the Summer School – 12 credit points;
   (iii) for enrolments in the Winter School – six credit points; or

(e) enrol in a prohibited unit of study.

Note: The award course resolutions may prescribe a lower credit point value limit.

Note: The Associate Dean will specify prohibited units of study in the table of units.

(2) A student who is permitted, in accordance with subclause (1)(a), to re-enrol in a unit of study may receive a higher or lower grade, but not additional credit points.

52 Repeating a unit of study

(1) Unless granted an exemption by the Associate Dean Unit of Study Coordinator, a student who repeats a unit of study must:

(a) participate in the learning experiences provided for the unit of study; and

(b) meet all the examination, assessment and attendance requirements for the unit of study.

(2) Except with the permission of the Associate Dean Unit of Study Coordinator, a student who presents for reassessment in any unit of study is not eligible for any prize or scholarship awarded in connection with that unit of study.

53 Concurrent enrolment

(1) A student may not enrol in more than one award course at any level, except:

(a) with the permission of the relevant Associate Deans; or

(b) as part of an approved combined degree or double degree program.

Note: This includes courses offered by other institutions.

(2) The same unit of study cannot be counted towards the requirements for two different courses, except:

(a) for combined degrees;
for the purpose of satisfying prerequisite, co-requisite and admission requirements; and

(c) where a student is permitted to enrol in two postgraduate programs simultaneously, faculties may allow a maximum of two units of study to be cross-credited towards requirements for a maximum of two degrees as set out in clause 90.

54 Cross-institutional study

(1) A student may, with the permission of the Associate Program Director, enrol in a unit or units of study at another university or institution and have those units of study credited to the student's award course.

(2) The Associate Program Director Dean may impose conditions on any cross-institutional study approved in accordance with subclause (1).

55 Attendance

(1) A faculty may specify the attendance and participation requirements for its courses and units of study.

(2) A student enrolled in a unit of study must comply with the requirements set out in the faculty resolutions, award course resolutions or unit of study outline about undertaking the unit of study, including on matters such as:
   
   (a) attendance at and participation in lectures, seminars and tutorials; and

   (b) participation in practical work.

(3) A Program Director An Associate Dean may specify the circumstances under which a student who does not satisfy attendance requirements may be deemed not to have completed a unit of study or award course.

(4) An Associate Dean A Unit of Study Coordinator may, having regard to the student's previous studies, exempt a student from a requirement mentioned in subclause (1).

PART 13 DISCONTINUATION AND SUSPENSION OF ENROLMENT

56 Discontinuation of enrolment

(1) Subject to this clause, a student may discontinue his or her enrolment in an award course or in one or more units of study.

(2) A student's enrolment in the course or the relevant units of study will be treated as discontinued from the date of discontinuation, unless he or she produces evidence that there was good reason why the application could not be made at an earlier time.

(3) 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 is later re-selected for admission to the course.

(4) 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 subclause (2).

(5) A student who discontinues enrolment in a unit of study is to be awarded a grade set out in Schedule 1.

57 Suspension of enrolment by student

(1) Subject to restrictions imposed by the Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 on student visa holders, a student in a course may suspend his or her enrolment in a course:
   (a) for a maximum period of one year; or
   (b) with the approval of the Associate Dean, for a maximum period of two years.

(2) The suspension must be notified to the University in a manner approved or accepted by the faculty.

(3) At the end of the suspension period, the student must comply with any requirements notified by the Associate Dean for completing the course. Those requirements apply to the student despite anything to the contrary in the award course resolutions.

58 Suspension and termination of candidature for failure to enrol

(1) If a student is not enrolled in any unit of study by the last of the census dates for that semester, and the student has not discontinued or suspended enrolment, the student's candidature is automatically suspended.

(2) If a student's candidature is automatically suspended, then, despite any contrary provision in this Policy, the procedures for the student to re-enrol in the course are to be as the faculty-Associate Dean determines.

(3) If a student fails to re-enrol in that and the subsequent semester, his or her candidature will be automatically terminated.

59 Return to candidature

(1) If a student returns to candidature after a discontinuation or suspension, the course requirements in force at the time of the student's return to candidature apply to the student's candidature.

(2) Despite subclause (1), the Associate Dean may, in writing, modify the application of the course requirements in a particular case.
PART 14 ASSESSMENT

60 Statement of intent

(1) The purpose of this Part is to:
   (a) set out the principles that underpin the University's approach to assessment;
   (b) support students' development and progressive demonstration of graduate qualities as defined in the *Learning and Teaching Policy 2015*;
   (c) inform curriculum and teaching quality assurance programs; and
   (d) underpin accountability for achievement of graduate outcomes.

(2) Assessments should be designed to provide feedback on performance or to establish that students have achieved an adequate standard to proceed or to graduate.

(3) This part applies to any coursework unit of study undertaken by a higher degree by research student.

61 Assessment principles and their implementation

(1) The following principles apply to assessment at the University.
   (a) Assessment practices must advance student learning.
   (b) Assessment practices must be communicated clearly to students and staff.
   (c) Assessment practices must be valid and fair.
   (d) Assessment practices must be continuously improved and updated.

(2) The University's assessment principles will be implemented in accordance with the implementation statements set out in this policy.

(3) The procedures for operation of the implementation statements are set out in the *Assessment Procedures 2011*.

62 Principle 1 - Assessment practices must advance student learning

This principle requires that:

(1) Assessment practices align with goals, context, learning activities and learning outcomes.

(2) A variety of assessment tasks are used while ensuring that student and staff workloads are considered.

(3) Assessment tasks reflect increasing levels of complexity across a program and foster enquiry-based learning.

(4) Constructive, timely and respectful feedback develops students' skills of self and peer evaluation and guides the development of future student work.
63 Principle 2 - Assessment practices must be communicated clearly to students and staff

This principle requires that:

(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.

(2) Unit of study outlines explain the rationale for the selection of assessment tasks (e.g. group task) in relation to learning outcomes.

(3) Procedures exist to ensure that all staff involved in teaching a unit of study share a common understanding of assessment practices.

(4) The process of marking and of combining individual task marks is explicitly explained in the unit outline.

64 Principle 3 - Assessment practices must be valid and fair

This principle requires that:

(1) Assessment tasks are authentic and appropriate to disciplinary and or professional context.

(2) Assessment incorporates rigorous academic standards related to the discipline(s) and is based on pre-determined, clearly articulated criteria with which students actively engage.

(3) Students’ assessment will be evaluated solely on the basis of students’ achievement against criteria and standards specified to align with learning outcomes.

(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.

65 Principle 4 - Assessment practices must be continuously improved and updated

This principle requires that:

(1) Assessment tasks and outcomes are moderated through academic peer review and used to inform subsequent practice.

(2) Assessments are regularly updated to ensure alignment with program learning outcomes or graduate qualities.

(3) Professional development opportunities that are related to design, implementation and moderation of assessment are provided to staff.

Note: A student does not have a right to a merits review by the Student Appeals Body under the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006, and cannot appeal against an academic decision on the ground that the student believes that the academic decision was made in a manner that was inconsistent with the Assessment Principles.
66 Common result grades

(1) The University will award common result grades as set out in Schedule 1.

(2) The grades of high distinction, distinction and credit indicate work of a standard higher than that required for a pass.

(3) A student who completes a unit of study for which only a pass or fail result is available will be recorded as having satisfied requirements.

66A Simple extensions

(1) A unit of study co-ordinator, who is satisfied that it is appropriate to do so, may permit a student to submit a non-examination task up to two working days after the due date with no penalty.

(2) Such permission is an informal arrangement between the unit of study co-ordinator and the student which does not:

(a) affect the student’s entitlement to apply for special consideration under this policy;

(b) alter any time limits or other requirements relating to applications for special consideration; or

(c) constitute an academic decision for the purposes of the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

Note: Any faculty resolution or local provision forbidding the granting of simple extensions is inconsistent with this policy.

67 Special consideration due to illness, injury or misadventure

(1) Generally, an illness, injury or misadventure will be taken into account when considering a student’s performance in a course or unit of study.

(2) Special consideration is provided in circumstances where well-attested illness, injury or misadventure occurs during a semester or at the time of an examination. It is an academic judgement which depends on the nature of the illness, misadventure or injury and its impact in relation to assessment or examination.

(3) Students who bear a primary carer responsibility toward another person at the time of an assessment may also apply for special consideration on the basis of illness, injury or misadventure on the part of the person for whom they care if their ability to prepare for or perform the assessment is adversely affected.

(4) Special consideration is also available to non-award students.

(5) Students who are granted special consideration must nonetheless be required to demonstrate achievement of designated learning outcomes.

(6) Rescinded.

(7) A student who is reasonably capable of attempting an examination should do so, despite any accompanying application for special consideration.

(8) All requests for special consideration must be genuine and made in good faith.

(a) Attempts to use special consideration as a means of gaining an unfair advantage in an assessment must be rejected.
(b) Making a request for special consideration that is not genuine or in good faith may lead to disciplinary action against a student.

(9) A request for special consideration does not guarantee that the request will be granted.

(10) Special consideration must not be granted for:

(a) balancing workloads from other units of study, disciplines or faculties;
(b) information and communications technology-related problems, except where they could not have been prevented, avoided or the effects minimised by reasonable diligence by the student; or
(c) jury service, military service, national sporting, religious or cultural commitments or other unforeseen events for which special arrangements may be provided in accordance with this policy.

(11) Special consideration granted to one or more students should not disadvantage other students.

68 Students with a disability

(1) Students with a permanent or temporary disability 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 and or accessible examination and assessment arrangements.

Note: See the University's Disability Services website.

(2) Disability Services will determine the student's eligibility for adjustments and inform the student and faculty of the required reasonable adjustments.

(3) Students wishing to apply for accessible examination and assessment conditions must make their application through Disability Services within specified timeframes.

(4) Accessible examination and assessment conditions include, but are not limited to:

(a) extra time for reading, writing, resting or toilet breaks;
(b) use of a scribe;
(c) examination papers in alternative formats;
(d) use of assistive technology;
(e) ergonomic furniture;
(f) using a designated room and experienced supervisors;
(g) using a separate room with a scribe or assistive technology;
(h) rescheduling and or spacing of examinations into the deferred examination period.

69 Special arrangements for assessments

(1) The relevant delegate may make special arrangements available to any student who is unable to meet assessment requirements or attend examinations because of one or more of the following:
(a) essential religious commitments or essential beliefs (including cultural and ceremonial commitments);
(b) compulsory legal absence (such as jury duty or court summons);
(c) sporting or cultural commitments, including political or union commitments, where the student is representing the University, state or nation;
(d) birth or adoption of a child;
(e) Australian defence force or emergency service commitments (including Army Reserve);
(f) the relevant delegate forms the view that employment of an essential nature to the student would be jeopardised and that the student has little or no discretion with respect to the employment demand.

(2) The relevant delegate may make special arrangements for a student who is unable to meet assessment requirements or attend examinations for any other reason that is beyond the student’s reasonable control, at the delegate’s own discretion, on a case-by-case basis.

(3) Special arrangements are intended to support the University’s commitment to flexible learning. However, while every reasonable attempt is made to accommodate student needs, it may not be possible to provide such arrangements in all cases. This is particularly so where clinical placements and practicums are involved.

70 Responsibilities for implementation of this Part

(1) The Academic Board is responsible for:
(a) ensuring that assessment practices comply with this policy; and
(b) ensuring that assessment practices and procedures are monitored and reviewed at the level of faculties in accordance with this policy, and that changes to assessment practices are made where appropriate as a consequence of such review.

(2) The Registrar is responsible for:
(a) overseeing the release of results to students; and
(b) overseeing the conduct of examinations.

(3) Deans and Associate Deans are responsible for:
(a) ensuring that this policy is contextualised and implemented in all programs and units for which the faculty is responsible;
(b) ensuring that faculty practices and standards in relation to assessment are consistent with this policy and any associated procedures; and
(c) appointing a responsible head where the teaching of a unit of study is shared by more than one department.

(4) Heads of Departments and or Heads of Schools and or Deputy Heads of Schools are responsible for:
(a) ensuring that this policy is contextualised and implemented in all programs and units for which the academic unit is responsible;
(b) appointing principal examiners; and
(c)(b) appointing program co-ordinators directors.

(5) Program co-ordinators directors are responsible for:

(a) developing and overseeing an assessment strategy for the students’ program or major that is consistent with this policy and any associated procedures;
(b) fostering a whole of program or major approach to assessment;
(c) ensuring program or major learning outcomes and standards are made clear to students;
(d) monitoring overall assessment loads for both staff and students;
(e) ensuring program or major learning outcomes are assessed at appropriate points throughout the degree;
(f) ensuring that assessment tasks reflect increasing levels of complexity across the program or major; and
(g) facilitating and promoting opportunities for professional development of assessment practice for all staff teaching a program, with particular emphasis on new and less experienced teachers.

(6) Unit co-ordinators and or principal examiners are responsible for:

(a) developing and implementing an assessment strategy which is consistent with this policy and any associated procedures;
(b) managing the moderation of assessment design and marking to ensure the validity and reliability of assessment within the unit;
(c) ensuring that assessment requirements for a unit are discussed and understood by all members of staff involved in teaching and assessment, including seasonal and casual teachers; and
(d) monitoring and reflecting on student assessment outcomes and student survey data to make changes to the assessment strategy for the unit in light of the review, as appropriate.

(7) Unit lecturers and tutors are responsible for:

(a) assessing student work fairly, consistently and in a timely manner;
(b) providing timely feedback which enables students to further improve their learning and performance wherever possible; and
(c) advising students in relation to expectations relevant to specific assessment tasks.

(8) Students are responsible for:

(a) actively engaging with assessment tasks, including carefully reading the guidance provided, spending sufficient time on the task, ensuring their work is authentic and their own (whether individual or group work) and handing work in on time;
(b) actively engaging in activities designed to develop assessment literacy, including taking the initiative where appropriate (e.g. asking for clarification or advice);
(c) actively engaging with and acting on feedback provided;
(d) providing constructive feedback on assessment processes and tasks through student feedback mechanisms (e.g. student surveys or student representation on committees); and
(e) becoming familiar with University policy and faculty procedures and acting in accordance with those policy and procedures.

PART 15  PROGRESSION

71  Progression requirements

Note: A student enrolled in an award course must meet the progression requirements and all the course requirements for an award course within the time limits for the course.

See Part 4 of the Coursework Rule.

Subject to this Policy, a faculty will prescribe in the faculty resolutions or the award course resolutions the progression requirements for coursework award courses in that faculty.

72  Statement of intent

(1) The University is committed to early identification and support of students who are not meeting progression requirements, and may therefore be at risk of exclusion from their award course.

(2) Faculties Associate Deans will assist and promote the progression of students who are not meeting progression requirements by:

(a) regularly and effectively advising students of progression requirements;
(b) identifying and alerting students who are not meeting progression requirements;
(c) providing assistance to students who are not meeting progression requirements; and
(d) tracking the progress of students after they are identified as not meeting progression requirements.

(3) Faculties Associate Deans will ensure that they have clear and transparent internal processes for handling students who are not meeting progression requirements, consistent with this policy.

73  Monitoring progression

(1) Faculties Associate Deans will monitor each student’s progression, including through reports generated by the student record keeping system.

(2) When monitoring each student’s progression, the faculty Associate Dean may take into account:

(a) whether the student has attended compulsory teaching and assessment components of a unit of study;
whether the student has over-enrolled in an attempt to catch up on failed units of study; and
whether there are significant variations in the student’s academic performance.

(3) Where the attendance record of a student is deemed by the faculty Associate Dean to be unsatisfactory, that information will be recorded in the student record keeping system.

74 Progression profile

(1) Faculties Associate Deans will establish and maintain a progression profile for each student who is identified as not meeting academic progression requirements.

(2) The progression profile will include all documents relating to a student’s academic progression, including correspondence and interview records.

(3) The progression profile will be attached to the student’s file.

75 Triggers for identifying students who are not meeting academic progression requirements

(1) At the end of each semester, each faculty Associate Dean will identify the students in courses offered by the faculty who are not meeting academic progression requirements.

(2) A student will be identified as not meeting academic progression requirements in a semester if:

(a) the student received a Fail, Discontinued - Fail or Absent Fail grade in more than 50% of the total credit points allocated to the units of study in which they were enrolled for the semester;
(b) the student’s semester average mark was less than 50;
(c) the award course resolutions stipulate that:
   (i) an average mark above 50 is required in order to remain enrolled in an award course or stream; and
   (ii) alternative enrolment is available; and
   the student’s average mark for all the units of study in which they were enrolled for the semester was less than the required average mark;
(d) the student failed one or more barrier units of study, compulsory units of study, field work, clinical work, practicum or other professional experience specified in the award course resolutions;
(e) the student has failed twice to pass the same unit of study (excluding Summer School and Winter School units of study);
(f) the student’s attendance record during the semester was unsatisfactory; or
(g) the student is unable to complete their award course within the maximum time limit, while carrying a normal student load.
76 Stage 1 - Students identified for the first time as not meeting academic progression requirements

(1) The faculty Associate Dean will send all students identified as not meeting academic progression requirements for the first time a letter and a self-reflective Staying on Track survey.

(2) The letter will advise each student:
   (a) that they have been identified as not meeting academic progression requirements;
   (b) why they have been identified as not meeting academic progression requirements;
   (c) that they are advised to:
      (i) complete a Staying on Track survey; and
      (ii) attend a Staying on Track information session;
   (d) that all correspondence and documents relating to their academic progression status will be recorded on their progression profile; and
   (e) where the student is enrolled in an award course whose normal full-time duration is two years or less, that:
      (i) if they fail to meet progression requirements in the following semester, they may be asked to show good cause why they should be permitted to re-enrol in the award course; and
      (ii) they are recommended to consult an academic adviser in their faculty.

(3) Faculties Associate Deans may require students to consult an academic adviser.

(4) The Staying on Track survey will:
   (a) assist students to identify why they are having difficulties meeting academic progression requirements;
   (b) advise students to avail themselves of, and include details of, student support services available at the University, including:
      (i) the Counselling Service;
      (ii) the Learning Centre;
      (iii) the University Health Service; and
      (iv) the student representative bodies.

(5) The Staying on Track information session will:
   (a) provide information on study skills; and
   (b) introduce students to the student support services in subclause (4) (b).

Note: See clause 78 for information on the show cause process.

77 Stage 2 - Students at risk of being asked to show good cause

(1) Students who:
(a) are enrolled in an award course whose normal full-time duration is two years or less; and
(b) are identified for the second time as not meeting academic progression requirements, without an intervening period of satisfactory progress;

will be asked to show good cause why they should be permitted to re-enrol in the award course.

(2) Students who:
(a) are enrolled in an award course whose normal full-time duration is more than two years; and
(b) are identified for the second time as not meeting academic progression requirements, without an intervening period of satisfactory progress as prescribed in clause 82;

will be sent a warning letter and a Staying on Track survey by the faculty Associate Dean.

(3) The letter will advise each student:
(a) that they have been identified as not meeting academic progression requirements;
(b) why they have been identified as not meeting academic progression requirements;
(c) that they are advised to:
   (i) complete a Staying on Track survey; and
   (ii) attend a Staying on Track information session, if they have not already done so;
(d) that they are required to consult an academic adviser in their faculty; and
(e) that all correspondence and documents relating to their academic progression status will be recorded on their progression profile.

(4) The Staying on Track survey will:
(a) assist students to identify and explain why they are having difficulties meeting academic progression requirements; and
(b) require students to consult with their year adviser or Associate Dean, who will ask them to provide information about any support services or other remedial action the student has taken since they were first identified as not meeting academic progression requirements.

(5) The faculty Associate Dean will record whether the student has consulted an academic adviser.

Note: The Associate Dean will take into account whether a student has consulted an academic adviser when determining whether a student has shown good cause for the purposes of clause 78.
78 Stage 3 - Being asked to show good cause

(1) The relevant Associate Dean may require a student who has not met the progression requirements or other standards set out in applicable faculty local provisions to show good cause why he or she should be allowed to re-enrol.

(2) For the purposes of this policy, ‘good cause’ means:
   (a) circumstances beyond the reasonable control of a student, which may include serious ill health or misadventure, but does not include demands of employers, pressure of employment or time devoted to non-University activities, unless these are relevant to serious ill health or misadventure; and
   (b) reasonable prospects of meeting progression requirements in the following semester.

(3) Students will be asked to show good cause where:
   (a) they are enrolled in an award course whose normal full-time duration is two years or less, and they have been identified as not meeting progression requirements for that award course twice, without an intervening period of satisfactory progress as prescribed in clause 82;
   (b) they are enrolled in an award course whose normal full-time duration is more than two years, and they have been identified as not meeting progression requirements for that award course three times, without an intervening period of satisfactory progress as prescribed in clause 82; or
   (c) they have twice failed the same compulsory or barrier unit of study, field work, clinical work, practicum or other professional experience.

(4) A student may be asked to show good cause more than once.

(5) A student who is asked to show good cause will be invited to provide written reasons why they should be permitted to re-enrol in their award course.

(6) A student’s response to a request to show good cause should:
   (a) outline the circumstances that have negatively affected the student’s study performance;
   (b) explain the specific effects or impacts of those circumstances;
   (c) outline the steps that the student has taken, or will take in the future, to address each of those circumstances, with a view to ensuring that they will not negatively affect the student’s study performance in the future;
   (d) if the student has previously been asked to show good cause, explain whether previously identified factors affecting their study performance have recurred, including reasons why previous strategies to address those factors have been ineffective; and
   (e) attach any relevant documentary evidence.

(7) In all cases the onus is on the student to provide the Associate Dean with satisfactory evidence to establish good cause.

(8) The Associate Dean will provide reasons for his or her decision, which will be recorded on the student’s progression profile.

Note: Documentary evidence for subclause (6)(e) may include medical certificates, police reports, statutory declarations or academic transcripts. The Associate Dean may take into account relevant aspects of a student’s record in other courses or units of study.
study within the University, and relevant aspects of academic studies at other institutions, provided that the student presents this information to the Associate Dean.

Note: A response to a request to show good cause is not a substitute for a special consideration or special arrangement application, which should be lodged as appropriate in accordance with this policy.

79 Permission to re-enrol

(1) The Associate Dean will permit a student who has shown good cause to re-enrol.

(2) Subject to clause 82, a student who is permitted to re-enrol will remain at Stage 3 of the process outlined in this Part.

80 Actions that may be taken where a student does not show good cause

(1) Where a student has not shown good cause why he or she should be allowed to re-enrol, the Associate Dean may:
   (a) exclude the student from the relevant course; or
   (b) permit the student to re-enrol in the relevant award course subject to restrictions on units of study, which may include but are not limited to:
      (i) passing a unit or units of study within a specified time;
      (ii) exclusion from a unit or units of study; and
      (iii) specification of the earliest date upon which a student may re-enrol in a unit or units of study.

(2) The Associate Dean may not exclude a student who subsequently does not meet any restrictions on enrolment imposed under subclause (1)(b) without allowing the student a further opportunity to show good cause.

Note: For information on student appeals against decisions made by an Associate Dean under this clause, see the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

81 Applying for re-admission after exclusion for failure to meet progression requirements

(1) A person who has been excluded from an award course may apply for re-admission to the award course after at least two years.

(2) Re-admission will not be permitted without the approval of the Associate Dean.

(3) With the written approval of the Associate Dean, a person who is re-admitted to his or her award course may be given credit for any work completed elsewhere in the University or at another institution during a period of exclusion.

Note: For information on student appeals against decisions made by an Associate Dean under this clause, see the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.
82 Reversion

(1) Where a student previously identified as not meeting academic progression requirements meets progression requirements for two consecutive semesters, his or her name will be removed from the academic progression register.

(2) If, having been removed from the academic progression register, a student who has previously been identified as not meeting academic progression requirements fails again to meet progression requirements, he or she will be regarded as being at Stage 1 of the process outlined in this Part. These students may, at the faculty’s Associate Dean’s discretion, be required to consult an academic adviser about their progress.

PART 16 SHOW GOOD CAUSE FOLLOWING FAILURE, DISCONTINUATION OR EXCLUSION

83 Show good cause following failure, discontinuation or exclusion

(1) The Associate Dean may require a student to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to re-enrol in a unit of study that he or she has failed or discontinued more than once, whether that unit of study was failed or discontinued when the student was enrolled in an award course offered by the current faculty or by another faculty.

(2) The Associate Dean may require a student who:
   (a) has had his or her candidature in an award course at the University, or at another institution, terminated due to failure or discontinuation; and
   (b) has subsequently been admitted or re-admitted to an award course at the University;

to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to re-enrol in a year of candidature or a unit of study that he or she has failed or discontinued in the year immediately following the admission or re-admission.

(3) Where a student has not shown good cause why he or she should be allowed to re-enrol, the Associate Dean may:
   (a) exclude the student from the relevant course; or
   (b) permit the student to re-enrol in the relevant award course subject to restrictions on units of study, which may include but are not limited to:
      (i) completion of a unit or units of study within a specified time;
      (ii) exclusion from a unit or units of study; and
      (iii) specification of the earliest date upon which a student may re-enrol in a unit or units of study.
(4) The Associate Dean may not exclude a student who subsequently does not meet any conditions on enrolment imposed under subclause (3)(b) without allowing the student a further opportunity to show good cause.

Note: For information on student appeals against decisions made by an Associate Dean under this clause, see the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

PART 17 AWARD COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Note: To qualify for the award of a degree, diploma or certificate, a student must:

- complete the award course requirements prescribed in any relevant faculty resolutions and the award course resolutions; and
- satisfy the requirements of the Coursework Rule and any applicable policy

See clause 5.1 of the Coursework Rule.

Note: See clause 102(3) for commencement dates of clauses 83A to 83C inclusive.

Note: See also clauses 18(1)–(8) of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

83A Award course requirements for all Bachelor degrees

(1) The Bachelor degree:
   (a) offers liberal, professional or specialist learning and education; and
   (b) builds on prior secondary or tertiary study.

(2) All Bachelor award courses must meet:
   (a) the requirements for either:
      (i) a Liberal Studies Bachelor Degree; or
      (ii) a Professional or Specialist Bachelor’s degree;
   and
   (b) the applicable award course resolutions.

83B Award course requirements for the Liberal Studies Bachelor Degree

(1) Any Liberal Studies Bachelor Degree will have a requirement of 144 credit points of study as specified in the award course resolutions, including the requirement to complete:
   (a) core units of study as specified, to a maximum of 24 credit points;
   (b) a major or a program from the list specified;
   (c) a minimum of 12 credit points of elective units from the open learning environment; and
(d) a minor from a shared pool of minors common to Liberal Studies Bachelor
degrees.

(2) Every Liberal Studies Bachelor Degree must be designed to support the
development of the graduate qualities and must require all students to demonstrate
those qualities.

(3) Every Liberal Studies Bachelor Degree must offer the opportunity for students to
complete:
(a) a second major in place of the minor required in subclause 83B(1)(d) above
from a shared pool of majors common to Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees;
(b) a program from a pool of the degree’s list of available programs;
(c) elective units of study from a shared pool of elective units common to Liberal
Studies Bachelor Degrees (except where the requirements for a program do
not allow sufficient free credit points to take electives);
(d) elective modules from the open learning environment;
(e) in addition to the Liberal Studies Bachelor Degree, the requirements for the
Bachelor of Advanced Studies in a combined degree as set out in the award
course resolutions.

83C Award course requirements for the Professional or Specialist
Bachelor Degree

(1) Any Professional or Specialist Bachelor Degree must:
(a) have a requirement of not less than 144 credit points of study as specified in
the award course resolutions;
(b) support the development of the graduate qualities; and
(c) require all students to demonstrate those qualities.

(2) Professional or Specialist Bachelor degrees may offer the opportunity for students
to complete, in addition to the Professional or Specialist Bachelor Degree, a
Bachelor of Advanced Studies.

84 Masters by coursework

The Masters by coursework degree:

(a) is a program of either or both of advanced learning and professional training;
(b) builds on prior undergraduate study; and
(c) normally leads to a capstone experience, which provides an opportunity to
synthesize the knowledge and experience gained.

85 The capstone experience

(1) All Advanced Learning Masters degrees and appropriate Professional or Specialist
Masters degrees culminate in a capstone experience.
(2) The capstone experience:

(a) is a unit of study designed to provide students with an opportunity to:
   (i) draw together the learning that has taken place during the award course;
   (ii) synthesise the learning that has taken place during the award course with their prior learning and experience; and
   (iii) draw conclusions that will form the basis for further investigation and intellectual and professional growth;

(b) will be integrative, foster student autonomy and, where appropriate, a trans-disciplinary perspective;

(c) will contribute to award course aims and graduate qualities;

(d) is taken towards the end of the award course, with the result captured in a mark or the component of a mark;

(e) may take the form of:
   (i) a long essay;
   (ii) a thesis;
   (iii) a project;
   (iv) a professional placement;
   (v) a comprehensive or oral examination;
   (vi) a portfolio with commentary;
   (vii) a performance;
   (viii) an exhibition;
   (ix) a public presentation;
   (x) a law moot; or
   (xi) another activity appropriate to the discipline.

86 Award course requirements for the Advanced Learning Masters degree

(1) The Advanced Learning Masters degree comprises a minimum of one year of full-time advanced study culminating in a capstone experience.

(2) Advanced Learning Masters degrees contain optional opportunities for interdisciplinary study and research and, where appropriate and feasible:
   (a) exchange and work-based projects; and
   (b) professional or industry experience.

(3) Advanced Learning Masters degrees carry the title Master of Arts in [discipline], Master of Science in [discipline], or a title specified in the relevant award course resolutions.

(4) Candidates for the Advanced Learning Masters degree must complete a minimum of 48 credit points of study, or such higher number as specified in the award course resolutions, including:
(a) core advanced units of study as specified in the award course resolutions;
(b) a capstone experience;
(c) elective advanced units of study, including:
   (i) an optional 12 credit points of research, as prescribed in the award course resolutions;
   (ii) optional units of study offered by another faculty, as prescribed in the award course resolutions or with the permission of both faculties;
(d) where specified in the award course resolutions, optional elective units designed by the faculty involving a professional or industry project; and
(e) where appropriate and specified in the award course resolutions, optional inter-institutional units of study.

87 Award course requirements for the Professional Masters degree

(1) The Professional Masters degree comprises a minimum of one year and a maximum of four years of full-time study leading to a qualification that contributes to professional accreditation or recognition.

(2) Where appropriate to professional requirements, Professional Masters degrees will include:
   (a) a capstone experience;
   (b) opportunities for interdisciplinary study;
   (c) research;
   (d) inter-institutional study; and
   (e) professional or industry experience.

(3) Candidates for Professional Masters degrees must complete the requirements set out in the award course resolutions, which will include a minimum of 48 and a maximum of 192 credit points, including:
   (a) core units of study as specified in the award course resolutions;
   (b) where appropriate, a capstone experience;
   (c) elective advanced units of study including, where appropriate and feasible:
      (i) an optional 12 credit points of research as set out in the award course resolutions;
      (ii) optional elective units of study offered by another faculty, as prescribed in the award course resolutions or with the permission of both faculties;
      (iii) where specified in the award course resolutions, optional elective units designed by the faculty involving a professional or industry project; and
      (iv) where specified in the award course resolutions, optional exchange units.
87A Award course requirements for research-pathway Masters degrees

(1) This section applies to Masters degrees by coursework intended to develop research ability in a discipline and to prepare students for admission to a PhD.

(2) The research-pathway Masters degree builds on a prior undergraduate degree and develop advanced knowledge and skills necessary to undertake research in a Doctor of Philosophy.

(3) The volume of learning in a research-pathway Masters will depend on a student’s prior undergraduate study and will normally be:
   (a) For a student who has taken a major or specialisation in a 144 credit point undergraduate degree in the area of the specialisation for the Masters degree at a standard accepted by the faculty, 72 credit points;
   (b) For a student who has not taken a major or specialisation in the area of the specialisation for the Masters degree at a standard accepted by the faculty, 96 credit points;
   (c) For a student who has taken a major or specialisation in a 192 credit point undergraduate degree in the area of the specialisation for the Masters degree at a standard accepted by the faculty, 48 credit points.

(4) Any research-pathway Masters degree will have a requirement of a maximum of 96 credit points as specified in the degree resolutions, including the requirement to complete:
   (a) a named Specialisation that develops research ability in a discipline to a standard for admission to a PhD including:
      (i) a research project of 24 – 36 credit points; and
      (ii) advanced coursework developing knowledge, and research skills in the discipline of the Specialisation at 4000 and 5000 level;
   (b) a minimum of 72 credit points at 4000 level or above;
   (c) a minimum of 36 credit points at 5000 level or above, including:
      (i) a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 12 credit points from the Open Learning Environment at 5000 level or above.
   (d) Optionally, a maximum of 24 credit points at 3000 level for students admitted without an undergraduate major or specialisation as set out in 3 (b) above.

(5) The usual research-pathway Masters degree at the University of Sydney is the Master of Advanced Studies ([Specialisation]).

88 Award course requirements for the Graduate Diploma

(1) The Graduate Diploma is an advanced program of study building on either or both of prior undergraduate and postgraduate study.

(2) A Graduate Diploma may be offered as an embedded award in an Advanced Learning or Professional Masters program, or as a stand-alone award.

(3) Where it is offered as part of an embedded program, the title of a Graduate Diploma will be Graduate Diploma in [discipline], where [discipline] is:
(a) an identifier that is unique within the faculty; and
(b) is used in the title of all components of the embedded program.

(4) Where the Graduate Diploma is offered as a stand-alone program, its title will be as specified in the award course resolutions.

(5) Candidates for a Graduate Diploma must complete a minimum of 36 and a maximum of 48 credit points of study, including:
(a) core units of study as specified in the award course resolutions; and
(b) where appropriate, elective units of study including optional elective units of study offered by another faculty, as prescribed in the award course resolutions or with the permission of both faculties.

89 Award course requirements for the Graduate Certificate

(1) The Graduate Certificate is an advanced program of study building on:
(a) prior undergraduate study; or
(b) where approved by the faculty, prior experience that is considered by the faculty to demonstrate knowledge and aptitude to undertake the required units of study.

(2) A Graduate Certificate may be offered as an embedded award in an Advanced Learning program, a Professional Masters program, a Graduate Diploma, or as a stand-alone award.

(3) Where it is offered as part of an embedded program, the title of a Graduate Certificate will be Graduate Certificate in [discipline], where [discipline] is:
(a) an identifier that is unique within the faculty; and
(b) is used in the title of all components of the embedded program.

(4) Where the Graduate Certificate is offered as a stand-alone program, its title will be as specified in the award course resolutions.

(5) Candidates for the Graduate Certificate must complete a minimum of 24 and a maximum of 36 credit points of study, including:
(a) core units of study as specified in the award course resolutions; and
(b) where appropriate, elective units of study including optional elective units of study offered by another faculty, as prescribed in the award course resolutions or with the permission of both faculties.

90 Award course requirements for combined postgraduate coursework degrees and double degrees

(1) Subject to this clause, faculties may establish combined degree and double degree programs involving postgraduate coursework awards allowing some units to be cross-credited to both degrees.

(2) The minimum course requirement for a double Masters degree is 96 credit points, equating to two years of full-time study.
(3) The cross-credited units of study for combined postgraduate degrees and double
degrees will not exceed a value of 12 credit points in each degree.

(4) Faculties may admit candidates to two postgraduate award courses and allow a
maximum of 12 credit points to be credited to both awards, provided that:

(a) where the awards are offered by two faculties, double enrolment is with the
permission of the Deans of both faculties; and

(b) units of study to be cross-credited in both degrees are cross-credited with
the written approval of the relevant Deans and Heads of
Department Program Directors.

91 Award course requirements for combined degree and double
degree programs for the award of a Bachelor and Masters
degree

(1) Subject to this clause, faculties may establish combined degree and double degree
programs for the award of a Bachelor degree and the award of a Masters degree.

(2) The minimum requirements for a double degree combining the award of a Bachelor
degree and a Masters degree is 192 credit points, equating to four years of full-
time study.

(3) Candidates may not proceed to units of study at the Masters level without
achieving in units contributing to the Bachelor degree at:

(a) a credit level; or

(b) such higher level as is set out in the award course resolutions.

91A Award course requirements for vertically-integrated
Bachelor/Master degrees

(1) This section applies to vertically-integrated Bachelor/Master degrees approved
after 1 January 2018.

(2) All vertically-integrated Bachelor/Master degrees must meet:

(a) award course requirements for:

(i) research-pathway vertically-integrated Bachelor/Master degrees; or

(ii) specialist-professional vertically-integrated Bachelor/Master degrees;

and

(b) the applicable award course resolutions.

91B Award course requirements for research-pathway vertically
integrated Bachelor/Master degrees

(3) Any research-pathway vertically integrated Bachelor/Master degrees with a
Bachelor degree of 144 credit points will have a requirement of 216 credit points of
study as specified in the award course resolutions, including the requirement to
complete:
(a) A Bachelor degree of 144 credit points;
(b) 72 credit points from the Master of Advanced Studies ([discipline]) degree of including:
   (i) a named Specialisation that develops research ability in a discipline to a standard for admission to a PhD including:
       a research project of 24 – 36 credit points; and
       advanced coursework developing knowledge, and research skills in the discipline of the Specialisation at 4000 and 5000 level;
(c) a minimum of 72 credit points at 4000 level or above;
(d) a minimum of 36 credit points at 5000-level or above including:
   (i) a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 12 credit points from the Open Learning Environment at 5000 level or above.

(4) Any research-pathway vertically integrated Bachelor/Master degrees with a Bachelor degree of 192 credit points will have a requirement of 240 credit points of study as specified in the award course resolutions, including the requirement to complete:
(a) A Bachelor degree of 192 credit points;
(b) 48 credit points from the Master of Advanced Studies ([discipline]) degree of 48 credit points including:
   (i) a named Specialisation that develops research ability in a discipline to a standard for admission to a PhD including:
       a research project of 24 – 36 credit points;
       advanced coursework developing knowledge, and research skills in the discipline of the Specialisation at 4000 and 5000 level;
(c) a minimum of 48 credit points at 4000 level or above;
(d) a minimum of 36 credit points at 5000-level or above including:
   (i) a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 12 credit points from the Open Learning Environment at 5000 level or above.

91C Award course requirements for professional/specialist vertically integrated Bachelor/Master degrees

(5) Any professional/specialist vertically integrated Bachelor/Master degrees with a bachelor degree of 144 credit points will have a requirement of 216 credit points of study as specified in the award course resolutions, including the requirement to complete:
(a) A Bachelor degree of 144 credit points;
(b) A Master of [discipline] degree of 72 credit points including:
   (i) a project of 12 – 36 credit points;
   (ii) a minimum of 72 credit points at 4000 level or higher;
   (iii) a minimum of 36 credit points at 5000-level or higher including:
a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 12 credit points from the Open Learning Environment at 5000 level or above.

(6) Any professional/specialist vertically integrated Bachelor/Master degrees with a bachelor degree of 192 credit points will have a requirement of 240 credit points of study as specified in the award course resolutions, including the requirement to complete:

(a) A Bachelor degree of 192 credit points;
(b) A Master of [discipline] degree of 48 credit points including:
   (i) a project of 12 – 36 credit points;
   (ii) a minimum of 48 credit points at 4000 level or higher;
   (iii) a minimum of 36 credit points at 5000-level or higher including:
      a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 12 credit points from the Open Learning Environment at 5000 level or above.

PART 18 AWARDS

Note: An Undergraduate Diploma may be awarded at one of four grades: pass, pass with merit, pass with distinction, pass with high distinction.

A Bachelor degree may be awarded at one of two grades: pass, or pass with honours.

Degrees of Master by coursework may be conferred, and Graduate Diplomas and Graduate Certificates may be awarded, only at a pass grade.

See clause 6.1 of the Coursework Rule.

92 Transcripts and testamurs

(1) A student who has completed an award course or a unit of study at the University will receive an academic transcript or graduation statement upon application and payment of any required fees.

Note: For information on the circumstances in which the University will apply sanctions for unpaid debts, see the Student Debtor Sanctions Policy 2014.

(2) A student who has completed the course requirements for an award course will receive a testamur and a graduation statement.

(3) A testamur will state:

(a) any major body of study including, where relevant, majors, streams or specialisations completed by the graduate;
(b) for a graduate of a Bachelor degree course with appended honours:
   (i) the honours grade awarded; and
   (ii) the subject area(s) of each honours course completed by the graduate;
(c) for an Undergraduate Diploma awarded with merit, distinction, high distinction or honours, that the Diploma is so conferred.
92A Aegrotat and posthumous awards

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) may, on the recommendation of the relevant Dean, authorise the conferral of an aegrotat or posthumous award in circumstances involving serious illness or the death of a student.

PART 19 AWARDS WITH HONOURS

93 Admission to an award course with honours

(1) On the recommendation of the relevant Head of Department, School or Program Director, an Associate Dean may admit a student to an appended honours course, if the student has:

(a) met the requirements for a pass degree in the course;

(b) achieved a weighted average of at least 65, calculated from at least 48 credit points of undergraduate study (excluding any 1000-level units if the course is available on a full-time basis to high school graduates); and

(c) met any additional requirements set by the faculty resolutions or award course resolutions for admission to honours in the course.

(2) On the recommendation of the relevant Head of Department, School or Program Director, an Associate Dean may admit a student to an integrated honours course:

(a) if the student has:

(i) met the requirements for a pass degree in the course;

(ii) achieved a weighted average of at least 65, calculated from at least 48 credit points of undergraduate units of study (excluding any 1000-level units if the course is available on a full-time basis to high school graduates); and

(iii) met any additional requirements set out by the faculty resolutions or award course resolutions; or

(b) from the commencement of the award course if:

(i) the Academic Board has approved the award course as one that meets the learning outcomes of an AQF Level 8 honours qualification; and

(ii) the award course resolutions incorporate explicit requirements for completion of the award course that are consistent with the awarding of honours as prescribed in this Policy.

(3) On the recommendation of the relevant Heads of Departments, Schools or Program Directors of faculties that offer and administer the proposed honours courses, an Associate Dean may admit a student to honours or double honours in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies if the student has:

(a) completed:

(i) 144 credit points in the combined degree program;

(ii) a Liberal Studies undergraduate degree program at the University; or
(iii) a program of study deemed by the relevant Heads of Departments, Schools or Program Directors to be the equivalent of such study;

(b) achieved a weighted average mark of at least 65, as specified in the award course resolutions, in the first three years (144 credit points) of the combined degree;

(c) completed:
   (i) requirements for a major in the intended area of honours specialisations; or
   (ii) study of equivalent depth in the intended area as set out in the award course resolutions; and

(d) met any additional requirements for admission to the honours courses set by the faculty or school and approved by the Academic Board.

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

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

94 Principles for the award of honours

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

(a) the award of honours is reserved to indicate special proficiency;

(b) the University offers courses leading to a degree with honours to provide research training opportunities to students who demonstrate special proficiency and the ability to undertake further study and research within a discipline;

(c) a course leading to a degree with honours is intended to attract and stimulate students of high ability;

(d) honours awards are in classes, to recognise and reward outstanding academic ability;

(e) an honours course:
   (i) will provide the foundations of research training within the relevant discipline; and
   (ii) will have an identifiable, discipline-specific individual research, scholarly or creative component that is allocated at least 12 credit points; and

(f) the assessment tasks for research units of study will comprise, at least in part, a dissertation.
95 Qualifying for an award with honours

(1) To qualify for an award with honours, a student must meet the requirements set out in the faculty resolutions and award course resolutions.

(2) The award of a degree with honours, and the grade of honours awarded, will be assessed and calculated according to two mechanisms:
   (a) for appended honours and for honours taken as an embedded component in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies - by an honours mark; or
   (b) for integrated honours - by a grade average calculated across at least 48 credit points of study.

(3) Each faculty will publish the grading systems and criteria for the award of honours in that faculty.

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

(1) This clause applies to:
   (a) an appended honours course; and
   (b) an integrated honours course where, under the award course resolutions, the conferral of the degree with honours, and the class of honours, is determined using a mark calculated across units of study attracting at least 48 credit points but less than 96 credit points.

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>A student who achieves an honours mark in the range …</th>
<th>will be awarded honours …</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>75 ≤ honours mark ≤ 100</td>
<td>First Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>70 ≤ honours mark &lt; 75</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>65 ≤ honours mark &lt; 70</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50 ≤ honours mark &lt; 65</td>
<td>Third Class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(4) A student who achieves a mark of less than 65 may be awarded Third Class honours where this has been specified as available under the course resolutions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(5) The requirements for double honours in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies will be the completion of:

(a) 36-48 credit points as set out in subclause 97A(3); and

(b) the requirements for the combined degree as set out in the award course resolutions.

(6) The honours mark will be:

(a) calculated according to a method specified in the faculty or school resolutions of the faculty or school offering the honours course; and

(b) based on results from 36-48 credit points of work as specified in subclause 97A(3).
(7) A student who achieves an honours mark within a range set out in the following table is to be awarded honours in the class set out in the table for that range.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PART 20 UNIVERSITY MEDALS

98 Qualifying for a University Medal

A student who has qualified for a Bachelor degree with honours with an outstanding academic record throughout the award course may be eligible for the award of a University Medal.
99 Awarding University Medals

(1) Faculties may signal outstanding achievement in a Bachelor degree course with honours by awarding a University Medal to one or more students.

(2) Faculties will discuss and determine the normal minimum levels of academic performance required for the award of a University Medal, using broadly comparable University-wide criteria approved by the Academic Board.

(3) Honours students entering the University with advanced standing will be assessed for University Medals in the same way as students undertaking their entire award course within the University.

(4) In the case of students who have completed the requirements for honours as an embedded component in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies:

(a) the faculty offering the embedded honours component may recommend to the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies that a University Medal be awarded to a student, after considering the student's honours mark and academic record for the entire combined award;

(b) the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies will consider all University Medal recommendations for students in a combined award with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies and make recommendations to the relevant administering faculties for candidates for the combined award; and

(c) the administering faculties for candidates for the combined award will award the University Medal according to the recommendation of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.

PART 21 TERMINATION OF CANDIDATURE

100 Failure to complete within time limits

The candidature of a student who has not completed the course requirements for an award course within the period prescribed under clause 4.2 of the Coursework Rule, is by force of this clause, automatically terminated at the end of that period.

Note: The candidature of a student who discontinues his or her enrolment in a course during his or her first year of enrolment in the course, without prior permission from the Associate Dean to re-enrol, is automatically terminated in accordance with subclause 56(3) of this Policy.

Note: The candidature of a student who does not enrol for any unit of study for two consecutive semesters is automatically terminated in accordance with subclause 58(3) of this Policy.

101 Termination of candidature where disqualifying circumstances exist

(1) Subject to this clause, the Registrar may terminate the candidature of a student if one or more of the following disqualifying circumstances exist:
(a) the student, or someone acting on the student’s behalf, made a material misrepresentation in applying for admission to an award course;

(b) the student failed to disclose to the University a fact or circumstance material to its decision to admit the person to an award course; or

(c) the student was admitted to an award course on the basis of a degree, diploma or certificate obtained wholly or partly by fraud, academic misconduct or other dishonesty.

(2) Before terminating the candidature of a student in accordance with this clause, the Registrar must give the student written notice of the proposed termination of candidature.

(3) The notice must:

(a) set out the basis on which it is proposed that the student’s candidature be terminated;

(b) inform the student that he or she may make written submissions to the Registrar on the proposed termination of candidature, and by when to make such submissions;

(c) inform the student that the Registrar will determine, after considering any submissions from the student, whether to terminate the student’s candidature.

(4) The period for making submissions under subclause (3) must be at least 20 working days.

(5) The Registrar will:

(a) consider the student’s submissions within 10 working days of receiving them; and

(b) take all reasonable measures to finalise the process as soon as practicable.

(6) If the Registrar is satisfied, after considering any submissions made by the student, that:

(a) the disqualifying circumstances specified in the notice exist; and

(b) because of those disqualifying circumstances the student’s candidature in the award course should be terminated;

the Registrar will terminate the student’s candidature in the award course.

(7) The Registrar will notify the student of the decision in writing, including reasons, as soon as possible after it is made.

(8) If the Registrar terminates the candidature of a student in accordance with this clause:

(a) any liability of the student to pay fees or charges to the University is not affected in relation to the course; and

(b) the student is not entitled to a refund, repayment or set off of any fee or other amount paid in relation to the course; and

(c) the student will not be eligible for admission to any course at the University for a period of three years from the date of termination of candidature.
Note: A decision made by the Registrar in accordance with this clause is not an 'academic decision' and cannot be appealed to the Student Appeals Body in accordance with the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

102 Rescissions, replacements and transitional arrangements

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

(a) Admission: Advanced Standing, Credit and Exemption Policy, which commenced on 15 April 1998;
(b) Admission to Undergraduate Courses Policy, which commenced on 16 October 2002;
(c) Assessment Policy 2011, which commenced on 9 November 2011;
(d) Academic Board Policy on Awards with Honours, which commenced on 13 August 2003;
(e) Postgraduate English Language Requirements Policy, which commenced on 24 August 2011; and
(f) Student Academic Progression Policy, which commenced on 13 December 2006.

(2) A reference in any course resolution, faculty resolution or policy to any document rescinded by this policy should be construed as a reference to this policy.

(3) Clauses 83A, 83B and 83C apply to

(a) all new courses approved after 25 July 2016; and
(b) all other courses from 1 January 2018.
SCHEDULE 1

Common Result Grades

(1) The Academic Board has adopted a set of grades that are common to all undergraduate and postgraduate courses that award merit grades for coursework, as set out in the following table.

(2) Learning outcomes for units of study are reported in one of two ways:
   (a) by grade and mark: the mark and grade must correspond as indicated in the Schedule below;
   (b) by grade only: the grade should be either Satisfied Requirements (SR) or Failed Requirements (FR).

(3) Learning outcomes for a unit of study must be reported in the same way for all students enrolled in the unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mark Range</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Use in WAM</th>
<th>Impact on Progression/ at risk status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>Range from 0 to 49</td>
<td>To be awarded to students who fail to demonstrate the learning outcomes for the unit at an acceptable standard through failure to submit or attend compulsory assessment tasks or to attend classes to the required level. In cases where a student receives some marks but fails the unit through failure to attend or submit a compulsory task, the mark entered shall be the marks awarded by the faculty up to a maximum of 49. This grade should not be used in cases where a student attempts all assessment tasks but fails to achieve a mandated minimum standard in one or more task. In such cases a Fail (FA) grade and a mark less than 50 should be awarded.</td>
<td>Included in WAM</td>
<td>To Count as Fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Credit (Aegrotat)</td>
<td>Range from 65 to less than 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
<td>No mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>Range from 65 to less than 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Distinction (Aegrotat)</td>
<td>Range from 75 to less than 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>Discontinue - fail</td>
<td>No mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>Range from 75 to less than 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Discontinued not to count as failure</td>
<td>No mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Range from 0 to less than 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FR*</td>
<td>Failed Requirements</td>
<td>No mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>HA</td>
<td>High Distinction (Aegrotat)</td>
<td>Range from 85 to 100 inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>HD</td>
<td>High distinction</td>
<td>Range from 85 to 100 inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>No mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Pass (Aegrotat)</td>
<td>Range from 50 to less than 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Range from 50 to less than 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SA*</td>
<td>Satisfied Requirements (Aegrotat)</td>
<td>No mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Result incomplete</td>
<td>No mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SR*</td>
<td>Satisfied requirements</td>
<td>No mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Unit of Study Continuing</td>
<td>No mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>No mark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHEDULE 2

1 Grade Descriptors for Honours awards

These descriptors are intended to apply to all Honours awards at the University of Sydney. They have been designed to foster collective thinking about standards between disciplines, to assist students, supervisors, staff and disciplinary groups to calibrate their own internal, professional or disciplinary standards with those applied across the University and to promote discussion about standards among students, staff, supervisors and faculties.

2 The University medal

(1) University medal candidates will have produced an outstanding research thesis that has been awarded a Class 1 Honours. Additionally, candidates will have demonstrated an exceptional level of achievement across the whole degree program.

(2) Knowledge: A student who receives First Class Honours and the University Medal will demonstrate command breadth and depth of knowledge of the discipline studied, together with a strong understanding of its context and insight into problem solving and into the potential for further inquiry.

(3) Skills: A student who receives First Class Honours and the University Medal will demonstrate:

(a) advanced skills that equip him or her to function and solve advanced problems within a profession or discipline under supervision and with autonomy and insight;

(b) a thorough proficiency in the methods, techniques and subject matter appropriate to the field or fields studied and insight into their application;

(c) strong skills and insight in the interpretation of results, data and appropriate information sources;

(d) a capacity for illuminating critical analysis and self-evaluation;

(e) outstanding skills in written and oral communication and in organisation and documentation;

(f) exceptionally innovative, creative and imaginative thinking; and

(g) cognitive and technical skills to carry out a research project with a high level of autonomy.

(4) Application of Knowledge and Skills: A student who receives First Class Honours and the University Medal will demonstrate the application of knowledge and skills by demonstrating the following characteristics:

(a) competently defending, where appropriate, his or her research within the chosen academic discipline at an expert level;

(b) autonomy in thinking and motivation;

(c) imagination, originality and insight;
(d) comprehensive and extensive critical analysis and synthesis at an advanced level;
(e) insightful analysis of results and the potential and limitations of their study;
(f) a high degree of intellectual consistency; and
(g) coherent and rigorous design and meticulous execution of projects.

(5) Graduates at this level will demonstrate the capacity to pursue further study, and show the capacity for independent research at doctoral level.

3 First Class Honours

(1) Knowledge: A student who receives First Class Honours will demonstrate breadth and/or depth of knowledge of the discipline(s) studied at a very high level, and the ability to place their work in context, appreciating the implications and broader significance.

(2) Skills: A student who receives First Class Honours will demonstrate:
   (a) advanced or professional skills that equip him or her to function and solve advanced problems within a profession or discipline under supervision and with autonomy;
   (b) a very high level of proficiency in the methods, techniques and subject matter appropriate to the field or fields studied;
   (c) a very high level of skill in the interpretation of results, data and appropriate information sources;
   (d) a high degree of sophistication in critical analysis and self-evaluation;
   (e) outstanding written and oral expression, organisation, format and documentation;
   (f) where relevant, highly innovative, creative and imaginative thinking; and
   (g) a very high level of cognitive and technical skills to carry out a research project with considerable independence.

(3) Application of knowledge and skills: A student who receives First Class Honours will demonstrate the application of knowledge and skills by demonstrating the following characteristics:
   (a) significant independence in thinking and motivation;
   (b) significant evidence of originality and insight;
   (c) comprehensive critical analysis and synthesis at an advanced level;
   (d) a skilful treatment and analysis of unexpected outcomes or inconsistent results, and/or recognition of some limitation of the methodology, if relevant; and
   (e) a well-developed logical approach to designing appropriate research strategies.

(4) Graduates at this level will demonstrate the capacity to pursue further study, and show the capacity for independent research at doctoral level.
4 Second Class Honours, Division I

(1) Knowledge: A student who receives Second Class Honours, Division I, will have advanced knowledge in the discipline of study and sound knowledge of the research principles and methodologies appropriate to the field of study.

(2) Skills: A student who receives Second Class Honours, Division I, will demonstrate:
(a) advanced or professional skills that equip him or her to function and solve problems within a profession or discipline under supervision and with independence;
(b) a high level of proficiency in the methods, techniques and subject matter of the field studied;
(c) a high level of cognitive skills to interpret results, data and other information sources;
(d) mastery of the modes of expression appropriate to the field of study, enabling fluent and succinct presentation of knowledge; and
(e) technical skills to plan a solid research project under supervision and execute it with some independence.

(3) Application of knowledge and skills: A student who receives Second Class Honours, Division I, will demonstrate the application of knowledge and skills by demonstrating the following characteristics:
(a) design and plan a solid piece of research and scholarship;
(b) critically evaluate and synthesise material; and
(c) contextualize his or her work within the broader discipline of study.

(4) Graduates at this level will demonstrate the capacity to pursue further study, and pursue independent research at postgraduate level.

5 Second Class Honours, Division II

(1) Knowledge: A student who receives Second Class Honours, Division II will have advanced knowledge of an area of, or a problem in, a discipline in sufficient depth to understand the range of scope of a defined topic, have a broad grasp of its theoretical underpinnings and understand the general range of principal issues facing that area of the discipline.

(2) Skills: A student who receives Second Class Honours, Division II will demonstrate:
(a) advanced or professional skills that equip him or her to understand problems within a profession or discipline under supervision and with some independence;
(b) a broad understanding of the methods, techniques and subject matter of the field studied and some proficiency;
(c) advanced cognitive skills to understand the interpretation of results and data and the ability to apply this understanding with supervision;
(d) effective skills in the modes of expression appropriate to the field of study; and
(e) technical skills to contribute to the planning of a research project and to execute it with direct supervision.

(3) Application of knowledge and skills: A student who receives Second Class Honours, Division II, will demonstrate the application of knowledge and skills by demonstrating the following characteristics:

(a) understand and be able to apply methodologies relevant to complex problems in their area of investigation under supervision and have demonstrated some independence of thought and autonomy; and

(b) with the guidance of a supervisor, draw valid conclusions based on investigation, observation and/or experiment, and understand the scope and limitations of those conclusions.

(4) Graduates at this level will demonstrate the capacity to pursue further study and after further research training, demonstrate the potential for independent research.

6 Third Class Honours

(1) Knowledge: A student who receives Third Class Honours will have advanced knowledge of an area of a discipline and understand relevant theory.

(2) Skills: A student who receives Third Class Honours will have

(a) skills that equip him or her to understand problems;

(b) some understanding of the methods, techniques and subject matter of the field studied;

(c) cognitive skills to understand the interpretation of results and data with supervision;

(d) communication skills that are able to articulate a problem and an approach taken to its solution; and

(e) technical skills to participate in the planning and execution of a research project with direct supervision.

(3) Application of knowledge and skills: A student who receives Third Class Honours will demonstrate the application of knowledge and skills by demonstrating the following characteristics:

(a) understand and be able to apply methodologies relevant to complex problems in their area of investigation under supervision.

(b) with the guidance of a supervisor, graduates will be able to understand and draw conclusions based on investigation, observation and/or experiment.

(4) Graduates at this level, after undertaking further research training, will demonstrate the capacity to pursue further supervised study.

7 Fail

(1) A fail to achieve Honours indicates that the student has not demonstrated the learning outcomes for any of the classes of Honours available.

(2) Students who do not achieve Honours may be awarded a pass degree provided that they have demonstrated the learning outcomes for the degree.
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RECOMMENDATION

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

(1) endorse the amendment of the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended), as presented; and

(2) recommend that Senate approve the amendment of the Rule, with effect from 1 January 2018.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The proposed amendment of University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended), as attached, includes changes from the following areas:

- clarification in the entity that handles formal appeals regarding matters concerning applications for credit. The current rule contains ambiguities which these changes remove.

- Organisation design changes throughout the university have altered entities handling appeals. The Corrections have been made to make the Rule reflect the new Academic Delegations and organisational design (eg adding in references to University schools).
University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended)

Approved on: 6 November 2006
Amended on: 6 December 2010
3 August 2015 (administrative amendments only)
25 August 2015 (administrative amendments only)
14 December 2015
20 July 2016 (administrative amendments only)

Amendment effective from: 10 December 2010
1 January 2016
20 July 2016

Part 1: Preliminary

1.1 Citation
This Rule is made by the Senate of the University, pursuant to section 37(1) of the University of Sydney Act 1989 and section 5(1) of the University of Sydney By-law 1999 (as amended).

1.2 Commencement
This Rule will commence on 28 November 2006.

1.3 Purpose
The purpose of this Rule is to ensure that students are treated fairly in relation to the assessment of their work and progress within their Award Course, by providing an internal appeal mechanism that reflects the University’s commitment to fair academic decision making.

1.4 Effect
This Rule repeals and replaces:

1.4.1 clause 18 of the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2000 (as amended);
1.4.2 the Resolutions of the Senate relating to Student Appeals against Academic Decisions; and
1.4.3 the Resolutions of the Academic Board on Student Appeals against Academic Decisions.
1.5 Associated documents
This Rule should be read in conjunction with the *Coursework Policy 2014* and *Assessment Procedures 2011*.

1.6 Definitions
In this Rule:

1.6.1 **Academic Decision** means a decision by the University that affects the academic assessment or progress of a person within his or her Award Course, including a decision:

1.6.1.1 to exclude a Student in accordance with the *Coursework Policy 2014*;
1.6.1.2 not to readmit or re-enrol a person following exclusion in accordance with the *Coursework Policy 2014*;
1.6.1.3 to terminate a Student’s candidature for a postgraduate award.

1.6.1B **Academic Panel** means the panel of academics appointed by the Registrar in accordance with clause 3.2B.2.

1.6.2 **Appeal Hearing** means an Appeal Hearing under Part 8.

1.6.3 **Appellant** means:

1.6.3.1 a person enrolled in an Award Course at the time of, or in the semester immediately preceding, the lodgement of his or her appeal; or
1.6.3.2 in the case of an Academic Decision by the University regarding an application for readmission or re-enrolment, a person who was excluded in accordance with the *Coursework Policy 2014*, prior to the lodgement of his or her appeal.

1.6.3B **Assessment Principles** means the principles for assessment set out in the *Coursework Policy 2014*.

1.6.4 **Award Course** means a formally approved program of study that can lead to an academic award granted by the University or by any other higher education institution that offers credit for units of study undertaken at the University.

1.6.4B **Credit** means advanced standing awarded to a Student in accordance with the *Coursework Policy 2014*.

1.6.5 **Dean** means the dean of the relevant Faculty, or the Head of School and Dean of the relevant University school.

1.6.6 **Due Academic Process** means the making of Academic Decisions according to published University, Academic Board and Faculty rules, policy, procedure and local provisions, as amended from time to time and as current at the time the Academic Decision was made.

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

1.6.8 **Registrar** means the Registrar of the University of Sydney for the time being, or his or her nominee.

1.6.8B **Special Arrangements** means special arrangements made available to Students for assessments in accordance with the *Coursework Policy 2014*. 

1.6.9 **Special Consideration** means special consideration given to Students in accordance with the [Coursework Policy 2014](#).

1.6.10 **Student** means a person who is currently admitted to candidature in an Award Course.

1.6.11 **Student Appeals Body** means a Student Appeals Body constituted by the Registrar in accordance with Part 7.

1.6.12 **Student Appeals Panel** means the Student Appeals Panel constituted by the Senate in accordance with Part 6.

1.6.13 **University** means the University of Sydney established by the *University of Sydney Act 1989* (as amended).

1.6.14 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.

1.6.15 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.

1.6.16 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/School.

1.6.17 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.

1.6.18 A note, marginal note, footnote or endnote is not a provision of this Rule.

1.6.19 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.

1.6.20 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.

### Part 2: Principles

2.1 The University is committed to fair academic decision-making.

2.2 Academic Decisions are entrusted to members of the academic staff acting reasonably in accordance with Due Academic Process.

2.3 A Student who believes that there are genuine grounds for contesting an Academic Decision may apply to have the decision reviewed.

2.4 Students and staff should endeavour to resolve concerns about Academic Decisions in the manner more fully described in clause 3.1 and 3.1A of this Rule, by way of personal communication.

2.5 Where attempts to resolve a concern about an Academic Decision under clause 3.1 or 3.1A of this Rule are unsuccessful, Students may appeal to the relevant Faculty or administrative unit (for consideration by an Academic Panel member), as appropriate, in the first instance.
2.6 Students who are not satisfied with the decision of the Faculty or Academic Panel member may appeal to the Student Appeals Body in accordance with this Rule.

2.7 The University will handle all Student concerns and appeals regarding Academic Decisions in a procedurally fair and reasonable manner, having regard to the principles of timeliness, confidentiality, absence of bias and freedom from victimisation.

2.8 Students may not appeal against Academic Decisions which are otherwise consistent with the principles in Part 2 of this Rule:
   (a) on the grounds that they believe that the Academic Decision was made in a manner that was inconsistent with the Assessment Principles; or
   (b) that are made in the absolute discretion of the decision maker.

   Note: Appeals to the Student Appeals Body can only be made on the grounds of a failure of Due Academic Process. See Part 5.

Part 3: Procedures for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Coursework Students

3.1 Resolution with Teacher or Unit of Study Coordinator
   3.1.1 Subject to clause 3.1A, an undergraduate or postgraduate coursework Student who believes that there are genuine grounds for contesting an Academic Decision should first discuss his or her concerns with the relevant teacher or unit of study co-ordinator.
   3.1.2 Students are encouraged to take the earliest opportunity to discuss their concerns with relevant Faculty staff. This must occur within:
      (a) 15 working days of the Student being advised of the Academic Decision;
      (b) in the case of Academic Decisions relating to completion of a unit of study, within 15 working days of the unit of study result being posted by the University; or
      (c) such other extended time as the Dean may reasonably authorise.
   3.1.3 The teacher or unit of study co-ordinator will address the Student’s concerns promptly, and provide to the Student a full explanation of the reasons for the Academic Decision.
   3.1.4 If the Student’s concerns are not resolved by these means, the teacher or unit of study co-ordinator will:
      (a) explain the next step in the procedure, which is set out at clause 3.2 below; and
      (b) give the Student a copy of this Rule or advise the Student how to access this Rule online.

3.1A Resolution with relevant administrative unit
   3.1A.1 If a Student’s concerns relate to an Academic Decision solely concerning Special Consideration, Special Arrangements or Credit, the Student should first raise those concerns with the relevant administrative unit, as specified by the Registrar.
   3.1A.2 Students must raise their concerns in writing with the relevant administrative unit within 15 working days of the Student being sent written notification of the Academic Decision.
3.1A.3 A representative of the relevant administrative unit will address the Student's concerns promptly, and provide a full explanation in writing of the reasons for the Academic Decision.

3.1A.4 If the Student's concerns are not resolved by these means, a representative of the relevant administrative unit will:

(a) explain the next step in the procedure, which is set out at clause 3.2A below; and

(b) give the Student a copy of this Rule or advise the Student how to access this Rule online.

3.2 Appeals to the Faculty

3.2.1 If the Student’s concerns cannot be resolved under clause 3.1 above, and relate to an Academic Decision that does not solely concern Special Consideration, or Special Arrangements or Credit, the Student may appeal in writing to the Faculty.

3.2.2 The Student must submit his or her written appeal, including any supporting documentation:

(a) for appeals relating to Credit, to the relevant administrative unit, as specified by the Registrar;

(b) for appeals not relating to Credit, to the office or staff member nominated by the Dean to receive Student appeals (such information to be provided to Students at the start of each Semester);

(c) within 20 working days of the date on which he or she was advised of the outcome of discussions under clause 3.1, or such other extended time as the Dean may reasonably authorise, in his or her absolute discretion.

3.2.3 The Faculty or administrative unit must acknowledge receipt of the appeal in writing within three working days of receipt.

3.2.4 The Dean will determine who is to undertake an initial review of the appeal.

3.2.5 This person will normally be the course co-ordinator, Head of Department or School, or relevant Associate Dean.

3.2.6 The person responsible for the initial review must prepare a report for consideration by the Dean, or by his or her nominee. Subject to sub-clause 3.2.7 below the Dean retains final responsibility for any decision regarding a Student appeal to the Faculty.

3.2.7 If the Dean is the relevant teacher or unit of study coordinator referred to in clause 3.1 above, or if the Dean otherwise has an actual, potential or perceived conflict of interests, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) must handle the Student’s appeal to the Faculty, in accordance with this clause 3.2.

3.2.8 The Faculty must make all reasonable efforts to:

(a) advise the Student in writing of the Dean’s decision and the reasons for the decision;

(b) advise the Student of his or her right to appeal to the Student Appeals Body; and

(c) give the Student a copy of this Rule or advise the Student how to access this Rule online;

within 10 working days of receiving a Student’s appeal.

3.2A Appeals to the Academic Panel
3.2A.1 If the Student’s concerns cannot be resolved under clause 3.1A above, and relate to an Academic Decision that solely concerns Special Consideration, or Special Arrangements or Credit, the Student may appeal in writing to the Academic Panel.

3.2A.2 The Student must submit his or her appeal, including any supporting documentation:
   (a) to the administrative unit nominated by the Registrar to receive appeals;
   (b) within 20 working days of the date on which he or she was advised of the outcome of discussions under clause 3.1A, or within such reasonable extended time as the Registrar approves, in his or her absolute discretion.

3.2A.3 The administrative unit must acknowledge receipt of the appeal in writing within three working days of receipt.

3.2A.4 A member of the Academic Panel must undertake a review of the appeal, and make a decision.

3.2A.5 The Registrar will maintain a list of Academic Panel members in the order of their appointment to the panel. Appeals must be allocated to the next available panel member on the list who can determine the appeal within the period specified in clause 3.2A.6, subject to the need to avoid conflicts of interests.

3.2A.6 The Academic Panel member must make all reasonable efforts to:
   (a) advise the Student in writing of his or her decision and the reasons for the decision;
   (b) advise the Student of his or her right to appeal to the Student Appeals Body; and
   (c) give the Student a copy of this Rule or advise the Student how to access this Rule online; within 10 working days of receiving a Student’s appeal.

3.2A.7 The Registrar will report annually to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee on:
   (a) the number of Academic Panel appeals; and
   (b) Academic Panel decisions

3.2B Academic Panel

3.2B.1 The Academic Panel will comprise academics employed by the University at Level C or above.

3.2B.2 Nominations will be sought from each Faculty biennially.

3.2B.3 Appointments to the Academic Panel will be made by the Registrar on the nomination of, or in consultation with, the relevant Dean.
3.2B.4 The names of Academic Panel members will be forwarded to the Academic Board for noting at the end of the nomination process.

Part 4: Procedures for Postgraduate Research Award Students

4.1 Subject to clause 4.2 below, a postgraduate research Student should follow the procedures for undergraduate and postgraduate coursework Students set out in Part 3 above.

4.2 A postgraduate research Student who believes that Due Academic Process has not been observed by the relevant Faculty in relation to an Academic Decision associated with:
   (a) termination of candidature; or
   (b) the examination of a thesis;

is not required to follow the procedures set out in Part 3 above, and may lodge a written appeal to the Student Appeals Body in the first instance.

Part 5: Appeals to the Student Appeals Body

5.1 An Appellant may appeal to the Student Appeals Body against an Academic Decision on the ground that Due Academic Process has not been observed by the relevant Faculty or the Academic Panel member in relation to the Academic Decision.

5.2 An Appellant must lodge his or her written appeal with the Registrar (on behalf of the Student Appeals Body) in accordance with sub-clause 5.3.2, within 15 working days of the date of the written decision of the Dean of the relevant Faculty (or the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) pursuant to sub-clause 3.2.6) or the Academic Panel member regarding the Academic Decision, or within such extended time as the Registrar, in his or her absolute discretion, authorises.

5.3 An appeal will not be heard by the Student Appeals Body unless:
   5.3.1 the basis for the appeal has previously been considered by the relevant Faculty or the Academic Panel (except in the case of Postgraduate Research Award Students as set out in section 4);
   5.3.2 the Appellant has set out in the written appeal his or her reasons, including any written evidence and written submissions, for believing that Due Academic Process has not been observed by the Faculty or the Academic Panel member in relation to the Academic Decision; and
   5.3.3 the Registrar has confirmed that the requirements under sub-clause 5.3.1 and 5.3.2 above have been satisfied; or
   5.3.4 the Registrar decides, in his or her absolute discretion and due to exceptional circumstances, to waive one or more of the requirements in sub-clause 5.3.1 or 5.3.2.

5.4 If the Academic Decision is to exclude a student in accordance with the Coursework Policy 2014 or, in the case of a student enrolled in a postgraduate research award, to terminate his or her candidature, the relevant faculty will not enforce the exclusion or termination until the appeal period specified in clause 5.2 has expired, or, where an appeal is lodged, until such time as the appeal has been determined.

5.5 A person who has lodged an appeal against a decision not to readmit or re-enrol him or her following a period of exclusion may not re-enrol pending determination of the appeal, unless the Registrar, in his or her absolute discretion, is satisfied that it is reasonable in the circumstances to permit re-enrolment.
Part 6: Student Appeals Panel

6.1 The Student Appeals Panel will comprise no fewer than 12 and no more than 48 persons appointed by Senate as members of the Student Appeals Panel on the recommendation of the Registrar.

6.2 At least one half of all members of the Student Appeals Panel will be a combination of members of the academic staff and Students of the University.

6.3 At least six members of the Student Appeals Panel will be undergraduate or postgraduate Students of the University, and at least six members of the Student Appeals Panel will be members of the Academic staff of the University.

6.4 The Registrar will consult with the Presidents of the Students’ Representative Council and the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association, on behalf of the Senate, regarding Student appointments to the Student Appeals Panel, without prejudice to the Registrar retaining the ultimate discretion as to whom to recommend.

6.5 The Senate will not appoint a Senate Fellow (other than the Chair of the Academic Board) as a member of the Student Appeals Panel, and the Chair of the Academic Board is appointed in that capacity and not as a Fellow of Senate.

Part 7: Student Appeals Body

7.1 A Student Appeals Body will comprise three members of the Student Appeals Panel, including a Chairperson, selected by the Registrar to sit on the Student Appeals Body, such Student Appeals Body not being a committee of Senate.

7.2 The Chairperson of the Student Appeals Body will normally be, but is not required to be, the Chair of the Academic Board, who may in a particular case nominate a substitute from the Student Appeals Panel advising the Registrar accordingly.

7.3 The Student Appeals Body will normally include, but is not required to include:

7.3.1 a member with academic qualifications (who may but need not be a member of the academic staff of the University); and

7.3.2 a student (who may but need not be a Student of the University).

7.4 The Registrar will not select a member of the Student Appeals Panel to sit on a Student Appeals Body responsible for hearing an appeal arising from a Faculty in which the member is an enrolled student or staff member, or with which the member has had other substantial involvement (including as a member of the Academic Panel).

7.5 The Registrar will report annually to the Senate on:

7.5.1 Student Appeals Body decisions; and

7.5.2 the number of appeal hearings for which the membership of the Student Appeals Body did not include a Student of the University, as a proportion of the total number of appeal hearings.

Part 8: Appeal Hearings

8.1 The Appellant will receive at least 10 business days’ notice of the date of an Appeal Hearing.

8.2.1 The relevant Faculty or the Academic Panel member must provide written evidence and written submissions to the Registrar (on behalf of the Student Appeals Body), at
least eight business days before the Appeal Hearing.

8.2.2 The submissions of the Faculty or Academic Panel member must describe the process by which the Academic Decision was made, and set out why the Faculty or Academic Panel member believes that Due Academic Process has been observed in the making of the Academic Decision.

8.2.3 The Registrar (on behalf of the Student Appeals Body) will provide copies of written evidence and written submissions made by the Faculty or Academic Panel member to the Appellant at least five business days before the Appeal Hearing.

8.3.1 The Appellant will be invited to appear in person at an Appeal Hearing.

8.3.2 The Appellant may be accompanied by a representative, who may speak on the Appellant’s behalf.

8.4 A representative of the relevant Faculty or the Academic Panel member will be invited to appear in person at an Appeal Hearing.

8.5 The Chairperson of the Student Appeals Body may invite independent officers of the University to attend an Appeal Hearing, for the sole purpose of providing expert advice that assists the Student Appeals Body in determining the appeal. An Appellant’s treating practitioner or case worker is not an independent officer of the University for the purpose of this clause.

8.6 Members of the Student Appeals Body may address questions to the Appellant, the Appellant’s representative, the Faculty representative, the Academic Panel member or any independent officer of the University invited to attend the Appeal Hearing in accordance with clause 8.5 above.

8.7 The purpose of an Appeal Hearing is for the Appellant and the Faculty or Academic Panel member to address any questions posed by the Student Appeals Body, but not to give further oral evidence or oral submissions unless the Student Appeals Body, in its absolute discretion, allows such further oral evidence or oral submissions.

8.8 If, due notice having been given, the Appellant or his or her representative does not attend an Appeal Hearing, the Student Appeals Body may, in its absolute discretion:

8.8.1 defer consideration of the appeal; or

8.8.2 hear and determine the appeal in the Appellant’s or representative’s absence.

8.9 A Student Appeals Body may uphold or dismiss an appeal and, in its absolute discretion:

8.9.1 refer the Academic Decision back to the relevant Faculty or the Academic Panel for reconsideration in accordance with Due Academic Process;

8.9.2 make a new or amended Academic Decision; or

8.9.3 determine that no further action should be taken in relation to the matter.

8.10 A decision of a Student Appeals Body is final.

8.11 The Appellant will be advised as soon as practicable of the Student Appeals Body’s decision and the reasons for it.

8.12 Where a decision of a Student Appeals Body reveals a systemic or other serious failure by the Faculty or the Academic Panel to observe Due Academic Process, the Chair of the Student Appeals Body will send a copy of the decision to the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor for consideration and action.

Part 9: Further provisions
9.1 Rescinded.
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The purpose of the proposal is to update the resolutions of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend its Faculty Resolutions; and
(2) approve the amendment of Faculty Resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The resolutions of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences have been updated for 2018. The amendments were necessary due to the amalgamation of Sydney School of Education and Social Work and Sydney College of the Arts, as well as the introduction of the new undergraduate curriculum.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Minor course amendment form
Attachment 2: Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Faculty Resolution amendment
1. Name of award course
Resolutions of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

2. Purpose of proposal
To update the resolutions of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences for 2018.

3. Details of amendment

Resolutions of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences 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 ‘Coursework Policy’), the resolutions for the course of enrolment, the University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended) and the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015.

Part 1: Course enrolment
1. Admission
   (1) General
   Admission to one or more courses, including undergraduate diplomas, concurrently with any other award course, requires the permission of all Deans concerned.

   (2) Sciences Po dual degree pathway
   Admission to this pathway is on the basis of a secondary school leaving qualification such as the NSW Higher School Certificate (including national and international equivalents). Details of admission policies are found in the Coursework Policy. In addition, admission to this pathway requires the applicant to submit a statement of motivation and attend an interview. The results of this process will form part of the ranking of applicants, and offers for available places are issued according to this ranking.

2. Enrolment restrictions
   (1) General
   (a) The Coursework Policy specifies the maximum number of credit points that a student may take in each semester. The Faculty does not encourage any student to take more than the normal full-time load required to complete their course in the standard time (usually 24 credit points per semester). The Faculty sets minimum and maximum limits for undergraduate students in their first year of study (below).

   (b) Units of study in excess of a student's award course requirements will be taken on a full-fee, non-award basis, unless approved otherwise by the Associate Dean.

   (c) A student may not enrol in a unit of study based on a language other than English if, in the opinion of the chair of department concerned on the advice of the teacher of the unit, the student's linguistic knowledge or competence would unfairly advantage them over other students enrolled in the unit of study. If enrolment has already taken place, the Associate Dean may direct that the student be withdrawn without penalty from the unit of study.

   (2) Undergraduate
   (a) An undergraduate student must enrol in a minimum of 12 junior credit points in semester one and two in the first year of candidature.

   (b) An undergraduate student must enrol in units of study with a total value of more than 24 junior credit points in semester one or two in the first year of candidature (students who are granted credit or advanced standing may be permitted to enrol in senior units).

   (c) The maximum number of credit points that may be counted towards a degree from any single subject area in Table A of the Tables of units of study is 18 junior and/or 60 senior, with the exception of the Bachelor of Economics where the individual course resolution applies.

   (d) The maximum number of credit points that may be counted towards a degree from any single subject area in Table B of the Tables of units of study is 12 junior and/or 48 senior.

3. Time limits
   The Coursework Rule specifies the maximum time limits for completion of candidature.
4 Suspension, discontinuation and lapse of candidature
The Coursework Policy specifies the conditions for suspending or discontinuing candidature, and return to candidature after these events. It also defines the circumstances when candidature is deemed to have lapsed. Students should pay careful attention to the significant dates in these requirements and their effect on results and financial liability.

5 Credit for previous study
(1) General
Except as described below, or in specific course resolutions, the Coursework Policy specifies the conditions for the granting of credit for previous study to courses in this Faculty.

(2) Except where a credit articulation agreement, approved by the Dean or their delegate, exists, credit will not be granted for units of study completed from:
(a) a Certificate, Diploma or Advanced Diploma* or
(b) a Vocational Education and Training Sector education provider.*

*In exceptional and well-attested circumstances, the student may appeal to the Associate Dean for an exemption from this restriction.

(3) Undergraduate
(a) A student can apply for credit to count towards an undergraduate diploma for up to 12 junior and six senior credit points if the credit is in a relevant subject area. Credit will not be granted for:
(i) units of study that count towards another qualification; or
(ii) units of study taken at another institution after admission to candidature, except as per Clause 5.
(b) A student can apply for credit to count towards a bachelor's degree for up to:
(i) 96 credit points for successfully completed units in courses where no award has been, or will be, made;
(ii) 48 credit points for successfully completed units in courses where an award has been, or will be, made.
(c) Credit will not be granted towards field education, internships or work experience units of study.

(4) Postgraduate
Unless otherwise specified in course resolutions, a student can apply for credit to count towards a master's degree or graduate diploma for up to 50% of the course requirements.

(b) Credit will not be granted for units of study completed more than 5 years prior to admission of candidature*
(c) Recognition of prior learning for previous study or work experience cannot be used to waive the requirements of degree capstone experience.

(5) Credit for studies undertaken after commencement
(a) This clause addresses credit granted for units of study taken at another institution after enrolment in the respective award course at the University of Sydney, including:
(i) cross-institutional study;
(ii) independent study abroad; and
(iii) the international exchange program
(b) Credit will only be granted to students who have received approval from the Faculty prior to commencing their studies at another institution.
(c) International students are not permitted to undertake studies in their home countries as part of the independent study abroad program or the international exchange program. In exceptional circumstances, the student may appeal to the Associate Dean to waive this restriction.
(d) At the discretion of the Faculty, applications may be rejected if it should cause the applicant to be in breach of the conditions in the Faculty resolutions or course resolutions.

6 Faculty Scholars Program
(1) The Faculty Scholars Program is a special program of study for students of exceptional merit who are enrolled in undergraduate degrees administered by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.
(2) Entry to the Faculty Scholars Program is by invitation from the Dean. Invitations are made in December each year, for the following year. Admission to the Faculty Scholars Program is competitive and restricted to a maximum 25 students each year.
(3) To be considered for entry into the Faculty Scholars Program students should normally have AAMs of 85 or over and a high distinction result in a Humanities or Social Sciences unit of study.
(4) Entry to the Faculty Scholars Program is available to eligible students who have completed 48 credit points over two consecutive semesters in their first year at the University of Sydney.
(5) The Faculty Scholars Program consists of three units of study totalling 18 credit points. Students complete the program over three consecutive semesters and must maintain a minimum average of 80% to remain enrolled.
(6) The Faculty Scholars Program is only available to students studying full-time.

Part 2: Unit of study enrolment
7 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Units of Study level
(1) Undergraduate units of study in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences are designated as junior, senior-intermediate, senior-advanced and honours level. They are represented numerically in the unit of study code as:
(a) Junior (1000)
(b) Senior-Intermediate (2000)
(c) Senior-Advanced (3000)
(d) Honours (4000)
(2) Postgraduate units of study in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences are represented numerically as 5000, 6000 and 7000.
6 Cross-institutional study
(1) Cross institutional study is available unless specified otherwise in the course resolutions. The Coursework Policy specifies the circumstances in which the Associate Dean may approve such study, with or without imposing conditions.
(2) Cross institutional study is regarded as another form of credit and will be counted as such when considering eligibility.

7 International exchange
The Faculty encourages students to participate in international exchange programs, unless specified otherwise in the resolutions for a particular course. For more information refer to the Study Abroad and Exchange Office.

Part 3: Studying and Assessment
8 Late submission
(1) It is expected that, unless an application for a simple extension or special consideration has been approved, students will submit all assessment for a unit of study on the due date specified. If assessment is completed or submitted within a period of extension, no academic penalty will be applied to that piece of assessment.
(2) If an extension is 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. The penalty for coursework is as follows: 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) From the day after the published due date, the penalty applied is two marks (out of 100) per working day. From the first calendar day after the published due date, the penalty applied is five percent of the maximum mark awardable for the assignment. For each calendar day late thereafter, the penalty increases by five percent.
(b) For assignments marked out of a maximum total other than 100, the penalty will apply pro rata. For example, for assignments marked out of 40 the penalty will be 0.8 marks per working day. Work will not be assessed and a mark of zero will be recorded when an assessment item is submitted either:
(i) more than ten working days after the deadline, or
(ii) after the designated return date, whichever is earlier.

9 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 80% 90 per cent of timetabled activities for a unit of study, unless granted exemption by the Associate Dean or relevant delegated authority. The Associate Dean or relevant delegated authority may determine that a student fails a unit of study because of inadequate attendance. Alternatively, at their discretion, they may set additional assessment items when attendance is lower than 80 per cent 90 per cent.
(3) The case of any formally enrolled student who is absent from 50% or more of classes, regardless of the reasons for the absences, will be automatically referred to the end-of-semester departmental examiners' meeting for a determination as to whether the student should pass or fail the unit, or, if a pass is awarded, the level of penalty that should be applied.
(4) In exceptional circumstances, for example where there are Work Health and Safety considerations or professional accreditation requirements, and with the approval of the Associate Dean, unit of study coordinators may set out additional attendance criteria in the unit of study outline.

10 Special consideration for illness, injury or misadventure
Special consideration is a process that affords equal opportunity to students who have experienced circumstances that adversely impact their ability to adequately complete an assessment task in a unit of study, as determined by the Coursework Policy.

11 Re-assessment
The Faculty does not offer opportunities for re-assessment (also called ‘supplementary’ assessment) other than on the grounds of approved special consideration.

Part 4: Progression, Results and Graduation
12 Satisfactory progress
The Faculty will monitor students for satisfactory progress towards the completion of their award course.
(1) 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.
(2) Professional experience or field education is an essential requirement for some courses. Where so prescribed, a candidate may not progress to the next year without completing the prescribed professional experience or field education units of study for the previous year.
(3) The Faculty reserves the right not to place candidates in a school or other professional experience or field education setting for practicum in any instance where the performance, personal or professional conduct of the candidate does not meet the required professional standard, regardless of the fact that the candidate may be enrolled in units of study with a practicum requirement.

13 Readmission after a period of exclusion
The Coursework Policy provides that a student excluded from a degree may seek readmission at the end of the exclusion period, with the approval of the Associate Dean. A student readmitted in this way is considered to have commenced a new period of candidature and must apply for credit from their previous candidature. Credit will only be awarded in accordance with the Coursework Policy and clause 5 of these resolutions.

16 Undergraduate majors

(1) A major from Table A is offered by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and consists of a minimum of 36 senior credit points in a defined subject area at senior-intermediate and senior-advanced level, including at least 6 credit points at senior-advanced level. In order for a major to be awarded, a minimum of 12 intermediate-senior or advanced-senior credit points must be completed at the University of Sydney from the respective Department.

(2) Units of study counted towards one major may not count towards any other major completed.

(3) A major from Table B is one offered by another faculty at the University of Sydney. Requirements for completion of the major are defined in the resolutions of the faculty offering the major.

(4) Specific majors required for the completion of a degree are listed in the course resolution for that degree. The majors available within the Faculty are:

(a) Table A Majors

(A) Agricultural Economics
(B) American Studies
(C) Ancient History
(D) Anthropology
(E) Arabic Language and Cultures
(F) Archaeology
(G) Art History
(H) Asian Studies
(I) Australian Literature
(J) Biblical Studies and Classical Hebrew
(K) Celtic Studies
(L) Chinese Studies
(M) Cultural Studies
(N) Digital Cultures
(O) Econometrics*
(P) Economics
(Q) English
(R) Environmental and Resource Economics
(S) European Studies
(T) Film Studies
(U) Financial Economics*
(V) French and Francophone Studies
(W) Gender Studies
(X) Germanic Studies
(Y) Government and International Relations
(Z) Greek (Ancient)
(AB) Hebrew (Modern)
(AC) History
(AD) Indigenous Studies
(AE) Indonesian Studies
(AF) International and Comparative Literary Studies
(BB) Italian Studies
(CC) Japanese Studies
(CC) Jewish Civilization, Thought and Culture
(DD) Korean Studies
(E) Latin
(F) Linguistics
(G) Modern Greek Studies
(H) Music
(I) Philosophy
(J) Political Economy
(K) Sanskrit
(L) Social Policy
(M) Socio-Legal Studies
(N) Sociology
(O) Spanish and Latin American Studies
(PP) Studies in Religion
(QQ) Theatre and Performance Studies

*This major is available to Bachelor of Economics candidates.

(b) Table B Majors

(A) Biochemistry
(B) Biometrics
(C) Biology
(D) Chemistry
(E) Computer Science
(F) Education
(G) Environmental Studies
(H) Geography
(I) Geology and Geophysics
(J) History and Philosophy of Science
Award of the bachelor's degree with honours

(1) To qualify for admission to candidacy for honours, a student must meet the requirements of the Coursework Policy and in addition:
   (a) have completed a major with an average of 70% or above in the intended subject area/s; and
   (b) have the permission of the relevant Chair of Department or program coordinator.

(2) To qualify for admission to the Bachelor of Economics (Honours), students must meet the requirements as outlined in the course resolutions.

(3) General conditions of candidature include:
   (a) the honours course is normally full-time over two consecutive semesters. Students who are unable to enrol full-time should apply to the Faculty to undertake the honours course part-time over a maximum of four consecutive semesters;
   (b) a student who Fails or Discontinue Fails an honours course may not re-enrol in it;
   (c) students who wish to suspend their honours candidature should apply to the Faculty. The maximum period of suspension is one semester;
   (d) the maximum period of candidacy is five consecutive semesters when a suspension is approved.

(4) To qualify for the award of honours a student must complete 48 credit points of honours units of study in a single subject area, or in two subject areas for students completing joint honours, with a minimum honours mark of 65.

(5) A student may not:
   (a) enrol in more than 24 credit points of honours units of study in any one semester; or
   (b) enrol concurrently in any other course or unit of study while enrolled in an honours course.

(6) A student who wishes to enrol in honours in two subject areas must meet the entry requirements for both subject areas. Eligible students can chose to enrol in either:
   (a) a joint honours course. The requirements are completion of 24 credit points in honours units of study in each subject area; or
   (b) an honours course in two subject areas. The requirements are completion of 48 credit points in honours units of study in each subject area. Honours in each subject area is completed separately and in succession.

(7) The grade of honours and the honours mark are determined by performance in the honours course, according to the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Honours Mark Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honours First Class (I) mark = 80-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Second Class, First Division (II.1) mark =75-79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Second Class, Second Division (II.2) mark = 70-74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Third Class (III) mark = 65-69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours not awarded to a mark below 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University medal

A student with an honours mark of 90 or above 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 Policy. Candidates who are awarded an undergraduate diploma with honours are not eligible for the award of a university medal.

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.

Progression through embedded postgraduate programs

Providing candidates satisfy the admission requirements for each stage, a candidate may progress to the award of any of the courses in an embedded sequence. Only the highest award completed will be conferred.

Part 5: Other

Transitional provisions

(1) These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature after 1 January 2018.
(2) Except where noted below, Students who commenced prior to 1 January 2018 complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions in force at the time of their commencement.

(i) 10 Late submission of work will be effective Semester 1, 2018 for all students
(ii) 11 Attendance will be effective Semester 1, 2018 for all students

Transitional arrangements

N/A.

Other relevant information
6. Signature of Dean
Resolutions of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences 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 'Coursework Policy'), the resolutions for the course of enrolment, the University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended) and the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015.

Part 1: Course enrolment

1. Admission

   (1) General

   Admission to one or more courses, including undergraduate diplomas, concurrently with any other award course, requires the permission of all Deans concerned.

   (2) Sciences Po dual degree pathway

   Admission to this pathway is on the basis of a secondary school leaving qualification such as the NSW Higher School Certificate (including national and international equivalents). Details of admission policies are found in the Coursework Policy. In addition, admission to this pathway requires the applicant to submit a statement of motivation and attend an interview. The results of this process will form part of the ranking of applicants, and offers for available places are issued according to this ranking.

2. Enrolment restrictions

   (1) General

   (a) The Coursework Policy specifies the maximum number of credit points that a student may take in each semester. The Faculty does not encourage any student to take more than the normal full-time load required to complete their course in the standard time (usually 24 credit points per semester). The Faculty sets minimum and maximum limits for undergraduate students in their first year of study (below).

   (b) Units of study in excess of a student's award course requirements will be taken on a full-fee, non-award basis, unless approved otherwise by the Associate Dean.

   (c) A student may not enrol in a unit of study based on a language other than English if, in the opinion of the chair of department concerned on the advice of the teacher of the unit, the student's linguistic knowledge or competence would unfairly advantage them over other students enrolled in the unit of study. If enrolment has already taken place, the Associate Dean may direct that the student be withdrawn without penalty from the unit of study.

   (2) Undergraduate

   (a) An undergraduate student must enrol in a minimum of 12 junior credit points in semester one and two in the first year of candidature. 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 24 junior credit points in semester one or two in the first year of candidature. Students who are granted credit or advanced standing may be permitted to enrol in senior units. 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 24 credit points per semester in their first year of candidature.

   (3) The maximum number of credit points that may be counted towards a degree from any single subject area in Table A of the Tables of units of study is 18 junior and/or 60 senior, with the exception of the Bachelor of Economics where the individual course resolution applies.

   (4) The maximum number of credit points that may be counted towards a degree from any single subject area in Table B of the Tables of units of study is 12 junior and/or 48 senior.

3. Time limits

   The Coursework Rule specifies the maximum time limits for completion of candidature.

4. Suspension, discontinuation and lapse of candidature

   The Coursework Policy specifies the conditions for suspending or discontinuing candidature, and return to candidature after these events. It also defines the circumstances when candidature is deemed to have lapsed. Students should pay careful attention to the significant dates in these requirements and their effect on results and financial liability.

5. Credit for previous study

   (1) General

   Except as described below, or in specific course resolutions, the Coursework Policy specifies the conditions for the granting of credit for previous study to courses in this Faculty.

   (2) Undergraduate

   (a) A student can apply for credit to count towards an undergraduate diploma for up to 12 junior and six senior credit points if the credit is in a relevant subject area. Credit will not be granted for:

      (i) units of study that count towards another qualification; or

      (ii) units of study taken at another institution after admission to candidature, except as per Clause 5.

   (b) A student can apply for credit to count towards a bachelor's degree for up to:
(i) 96 credit points for successfully completed units in courses where no award has been, or will be, made;
(ii) 48 credit points for successfully completed units in courses where an award has been, or will be, made.
(c) Credit will not be granted towards field education, internships or work experience units of study.

(4) Postgraduate

Unless otherwise specified in course resolutions a student can apply for credit to count credit can be awarded towards a master's degree or graduate diploma for up to 50% of the course requirements.

(b) Credit will not be granted for units of study completed more than 5 years prior to admission of candidature*

(c) Recognition of prior learning for previous study or work experience cannot be used to waive the requirements of degree capstone experience.

(d) Credit will not be granted for units of study completed from:
(a) a Certificate, Diploma or Advanced Diploma*; or
(b) a Vocational Education and Training Sector education provider.*

*In exceptional and well-attested circumstances, the student may appeal to the Associate Dean for an exemption from this restriction.

(5) Credit for studies undertaken after commencement

(a) This clause addresses credit granted for units of study taken at another institution after enrolment in the respective award course at the University of Sydney, including:
(i) cross-institutional study;
(ii) independent study abroad; and
(iii) the international exchange program

(b) Credit will only be granted to students who have received approval from the Faculty prior to commencing their studies at another institution.

(c) International students are not permitted to undertake studies in their home countries as part of the independent study abroad program or the international exchange program. In exceptional circumstances, the student may appeal to the Associate Dean to waive this restriction.

(d) At the discretion of the Faculty, applications may be rejected if it should cause the applicant to be in breach of the conditions in the Faculty resolutions or course resolutions.

6 Faculty Scholars Program

(1) The Faculty Scholars Program is a special program of study for students of exceptional merit who are enrolled in undergraduate degrees administered by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

(2) Entry to the Faculty Scholars Program is by invitation from the Dean. Invitations are made in December each year, for the following year. Admission to the Faculty Scholars Program is competitive and limited to a maximum of 25 students each year.

(3) To be considered for entry into the Faculty Scholars Program students should normally have AAMs of 85 or over and a high distinction result in a Humanities or Social Sciences unit of study.

(4) Entry to the Faculty Scholars Program is available to eligible students who have completed 48 credit points over two consecutive semesters in their first year at the University of Sydney.

(5) The Faculty Scholars Program consists of three units of study totalling 18 credit points. Students complete the program over three consecutive semesters and must maintain a minimum average of 90% to remain enrolled.

(6) The Faculty Scholars Program is only available to students studying full time.

Part 2: Unit of study enrolment

7 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Units of Study level

(1) Undergraduate units of study in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences are designated as junior, senior intermediate, senior advanced and honours level. They are represented numerically in the unit of study code as:
(a) Junior (1000)
(b) Senior Intermediate (2000)
(c) Senior Advanced (3000)
(d) Honours (4000)

(2) Postgraduate units of study in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences are represented numerically as 5000, 6000 and 7000.

6 Cross-institutional study

(1) Cross institutional study is available unless specified otherwise in the course resolutions. The Coursework Policy specifies the circumstances in which the Associate Dean may approve such study, without or with imposing conditions.

(2) Cross institutional study is regarded as another form of credit and will be counted as such when considering eligibility.

7 International exchange

The Faculty encourages students to participate in international exchange programs, unless specified otherwise in the resolutions for a particular course. For more information refer to the Study Abroad and Exchange Office.

Faculty exchange units of study can be counted towards the requirements of a program, major, minor or advanced coursework as approved prior to undertaking study while on exchange.

Part 3: Studying and Assessment

8 Late submission

(1) It is expected that, unless an application for a simple extension or special consideration has been approved, students will submit all assessment for a unit of study on the due date specified. If assessment is completed or submitted within a period of extension, no academic penalty will be applied to that piece of assessment.

(2) If an extension is 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. The penalty for coursework is as follows: 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) From the day after the published due date, the penalty applied is two marks (out of 100) per working day. From the first calendar day after the published due date, the penalty applied is five percent of the maximum mark awardable for the assignment. For each calendar day late thereafter, the penalty increases by five percent;

(b) Penalties are marked out of a maximum total. If the penalty is 100, the penalty will be 0.8 marks per working day. Work will not be assessed and a mark of zero will be recorded when an assessment item is submitted either:

(i) more than ten working days after the deadline, or
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The Faculty will monitor students for satisfactory progress towards the completion of their award course.

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.

Professional experience or field education is an essential requirement for some courses. Where so prescribed, a candidate may not progress to the next year without completing the prescribed professional experience or field education units of study for the previous year.

The Faculty reserves the right not to place candidates in a school or other professional experience or field education setting for practicum in any instance where the performance, personal or professional conduct of the candidate does not meet the required professional standard, regardless of the fact that the candidate may be enrolled in units of study with a practicum requirement.

The Coursework Policy provides that a student excluded from a degree may seek readmission at the end of the exclusion period, with the approval of the Associate Dean. A student readmitted in this way is considered to have commenced a new period of candidature and must apply for credit from their previous candidature. Credit will only be awarded in accordance with the Coursework Policy and clause 5 of these resolutions.

A major from Table A is offered by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and consists of a minimum of 36 senior credit points in a defined subject area at senior intermediate and senior advanced level, including at least 6 credit points at senior advanced level. In order for a major to be awarded, a minimum of 12 intermediate senior or advanced senior credit points must be completed at the University of Sydney from the respective Department.

Limits of study counted towards one major may not count toward any other major completed.

A major from Table B is one offered by another faculty at the University of Sydney. Requirements for completion of the major are defined in the resolutions of the faculty offering the major.

Specific majors required for the completion of a degree are listed in the course resolution for that degree. The majors available within the Faculty are:

- Table A Majors
- Agricultural Economics
- American Studies
- Ancient History
- Anthropology
- Arabic Language and Cultures
- Archaeology
- Art History
- Asian Studies
- Australian Literature
- Biblical Studies and Classical Hebrew
- Celtic Studies
- Chinese Studies
- Cultural Studies
- Digital Cultures
- Econometrics
- Economics
- English
- Environmental and Resource Economics
- European Studies
- Film Studies
- Financial Economics
- French and Francophone Studies
- Gender Studies
- Germanic Studies

(iii) after the designated return date, whichever is earlier.

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 insufficent 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 80% of timetabled activities for a unit of study, unless granted exemption by the Associate Dean or relevant delegated authority. The Associate Dean or relevant delegated authority may determine that a student fails a unit of study because of inadequate attendance. Alternatively, at their discretion, they may set additional assessment items when attendance is lower than 60%.

(3) The case of any formally enrolled student who is absent from 50% or more of classes, regardless of the reasons for the absences, will be automatically referred to the end-of-semester departmental examiners’ meeting for a determination as to whether the student should pass or fail the unit, or, if a pass is awarded, the level of penalty that should be applied.

(4) In exceptional circumstances, for example where there are Work Health and Safety considerations or professional accreditation requirements, and with the approval of the Associate Dean, unit of study coordinators may set out additional attendance criteria in the unit of study outline.

Special consideration for illness, injury or misadventure

Special consideration is a process that affords equal opportunity to students who have experienced circumstances that adversely impact their ability to adequately complete an assessment task in a unit of study, as determined by the Coursework Policy.

Re-assessment

The Faculty does not offer opportunities for re-assessment (also called ‘supplementary’ assessment) other than on the grounds of approved special consideration.

Part 4: Progression, Results and Graduation

Satisfactory progress

The Faculty will monitor students for satisfactory progress towards the completion of their award course.

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.

Professional experience or field education is an essential requirement for some courses. Where so prescribed, a candidate may not progress to the next year without completing the prescribed professional experience or field education units of study for the previous year.

The Faculty reserves the right not to place candidates in a school or other professional experience or field education setting for practicum in any instance where the performance, personal or professional conduct of the candidate does not meet the required professional standard, regardless of the fact that the candidate may be enrolled in units of study with a practicum requirement.

Readmission after a period of exclusion

The Coursework Policy provides that a student excluded from a degree may seek readmission at the end of the exclusion period, with the approval of the Associate Dean. A student readmitted in this way is considered to have commenced a new period of candidature and must apply for credit from their previous candidature. Credit will only be awarded in accordance with the Coursework Policy and clause 5 of these resolutions.

Undergraduate majors

A major from Table A is offered by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and consists of a minimum of 36 senior credit points in a defined subject area at senior intermediate and senior advanced level, including at least 6 credit points at senior advanced level. In order for a major to be awarded, a minimum of 12 intermediate senior or advanced senior credit points must be completed at the University of Sydney from the respective Department.

Limits of study counted towards one major may not count toward any other major completed.

A major from Table B is one offered by another faculty at the University of Sydney. Requirements for completion of the major are defined in the resolutions of the faculty offering the major.

Specific majors required for the completion of a degree are listed in the course resolution for that degree. The majors available within the Faculty are:

Table A Majors

- Agricultural Economics
- American Studies
- Ancient History
- Anthropology
- Arabic Language and Cultures
- Archaeology
- Art History
- Asian Studies
- Australian Literature
- Biblical Studies and Classical Hebrew
- Celtic Studies
- Chinese Studies
- Cultural Studies
- Digital Cultures
- Econometrics
- Economics
- English
- Environmental and Resource Economics
- European Studies
- Film Studies
- Financial Economics
- French and Francophone Studies
- Gender Studies
- Germanic Studies

(1) after the designated return date, whichever is earlier.
Award of the bachelor's degree with honours

(1) To qualify for admission to candidature for honours, a student must meet the requirements of the Coursework Policy and in addition:
(a) have completed a major with an average of 70% or above in the intended subject area/s; and
(b) have the permission of the relevant Chair of Department or program coordinator.

(2) To qualify for admission to the Bachelor of Economics (Honours), students must meet the requirements as outlined in the course resolutions.

(3) General conditions of candidature include:
(a) the honours course is normally full-time over two consecutive semesters. Students who are unable to enrol full-time should apply to the Faculty to undertake the honours course part-time over a maximum of four consecutive semesters;
(b) a student who Fails or Discontinue Fails an honours course may not re-enrol in it;
(c) students who wish to suspend their honours candidature should apply to the Faculty. The maximum period of suspension is one semester;
(d) the maximum period of candidature is five consecutive semesters when a suspension is approved.

(4) To qualify for the award of honours a student must complete 48 credit points of honours units of study in a single subject area, or in two subject areas for students completing joint honours, with a minimum honours mark of 65.

(5) A student may not:
(a) enrol in more than 24 credit points of honours units of study in any one semester; or
(b) enrol concurrently in any other course or unit of study while enrolled in an honours course.

(6) A student who wishes to enrol in honours in two subject areas must meet the entry requirements for both subject areas. Eligible students can chose to enrol in either:
(a) a joint honours course. The requirements are completion of 24 credit points in honours units of study in each subject area; or
(b) an honours course in two subject areas. The requirements are completion of 48 credit points in honours units of study in each subject area. Honours in each subject area is completed separately and in succession.

(7) The grade of honours and the honours mark are determined by performance in the honours course, according to the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Honours Mark Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honours First Class (I)</td>
<td>mark = 80-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Second Class - First Division (II.1)</td>
<td>mark = 75-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Second Class - Second Division (II.2)</td>
<td>mark = 70-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Third Class (III)</td>
<td>mark = 65-69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Honours not awarded to a mark below 65

15 University medal
A student with an honours mark of 90 or above 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 Policy. Candidates who are awarded an undergraduate diploma with honours are not eligible for the award of a university medal.

16 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.

17 Progression through embedded postgraduate programs
Providing candidates satisfy the admission requirements for each stage, a candidate may progress to the award of any of the courses in an embedded sequence. Only the highest award completed will be conferred.

Part 5: Other

18 Transitional provisions
(1) These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature after 1 January 2018.
(2) Except where noted below, students who commenced prior to 1 January 2018 complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions in force at the time of their commencement:
   (i) 10 Late submission of work will be effective Semester 1, 2018 for all students
   (ii) 11 Attendance will be effective Semester 1, 2018 for all students
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Purpose
To update the Faculty Resolutions for Dentistry.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Dentistry to amend its Faculty Resolutions; and
(2) approve the amendment of Faculty Resolutions arising from the proposal,
with effect from 1 January 2018.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Academic Standards and Policy committee endorsed amendments made to the Faculty of Dentistry resolutions to Academic Board in the meeting of 11 July 2017. However, on advice from Student Administrative Services, a minor amendment is required in relation to clause 12(3), Weighted Average Mark. This amendment is a reversion to the original clause 12(3).

(3) The weight of a unit of study is assigned by the owning faculty. In the Faculty of Dentistry, all units carry a weighting value of one. For the Bachelor of Oral Health, all units starting with ORHL1 have a weighting of 1, ORHL2 have a weighting of 2 and ORHL3 have a weighting of 3. For the Doctor of Dental Medicine, all units starting with SDDM51 have a weighting of 1, SDDM52 (2), SDDM53 (3) and SDDM54 (4).
Resolutions of the Faculty of Dentistry 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 of the School, 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
   Students are only permitted to enrol for the units of study specified for each semester of their program of study.

2 Time limits
   (1) The Coursework Rule defines the maximum time limits, and how time limits are affected by periods of suspension or absence.

3 Suspension, discontinuation and lapse of candidature
   (1) The Coursework Rule and Coursework Policy specify the conditions for suspending or discontinuing candidature, and return to candidature after these events.

4 Credit for previous study
   Credit for previous study may be granted for the Bachelor of Oral Health degree. Refer to the specific resolutions for the Bachelor of Oral Health.

Part 2: Unit of study enrolment
5 Cross institutional study
   Cross institutional study is not permitted by the Faculty of Dentistry.

6 International exchange
   International exchange is not permitted by the Faculty of Dentistry.

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 a requirement of any unit of study.
   (2) Students are expected to attend a minimum of 90 percent of timetabled activities for each component of a unit of study. The Dean or academic staff member most concerned may determine that a student fails a unit of study due to inadequate attendance.

8 Late submission penalty
   (1) It is expected that unless an application for an extension or special consideration has been approved, students will make submissions for a unit of study on the due date specified. Submissions may include assignments, application forms or log books. If the submission is made by the student within a period of approved extension, no academic penalty will be applied.
   (2) Late assignments that have not been granted extensions will attract a penalty of 5 percent of the maximum mark each day they are late, except week ends and public holidays.

9 Special consideration for illness, injury or misadventure
   Special consideration is a process that affords equal opportunity to students who have experienced circumstances that adversely impact their ability to adequately complete an assessment task in a unit of study. The Coursework Policy 2014 and Assessment Procedures 2011 provide full details.

10 Re-assessment
   In this Faculty, opportunities for re-assessment are offered to students on the grounds as stated in the Faculty of Dentistry - Assessment Provision 2017.
Part 4: Progression, Results and Graduation

11 Satisfactory progress

The Faculty will monitor students for satisfactory progress towards the completion of their award course in accordance with the Coursework Policy 2014. In addition to the common triggers used to identify students not meeting academic progression requirements (as defined by the progression requirements of the Coursework Policy 2014), students must meet any other requirements specified in the course resolutions as being critical to progression through the course.

12 Weighted Average Mark (WAM)

(1) The University uses the following formula for calculating the WAM. 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.

\[
\text{WAM} = \frac{\sum (Wc \times Mc)}{\sum Wc}
\]

(2) Where \(Wc\) is the unit of study credit points x the unit weighting and \(Mc\) is the mark achieved for the unit. Pass/fail units and credited units from other institutions are not counted.

(3) The weight of a unit of study is assigned by the owning faculty. In the Faculty of Dentistry, all units carry a weighting value of one. For the Bachelor of Oral Health, all units starting with ORHL have a weighting of 1. ORHL2 have a weighting of 2 and ORHL3 have a weighting of 3. For the Doctor of Dental Medicine, all units starting with SDDM51 have a weighting of 1. SDDM52 (2), SDDM53 (3) and SDDM54 (4).

Part 5: Other

13 Special permission

These resolutions apply to all students enrolled in programs of study in the Faculty of Dentistry. However, in exceptional circumstances and at the Dean's discretion, some exemptions may be permitted.

14 Transitional provisions

(1) These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature after 1 January, 2018 and students who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2018, who elect to proceed under these resolutions.
RECOMMENDATION

To Academic Board that the Student Misconduct Report 2015 – 2016 be received and noted.

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.
   
   ii. One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail in one unit of study, one semester suspension from the award course.
   
   iii. Seven (7) cases: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in one unit of study, semester suspended suspension from the award course.

### 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:
   i. One (1) case: Severe reprimand; one year suspension from the University; cancelation of a residency agreement.
   ii. One (1) case: Reprimand

2.2 Harassment/Bullying
A penalty was applied in two (2) cases:
   i. One (1) case: Severe reprimand; two semester suspension from the award course.
   ii. 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:
   i. One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in eleven units of study; exclusion for one year
   ii. One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail in seven units of study; two year expulsion from the University.
   iii. One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in five units of study, one year expulsion from the University.
   iv. One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in five units of study, one year expulsion from the University.
   v. One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in three units of study, one semester suspended suspension from the award course.
   vi. Two (2) cases: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in two units of study; one semester suspension from the award course.
   vii. Four (4) cases: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in two units of study; one semester suspended suspension from the award course.
   viii. 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:
   i. One (1) case: Reprimand; zero mark and fail grade in one unit of study; one semester suspension from the award course.
   ii. 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:
   i. One (1) case: One semester suspension from the award course.
   ii. 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.
Appendix

1.1 Comparative Data Case vs Penalties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigation &amp; penalties applied</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation &amp; no penalty applied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not proceed to investigation, referred to Faculty or withdrawn</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 Mechanism for feedback on penalties to unit of study coordinators

2015-2016 penalty updates were reported individually to respective faculty staff responsible for/and with access to updating enrolments records in Sydney Student. Penalty outcome letters and investigation reports are stored in and will remain on secure TRIM files for retrieval by approved staff.

Advice from the University’s Privacy Officer prescribes the release only of de-identified information and hence study coordinators have not be updated with details on specific cases.

Moving forward, it is proposed that penalty data be relayed to Deans and Associate Deans bi-annually in a de-identified fashion by the Student Affairs Unit.

1.3 Penalty determinations

Note that under Chapter 8 of the By-law, the Vice-Chancellor had discretion in determining and prescribing the severity of penalties in light of any mitigating circumstances.

2015 Penalty data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Misconduct Type</th>
<th>Penalty Applied</th>
<th>Offence Background</th>
<th>Penalty Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harassment/ Bullying</td>
<td>Severe Reprimand</td>
<td>Harassment, bullying or discrimination of a Student by another that was found to be not acceptable and impeded the students participation at the University</td>
<td>The application of the respective penalties was relative to the individual case circumstances, the effect on the complainant and precedents established from other similar cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Harassment/ Bullying</td>
<td>Severe Reprimand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Harassment/ Bullying</td>
<td>Severe Reprimand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Harassment/ Bullying</td>
<td>Severe Reprimand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>Reprimand plus expulsion from the University for a period of seven (7) years</td>
<td>Student operated a fraudulent scheme which effected other Students financially</td>
<td>Severe incident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Ghost Writing/Plagiarism**
   - **Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in two subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course**
   - **Ghost Writing:**
     - Conscious action to cheat through purchase of material to fulfill course work assignments.
     - Severity determined by such factors as previous history, number of subjects; Course content involved - Assignment/Major Work/Thesis and the degree of course contribution purchased.
   - **Plagiarism:**
     - Either conscious or unconscious actions in the use of and or reference to non-original material in course work.
     - Offences may range from copying and using whole sections of material through to omitting to quote references to published works used in course work.
   - The consideration of Penalty will in the first instance involve a fail and zero mark in respect to the subjects involved. The second consideration will be in respect to a period of exclusion or suspension from either the course or the University, and whether this aspect of the penalty is applied or suspended.
   - Factors involved in this process include -
     1. **(a)** the nature, frequency and seriousness of the misconduct;
     2. **(b)** any previous record of misconduct by the student or former student;
     3. **(c)** previous penalties imposed on a student or former student for misconduct, including any penalty suspended;
     4. **(d)** the timing of any admission by the student or former student of the misconduct; and
     5. **(e)** any relevant mitigating circumstances

7. **Ghost Writing/Plagiarism**
   - **Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course plus an additional one semester suspension from the award course that was suspended**

8. **Ghost Writing/Plagiarism**
   - **Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course**

9. **Ghost Writing/Plagiarism**
   - **Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course**

10. **Ghost Writing/Plagiarism**
    - **Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course**

11. **Ghost Writing/Plagiarism**
    - **Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course**

12. **Ghost Writing/Plagiarism**
    - **Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course**

13. **Ghost Writing/Plagiarism**
    - **Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course**

14. **Ghost Writing/Plagiarism**
    - **Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course**

15. **Ghost Writing/Plagiarism**
    - **Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course**

16. **Ghost Writing/Plagiarism**
    - **Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course**

17. **Ghost Writing/Plagiarism**
    - **Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Ghost Writing/ Plagiarism</td>
<td>Reprimand plus a one semester suspension from the award course that was suspended</td>
<td>As Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Ghost Writing/ Plagiarism</td>
<td>Reprimand plus a requirement to redo thesis which is to be reviewed by an external party</td>
<td>As Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1-10</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 7 – 10 subjects</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in seven subjects, plus a two semester suspension from the award course</td>
<td>Conscious action to provide falsified certificates as a reason for being unfit to complete assignments or attend examinations. Certificates have either been purchased online (for a fee) or acquired or forged through other sources. In all cases Students had not attended a registered medical practice for assessment and issue of the required certificate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1-15</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 4 – 6 subjects</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in six subjects, plus expulsion from the University for six semesters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.1-20</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 4 – 6 subjects</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in five subjects, plus expulsion from the University for six semesters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.1-24</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 4 – 6 subjects</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in four subjects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.1-28</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 2 – 3 subjects</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in three subjects, plus a one semester suspension from the award course that was suspended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.1-32</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 2 – 3 subjects</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in two subjects, plus a one semester suspension from the award course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.1-36</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a two semester suspension from the award course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.1-40</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course that was suspended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.1-44</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course that was suspended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.1-48</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course that was suspended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.1-52</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course that was suspended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.1-56</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course that was suspended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.1-60</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course that was suspended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Outcome Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course that was suspended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Above</td>
<td>As Above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course that was suspended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Above</td>
<td>As Above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Falsified reports relating to two units of study</td>
<td>Degree previously conferred Revoked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Above</td>
<td>Degree to be re-conferred when Student completed remedial actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Complaint Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Outcome Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miss Conduct No Penalty</td>
<td>Nine Cases No Further Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Conduct No Penalty</td>
<td>Six Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Conduct No Penalty</td>
<td>Three Not Proceeded With</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Conduct No Penalty</td>
<td>Did Not Proceed to Investigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2016 Penalty Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Misconduct Type</th>
<th>Penalty Applied</th>
<th>Offence Background</th>
<th>Penalty Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>Severe reprimand plus a one-year suspension from the University plus cancelation of a residency agreement</td>
<td>The application of the respective penalties was relative to the individual case circumstances, the effect on the complainant and precedents established from other similar cases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>Reprimand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Harassment/ Bullying</td>
<td>severe reprimand plus a two-semester suspension of an award course</td>
<td>The application of the respective penalties was relative to the individual case circumstances, the effect on the complainant and precedents established from other similar cases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Harassment/ Bullying</td>
<td>Reprimand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ghost Writing</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in two subjects, plus a three-year exclusion from the award course</td>
<td>Conscious action to cheat through purchase of material to fulfill course work assignments. Severity determined by such factors as previous history, number of subjects; Course content involved; Assignment/Major Work/The Thesis and the degree of course contribution purchased.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ghost Writing</td>
<td>Zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course that was suspended</td>
<td>The consideration of penalty will in the first instance involve a fail and zero mark in respect to the subjects involved. The second consideration will be in respect to a period of exclusion or suspension from either the course or the University, and whether this aspect of the penalty is applied or suspended. Factors involved in this process include - (a) the nature, frequency and seriousness of the misconduct; (b) any previous record of misconduct by the student or former student; (c) previous penalties imposed on a student or former student for misconduct, including any penalty suspended; (d) the timing of any admission by the student or former student of the misconduct; and (e) any relevant mitigating circumstances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>Severe reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course</td>
<td>Either conscious or unconscious actions in the use of and or reference to non-original material in course work. Offences may range from copying and using whole sections of material through to omitting to quote references</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Submission To</td>
<td>Item 5.1 Student Misconduct Report - Page 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14 November 2017</td>
<td>Academic Standards &amp; Policy Committee</td>
<td>Page 9 of 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>14 November 2017</td>
<td>Academic Standards &amp; Policy Committee</td>
<td>Page 9 of 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>Falsifying a Tutor's report</th>
<th>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course that was suspended</th>
<th>Associated actions falsifying information relevant to course operations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 10 Plus subjects</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in eleven subjects, plus exclusion for one year</td>
<td>The consideration of Penalty will in the first instance involve a fail and zero mark in respect to the subjects involved. The second consideration will be in respect to a period of exclusion or suspension from either the course or the University, and whether this aspect of the penalty is applied or suspended. Factors involved in this process include - (a) the nature and repeat instance of the misconduct; (b) any previous record of misconduct by the student or former student; (c) previous penalties imposed on a student or former student for misconduct, including any penalty suspended; (d) the timing of any admission by the student or former student of the misconduct; and (e) any relevant mitigating circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 7 – 10 subjects</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in seven subject, plus exclusion for two years</td>
<td>Certificates have either been purchased on line (for a fee) or acquired or forged through other sources. In all cases Students had not attended a registered medical practice for assessment and issue of the required certificate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 4 – 6 subjects</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in five subject, plus exclusion for one year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 4 – 6 subjects</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in five subject, plus exclusion for one year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 2 – 3 subjects</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in three subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course that was suspended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 2 – 3 subjects</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in two subjects, plus a one semester 15suspension from the award course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 2 – 3 subjects</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in two subjects, plus a one semester suspension from the award course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 2 – 3 subjects</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in two subjects, plus a one semester suspension from the award course that was suspended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 2 – 3 subjects</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in two subjects, plus a one semester suspension from the award course that was suspended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 2 – 3 subjects</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in two subjects, plus a one semester suspension from the award course that was suspended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 2 – 3 subjects</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in two subjects, plus a one semester suspension from the award course that was suspended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension from the award course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated</td>
<td>Reprimand plus zero mark and fail in one subject, plus a one semester suspension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certificates have either been purchased on line (for a fee) or acquired or forged through other sources.
In all cases Students had not attended a registered medical practice for assessment and issue of the required certificate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Falsified certificates associated with 1 Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Falsified certificates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaint Type</th>
<th>Outcome Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34 - 39 Misconduct No Penalty</td>
<td>Six Cases No Further Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45 Misconduct No Penalty</td>
<td>Six Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-49 Misconduct No Penalty</td>
<td>Four Not Proceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-51 Misconduct No Penalty</td>
<td>Two Did Not Proceed to Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Misconduct No Penalty</td>
<td>Student Graduated No Longer Under University Jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Purpose: To inform the Academic Standards and Policy Committee about the feedback provided to the University of Sydney regarding the units of study that were submitted to the 2016 Group of Eight Quality Verification System review.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the feedback provided about the University of Sydney units of study that were reviewed during the 2016 Group of Eight (Go8) Quality Verification System (QVS) review.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The University of Sydney participated in the QVS review in 2016 and has received completed reviews from the Go8 for all units of study except those within the Civil Engineering discipline area. The reviews provided positive feedback about the objectives and assessment tasks of units of study provided for review, while also identifying some areas for improvement. The reviews of University of Sydney units of study are provided in attachment 1.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

The University of Sydney has been participating in the QVS since it commenced in 2011. As required by the renewed Higher Education Standards, its purpose is to provide an externally referenced quality assurance process to review academic standards at all levels of achievement across Go8 institutions and provide public assurance that learning outcomes are comparable with world leading universities.

The 2016 QVS involved the review of two capstone or core final year units in six nominated discipline areas by academic reviewers from Go8 universities.

The Go8’s Deputy Vice Chancellors Academic Group selected the following disciplines for review across the Go8 in 2016: Education, Law, Archaeology, Environmental Sciences, Biology, and Civil Engineering. The University has received reviews from the Go8 for all for all units of study except those within the Civil Engineering discipline area. The table below provides information on the University’s units of study that were submitted to the Go8 for review by other institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline area</th>
<th>Unit of Study</th>
<th>Unit of Study Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>EDMT6012 Professional Research Project</td>
<td>Nigel Goodwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>EDSE5010 Meeting the Needs of Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>Kate Keeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>LAWS3480/5180 IP: Copyright and Designs</td>
<td>Kimberlee Weatherall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>LAWS5017 Private International Law A</td>
<td>Ross Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>ARCA3601 Research in Australasian</td>
<td>Peter Hiscock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>ARCA3605 Dialogue of Civilizations: East and West</td>
<td>Margaret Miller Barbara Helwing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Go8 Reviewers evaluated the appropriateness of learning outcomes and assessment tasks for each unit of study, and assessed whether each sampled item of student work received an appropriate grade, or whether the reviewer considered the mark to be either too high or too low. Of the assessments graded by Go8 reviewers in 2016, 165 aligned with the University of Sydney grade awarded and 25 disagreed. Of those that disagreed, 17 grades were deemed to be unduly high, while eight grades were considered to be unduly low.

For the majority of units, the Go8 reviews were positive and considered the assessment tasks and processes to be appropriate. Reviewers were asked to provide an overall summary judgement of the unit and only one selected the option identifying immediate concerns relating to the unit’s learning outcomes and assessment tasks. Where possible, assessment tasks and marking criteria generally compared favourably with analogous or relevant units of study at other universities. Reviewer feedback also highlighted that the learning objectives of units were well developed and their relationship with the Graduate Qualities was clearly articulated. However, some reviewers identified areas for improvement, such as course content being too broad for a final year unit, high grades awarded to assessments that were significantly over the indicated word limit, and insufficient weight given to demonstrating competency in a range of research approaches within a unit of study.

The University will continue to participate in the Go8 QVS review, with the 2017 QVS currently in progress. The attached QVS Reviews have also been provided to the University Executive Education Committee at its meeting on 6 November 2017.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Go8 QVS Reviews of 2016 University of Sydney Units of Study
Reviewer Evaluation Form
Go8 Quality Verification System 2016

Date: 20 January 2017

Reviewer Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>TRACEY ROGERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Institution</td>
<td>UNSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline area</td>
<td>BIOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of expertise</td>
<td>ECOLOGY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject Review Coversheet

Prepare one of these reports for each subject or capstone project reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Go8 University:</th>
<th>University of Sydney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field of Education:</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Subject reviewed (Subject Code):</td>
<td>BIOL3007/3907 – Ecology and Advanced Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size (number of student work items assessed):</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assessments</th>
<th>Below Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed in total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with grade awarded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly high</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly low</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*5/6 students each 4 assessment tasks

1 Adapted from the University of Cambridge’s report Coversheet for External Examiners (2009); www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf
Please tick one of the three options below that accords with your overall summary judgement of the subject you have reviewed.

| The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate. | X |
| Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment. |

| The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate. |
| HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations. |

| There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed. |
| These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review. |

Comments (optional)

If you wish, please include further comments which may be used by the associated Faculty or Department in marketing materials.
Go8 Quality Verification System – Discipline Review Form

Statement of potential conflicts of interest

For example, being involved in collaborative teaching, research or consultancy work with colleagues teaching in the subjects being reviewed, or recent transfer from the institution being reviewed.

- No conflict.

Review of specified learning objectives

1. To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

   - Not at all
   - Somewhat
   - Adequately
   - Very well
   - Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating:

1. 
2. 
3. 

2. To what extent are the specified learning objectives appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

   - Not at all
   - Somewhat
   - Adequately
   - Very well
   - Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating:

1. 
2. 
3. 

3. How do the specified learning objectives compare with those of final year or postgraduate subjects (as relevant) from similar universities?

They are consistent with those of UNSW.

Review of assessment tasks

1. To what extent are the assessment tasks suitable for the specified learning objectives? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

Not at all Somewhat Adequately Very well Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. They are consistent with those of UNSW.
2.
3.

2. To what extent are the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

Not at all Somewhat Adequately Very well Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. They were clear to follow.
2.
3.
3. To what extent are the assessment tasks and marking criteria appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

| 1. | They are consistent with UNSW assessment tasks for final year subjects. |
| 2. | |
| 3. | |

4. How do the assessment tasks and marking criteria compare with those of final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject from similar universities?

Consistent with UNSW.
Go8 Quality Verification System – Reviewer Evaluation Form

Date: 20 January 2017

1. To what extent did the materials provided for the QVS Review give you the information needed to undertake the Review? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

- Not at all
- Somewhat
- Adequately
- Very well
- **Completely**

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating:

1. All appropriate material provided.
2. 
3. 

2. What other information or materials would have helped you undertake the review more effectively and efficiently?

No further material required.

3. In your opinion, how effective is the current Go8 QVS process for monitoring and maintaining academic standards across universities?

- Not at all
- Somewhat
- Adequately
- Very well
- **Completely**

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating:

1. Peer review is an appropriate process.
2. 
3. 
4. What are the best aspects of the Go8 QVS process?

5. What in your view are the aspects of the Go8 QVS process that could be improved and how might this most feasibly be achieved?

This form is really terrible.

*The reviewer used an older version of the review form and comments have been transcribed onto this more updated form. In addition, the reviewer noted the following points:

- Compiling and de-identifying relevant materials was not overly time consuming and was very manageable.

- Providing an auto-populating form would be very useful.

- The QVS and QVS report is a very useful tool for the reviewer’s subject; this is because it is important to ensure there are similar levels across Go8 universities. The QVS is very effective in monitoring academic standards across institutions.
Reviewer Evaluation Form
Go8 Quality Verification System 2016

Date: 20 January 2017

Reviewer Details:
Name: TRACEY ROGERS
Home Institution: UNSW
Discipline area: BIOLOGY
Area of expertise: GENOMICS

Subject Review Coversheet¹
Prepare one of these reports for each subject or capstone project reviewed.

| Go8 University: | University of Sydney |
| Field of Education: | Biology |
| Home Subject reviewed (Subject Code): | BIOL3018/3918 – Gene Technology and Genomics |
| Sample size (number of student work items assessed): | 6 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assessments</th>
<th>Below Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed in total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with grade awarded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly high</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly low</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*3/6 students each 5 assessment tasks

¹ Adapted from the University of Cambridge’s report Coversheet for External Examiners (2009); www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf
Please tick one of the three options below that accords with your overall summary judgement of the subject you have reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments (optional)

If you wish, please include further comments which may be used by the associated Faculty or Department in marketing materials.
Go8 Quality Verification System – Discipline Review Form

Statement of potential conflicts of interest

For example, being involved in collaborative teaching, research or consultancy work with colleagues teaching in the subjects being reviewed, or recent transfer from the institution being reviewed.

No conflict, however this is not my specific area of expertise.

Review of specified learning objectives

1. To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

   Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. 
2. 
3. 

2. To what extent are the specified learning objectives appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

   Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. 
2. 
3. 
3. How do the specified learning objectives compare with those of final year or postgraduate subjects (as relevant) from similar universities?

They are consistent with those of UNSW.

Review of assessment tasks

1. To what extent are the assessment tasks suitable for the specified learning objectives? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Completely</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. They are consistent with those of UNSW.
2. 
3. 

2. To what extent are the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Completely</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. They were clear to follow.
2. 
3. 
3. To what extent are the assessment tasks and marking criteria appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Please list up to three reasons for making this rating*

1. They are consistent with UNSW assessment tasks for final year subjects.

4. How do the assessment tasks and marking criteria compare with those of final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject from similar universities?

Consistent with UNSW.
Go8 Quality Verification System – Reviewer Evaluation Form

Date: 20 January 2017

1. To what extent did the materials provided for the QVS Review give you the information needed to undertake the Review? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. All appropriate material provided.
2. 
3. 

2. What other information or materials would have helped you undertake the review more effectively and efficiently?

No further material required.

3. In your opinion, how effective is the current Go8 QVS process for monitoring and maintaining academic standards across universities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. Peer review is an appropriate process.
2. 
3. 
4. What are the best aspects of the Go8 QVS process?

5. What in your view are the aspects of the Go8 QVS process that could be improved and how might this most feasibly be achieved?

This form is really terrible.

*The reviewer used an older version of the review form and comments have been transcribed onto this more updated form. In addition, the reviewer noted the following points:

- Compiling and de-identifying relevant materials was not overly time consuming and was very manageable.

- Providing an auto-populating form would be very useful.

- The QVS and QVS report is a very useful tool for the reviewer’s subject; this is because it is important to ensure there are similar levels across Go8 universities. The QVS is very effective in monitoring academic standards across institutions.
Reviewer Evaluation Form
Go8 Quality Verification System 2016

Date: 27 January 2017

Reviewer Details:
Name: JESSICA VIVEN-WILKSCH
Home Institution: UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE
Discipline area: LAW
Area of expertise: PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW

Subject Review Coversheet

Prepare one of these reports for each subject or capstone project reviewed.

Go8 University: University of Sydney
Field of Education: Law
Home Subject reviewed (Subject Code): LAWS5017 – Private International Law
Sample size (number of student work items assessed): 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assessments</th>
<th>Below Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed in total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with grade awarded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Adapted from the University of Cambridge’s report Coversheet for External Examiners (2009); www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf
Please tick one of the three options below that accords with your overall summary judgement of the subject you have reviewed.

| The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate. |
| Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment. |
| The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate. |
| HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations. |
| There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed. |
| These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review. |

Comments (optional)

If you wish, please include further comments which may be used by the associated Faculty or Department in marketing materials.
Go8 Quality Verification System – Discipline Review Form

Statement of potential conflicts of interest

For example, being involved in collaborative teaching, research or consultancy work with colleagues teaching in the subjects being reviewed, or recent transfer from the institution being reviewed.

Review of specified learning objectives

1. To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

| Not at all | Somewhat | Adequately | Very well | Completely |

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. Groups 1&2: Long statements that could be more precisely to link with assessment piece (see recommendation);
   Group 3: No learning objective present on the documents available for review.
2. Groups 1&2: clear wording used;
   Group 3: learning objectives missing so no further comment to make here.
3. Groups 1&2: some aspects covered in topic outline could be brought into the learning outline;
   Group 3: learning objectives missing so no further comment to make here.

2. To what extent are the specified learning objectives appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

| Not at all | Somewhat | Adequately | Very well | Completely |

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. Groups 1&2: learning objectives require sophisticated reasoning appropriate for final year students;
   Group 3: not present.
2. Groups 1&2: learning objective demonstrate the need to draw upon previously acquired knowledge in a manner appropriate for final year students;
   Group 3: not present.
3. Groups 1&2: learning objectives are practically oriented and complex in a manner appropriate for final year students;
3. How do the specified learning objectives compare with those of final year or postgraduate subjects (as relevant) from similar universities?

It looks like Group 3 does not have access to learning objectives. Recommendations:

1) The learning objectives need to be reviewed to be present in all three student groups. This is essential for future reviews;
2) Learning objectives should be more precise to show particular skill is to be demonstrated / and therefore will be assessed;
3) Since not all parts of the course are assessed, this should be reflected in the learning objectives and not only in the reading list.

Review of assessment tasks

1. To what extent are the assessment tasks suitable for the specified learning objectives? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. Groups 1&2: problem based assessment required and used to demonstrate learning objectives achieved;
   Group 3: learning objectives not present but when compared with group 1&2, assessment suitable - also problem based.

2. Groups 1&2: complex scenario appropriate for this level of student;
   Group 3: compared to learning objectives in groups 1&2 - level of complexity comparable.

3. Groups 1&2 and 3: clear understanding and grasp of the course needed to complete the tasks satisfactorily.

2. To what extent are the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. Groups 1&2: presence of marking criteria for the course which provides broad understanding of how students will be marked;
3. **To what extent are the assessment tasks and marking criteria appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject?** (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

   - Not at all  
   - Somewhat  
   - Adequately  
   - Very well  
   - Completely

**Please list up to three reasons for making this rating**

1. Groups 1&2: lack of precise marking criteria adapted for to the subject. But equitable and fairly conducted process based on the sample of assessment provided;  
   Group 3: lack of marking criteria but feedback sheet after first assessment.

2. Groups 1&2: complex scenario appropriate for this level of student;  
   Group 3-compared to learning objectives of groups 1&2 -level of complexity comparable both require a clear understanding and grasp of the course.

3. Groups 1&2: one optional problem based question + one final problem based question. Possibility for students to miss on feedback;  
   Group 3: 2 assessments with one in class test is more appropriate for students to get feedback on.

4. **How do the assessment tasks and marking criteria compare with those of final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject from similar universities?**

   For the same course, there are different assessment and a lack of continuity. Recommendations:
   1) Assessment tasks should be make if not identical at least similar, i.e. 2 pieces of assessment instead of an optional one and one final task.
   2) Marking criteria should be made available to all student groups.
   3) Feedback on first assessment task should be made available to students.
Go8 Quality Verification System – Reviewer Evaluation Form

Date: 20 January 2017

1. To what extent did the materials provided for the QVS Review give you the information needed to undertake the Review? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. Provided sufficient number of documents to ensure the review is fairly conducted.
2. Broad spectrum of assessment pieces to review.
3. Easy to go through material. Key document helpful.

2. What other information or materials would have helped you undertake the review more effectively and efficiently?

Sample of teaching notes/PowerPoint to see how the course is taught to students. I am unsure whether students received or did not receive a feedback on the assessment. If they have, this should have been part of the review.

3. In your opinion, how effective is the current Go8 QVS process for monitoring and maintaining academic standards across universities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. Clear wording and questions for the reviewers
2. Time allocation of 2 weeks appropriate to complete task correctly
3. 
4. What are the best aspects of the Go8 QVS process?

- There is one QVS process.
- It ensures a benchmark level for all Go8 Universities
- It is interesting to compare the way subjects are taught in different Go8 Universities

5. What in your view are the aspects of the Go8 QVS process that could be improved and how might this most feasibly be achieved?

The format of the reviewer’s form needs to be changed to ensure no time is spent on formatting the document instead of the review itself.

While the reviewer understood the notion of learning objectives, their drafting etc. within a Go8 University it would be helpful to have a guide to ensure the reviewer’s understanding is on par with the QVS’s approach.

An important part of the student’s learning is the way the course is taught, a sample of material taught (picked at random and including a list or some samples on materials on LMS platform - PowerPoint slides, etc.) would be useful to better understand the philosophy behind the teaching approach.

The form should include another box for comments that do not fit in the form either due to space or wording of question.
Reviewer Evaluation Form
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Date: 12 January 2017

Reviewer Details:
Name: DR JUDITH BANNISTER
Home Institution: UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE
Discipline area: LAW
Area of expertise: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

Subject Review Coversheet

Prepare one of these reports for each subject or capstone project reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Go8 University</th>
<th>University of Sydney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field of Education</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Subject reviewed (Subject Code):</td>
<td>LAWS3480/5180 – Copyright and Designs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size (number of student work items assessed):</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assessments</th>
<th>Below Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed in total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with grade awarded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly high</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Adapted from the University of Cambridge’s report Coversheet for External Examiners (2009); www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf
Please tick one of the three options below that accords with your overall summary judgement of the subject you have reviewed.

| The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate. | X |
| Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment. |

| The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate. |
| HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations. |

| There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed. |
| These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review. |

Comments (optional)

If you wish, please include further comments which may be used by the associated Faculty or Department in marketing materials.
Go8 Quality Verification System – Discipline Review Form

Statement of potential conflicts of interest

For example, being involved in collaborative teaching, research or consultancy work with colleagues teaching in the subjects being reviewed, or recent transfer from the institution being reviewed.

None.

Review of specified learning objectives

1. To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

   Not at all       Somewhat       Adequately       Very well       Completely

   Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

   1. The subject objectives are very clearly and concisely stated. Students will find it easy to determine what it is they need to understand to complete the subject.

   2. I have allocated this rating because I have some concerns around sufficiency. Students are told that they should be able to understand and apply the relevant law, but it is not expressly explained in the objectives how students will be expected to demonstrate that understanding. For example, through the problem solving and research that is required in the assessment. The opportunity to demonstrate that understanding is certainly there in the subject and in the assessment, but not expressly stated in the objectives.

   3. The Objectives refer only to the copyright system – whereas the subject also covers designs, which should also be mentioned.

2. To what extent are the specified learning objectives appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

   Not at all       Somewhat       Adequately       Very well       Completely

   Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

   1. When considered in combination with the subject material and assessment, this subject in its entirety is completely appropriate for a final year subject. However, this question is confined to the “specified” learning objectives. I have chosen this rating because the objectives do not expressly refer to the expectations apparent in the assessment, or how students will successfully demonstrate
their understanding of copyright and designs law. However, this difference in approach may arise from the difference between “objectives” and “outcomes”. Please see comments below about the different uses of this terminology in the QVS documentation.

3. How do the specified learning objectives compare with those of final year or postgraduate subjects (as relevant) from similar universities?

Please see comments below about the need for comparative material to be included in the QVS documentation to properly answer the “similar universities” questions in relation to specified learning objectives/outcomes. In my experience, the specified learning objectives for this subject are quite consistent with the way objectives have been expressed over the years for this subject in similar universities. However, they may not be consistent with emerging terminology for the expression of “outcomes”.

Review of assessment tasks

1. To what extent are the assessment tasks suitable for the specified learning objectives? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. The specified objectives are that students understand and apply Australian copyright law, and understand the international copyright system and its impact upon Australian copyright law. The assessment tasks are completely suitable for the objective that students understand and apply copyright law.

2. It should also be noted that there was an opportunity in the exam to demonstrate and apply knowledge of Australian designs law, which was relevant to the subject although not expressly stated in the objectives.

2. To what extent are the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).
Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. The assessment tasks (and % value) are clearly stated in the subject outline.
2. The assessment grading guidelines (in the subject outline) clearly state the standard of work that is expected at each grade level. The marking criteria used (and set out in feedback sheet) for the exam are consistent with the grading guidelines.
3. The interim assessment instructions referred to the grading guidelines (in the subject outline). Additional guidance was provided in the interim assessment instructions (“what I am looking for”). This was consistent with the grading guidelines and provided specific guidance relevant to that assessment task.

3. To what extent are the assessment tasks and marking criteria appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. The assessment tasks and grading guidelines require students to: understand advanced legal concepts; apply those concepts to complex legal problems; and present well-structured and clearly expressed written analysis.
2. The optional interim assessment also requires students to demonstrate independent research.
3. 

4. How do the assessment tasks and marking criteria compare with those of final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject from similar universities?

The assessment tasks and marking criteria compare very well with final year intellectual property subjects from similar universities. Indeed, this course has the luxury of spending extra time on advanced legal concepts and detailed analysis of copyright and designs when compared with intellectual property courses in similar universities that also cover patents and trademarks.
Go8 Quality Verification System – Reviewer Evaluation Form

Date: 12 January 2017

1. To what extent did the materials provided for the QVS Review give you the information needed to undertake the Review? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

Not at all Somewhat Adequately Very well Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. It is not clear in this question whether the “materials provided” refer to the materials provided by the Faculty (which were completely satisfactory), or extends to the QVS document and form. If it is referring to the QVS document and form, then there is an inconsistency in terminology used throughout. The QVS document at times refer to “learning outcomes” when explaining the QVS system, but “learning objectives” when referring to the material the Faculty must provide for each subject. The instructions to the reviewer refer to “learning outcomes”, but the form then asks questions about “learning objectives”. For the purposes of this exercise I have treated the two terms as referring to the same thing, although I do not think they are. I note that the subject documentation refers to “objectives”.

2.

3.

2. What other information or materials would have helped you undertake the review more effectively and efficiently?

The form asks the reviewer to compare the specified learning objectives with those of final year subjects from similar universities. Years of teaching experience have equipped me with knowledge of teaching and assessment methods in a range of law schools, and it is that background that I relied upon to assess the subject materials and assessments. However, the drafting of learning objectives/outcomes and the specific linking of those outcomes to assessment methods is a more recent phenomenon. While a direct comparison with one institution (my own) was possible that was not what was being asked for. Comparative material on specified learning outcomes in a number of other similar subjects was required to answer this question effectively.

The QVS document states that the material sought for each subject being reviewed includes: “b. information on how the learning outcomes of this subject relate to the degree program level outcomes”. I can find no information on the degree program level outcomes in the material provided, but then it does not
not seem to be included in any of the question on this form either. It is not clear whether that ought to have been supplied and assessed.

3. In your opinion, how effective is the current Go8 QVS process for monitoring and maintaining academic standards across universities?

Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. This review seems to focus upon documentation of learning outcomes. If the purpose of the review is to monitor documentation of learning outcomes then that has been achieved, albeit with some confusion over the use of terminology.

2. The review is successful in monitoring grading of assessment.

3. The questions asked in this form do not enable the reviewer to consider in detail the standard of the subject overall – specifically subject content.

4. What are the best aspects of the Go8 QVS process?

The opportunity to review the assessment tasks and samples of graded papers. This was a very interesting exercise to compare another subject with my own assessment design and marking. It encouraged me to reflect upon my own subject when I was in the process of preparing to teach that subject.

5. What in your view are the aspects of the Go8 QVS process that could be improved and how might this most feasibly be achieved?

See comments above about the various inconsistent references to outcomes and objectives. The questions that require the reviewer to make comparisons based upon “similar universities” gives no indication about how that is to be done. A selection of outlines and learning outcomes from equivalent subjects in other Go8 universities would make that processes more transparent, rather than relying upon the “experience” of the reviewer.

A form that enables easy and stable entry of text into boxes (inside the lines!). Also – very little space is allowed for the reasons when rating the subject material – whereas there are comparatively large boxes for the QVS assessment.
Reviewer Evaluation Form
Go8 Quality Verification System 2016

Date: 13/2/2017

Reviewer Details:

Name: SARA BEAVIS
Home Institution: AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY
Discipline area: ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES
Area of expertise: HYDROLOGY, WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT, ENVIRONMENTAL GEOLOGY

Subject Review Coversheet

Prepare one of these reports for each subject or capstone project reviewed.

| Go8 University: | UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY |
| Field of Education: | ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES |
| Home Subject reviewed (Subject Code): | ENVI3112/3912 |
| Sample size (number of student work items assessed): | 36 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assessments</th>
<th>Below Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed in total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with grade awarded</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly high</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Adapted from the University of Cambridge’s report Coversheet for External Examiners (2009); www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf
Please tick one of the three options below that accords with your overall summary judgement of the subject you have reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments (optional)

If you wish, please include further comments which may be used by the associated Faculty or Department in marketing materials.

The academics who submitted material for this review should be congratulated for their efforts. The way the material was organised and presented was very helpful. The course design itself has prompted some thought on pedagogy, which has also been valuable.
Go8 Quality Verification System – Discipline Review Form

Statement of potential conflicts of interest

For example, being involved in collaborative teaching, research or consultancy work with colleagues teaching in the subjects being reviewed, or recent transfer from the institution being reviewed.

No conflict of interest

Review of specified learning objectives

1. To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

   Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  **Very well**  Completely

   Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

   1. The learning objectives are clearly articulated in the course outline and provide links to Faculty of Science Graduate Attributes.

   2. It is not specified which learning objectives are addressed by each of the assessment tasks. The assessments, however, appear to be aligned to the learning objectives.

   3. 

2. To what extent are the specified learning objectives appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

   Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely

   Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

   1. It is expected that students passing this course will have the environmental assessment knowledge and critical analytical skills required to undertake research or graduate entry employment. The emphasis on critical analysis in the assessment is indicative of the higher level of thinking expected of final year and graduate students.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. How do the specified learning objectives compare with those of final year or postgraduate subjects (as relevant) from similar universities?

By referencing a cross section of Australian University offerings of similar courses (Murdoch, UQ, ANU, UniSA, Newcastle and Charles Darwin), the specified objectives are comparable. There is an opportunity, however, to use stronger verbs to describe the learning objectives by using terms such as ‘evaluate’, or ‘critically assess/analyse’ rather than ‘appreciate’ or ‘think about’

Review of assessment tasks

1. To what extent are the assessment tasks suitable for the specified learning objectives? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

Not at all Somewhat Adequately Very well Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. I consider that the assessments are very closely aligned to the stated objectives. There were opportunities for students to work individually, within small discussion and research groups and individually on a written assignment requiring extensive engagement with the current literature. The structuring of the assessment, as well as its timing, suggests a sequential process of learning by which students acquire new knowledge and skills in a supported and supportive learning environment.

2. 

3. 

2. To what extent are the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

Not at all Somewhat Adequately Very well Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating
1. The assessment requirements are described in detail. The marking criteria are explained clearly, and specifically for each assessment. I would consider that the level of detail should leave no room for misinterpretation or ambiguity. The directions provided are highly prescriptive and supportive.

2. The amount of direction provided for the assessments is extensive. In some cases it is so extensive as to question how much independence is expected of students at this final year/graduate level. Although it can also be seen as an outstanding example of student support in learning.

3. One piece of information missing is how word limits would be handled. I noticed a very wide range in length of submitted work. In one case a paper with a word limit of 2000 words was nearly 9000 words long and the student was given a High Distinction, which seems inequitable, but cannot be interpreted as such if there is not a clear statement about word limits.
3. To what extent are the assessment tasks and marking criteria appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. Both the assessment and the marking criteria are certainly appropriate to final year or graduate students due to the requirement for students to engage in the critical analysis of complex, inter-linked natural and human systems from social, political and environmental perspectives. Question: if some of the same assessment tasks are taken by both final year and graduate students, would there be additional criteria for graduate students?

2. It is interesting to note that this course encourages students to acquire a complex of analytical skills by targeting a specific project (the T4 development). This focus is highly appropriate for students about to embark on future careers. It is apparent that the lecturers have used to advantage the diverse disciplinary backgrounds to inform the assessment structure, type and topic.

3. 

4. How do the assessment tasks and marking criteria compare with those of final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject from similar universities?

With reference to the same range of representative universities quoted in an earlier question, and as far as access makes it possible, the assessment tasks and marking criteria for this course compare very favourably. It is a strength of the course that, in contrast to other similar courses, ENVI3112/3192 does not rely on examinations, but places the emphasis on critical thinking, group activities emulating the workplace, and individual research.
Go8 Quality Verification System – Reviewer Evaluation Form

Date: 13/2/2017

1. To what extent did the materials provided for the QVS Review give you the information needed to undertake the Review? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. The amount of material provided was extensive: in total comprising more than 50 documents. The background information on the course and the assessments was very useful in undertaking the initial blind marking. The assessment instructions were very detailed, and left no doubt as to the expectations of the lecturers and markers.

2. One piece of information that seemed to be missing was the learning objectives for the group work (the major report). It was also not clear how the group activity was meant to be structured: I could only find information on how problems with group interactions would be managed, but not how groups were expected to operate (eg roles and responsibilities in research and reporting/writing).

3. 

2. What other information or materials would have helped you undertake the review more effectively and efficiently?

(See Q2 above). My own efforts at undertaking this review had less to do with the materials, for which the University of Sydney academics should be congratulated, than with the timing and access to those files. The timeline was not ideal for academics over the Xmas/New Year break who would be engaged in funding applications or preparing for early-commencement teaching. I fell into both categories.

3. In your opinion, how effective is the current Go8 QVS process for monitoring and maintaining academic standards across universities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The University of Western Australia
Monash University
The Australian National University
The University of Adelaide
The University of Melbourne
UNSW Australia
The University of Queensland
The University of Sydney
Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The outputs of and responses to the review will, I consider, inform its effectiveness as a process to monitor and improve. How will these be disseminated and acted upon? As this is a future measure, I have not marked a response (not at all – completely) to this section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Despite some issues (see Q 2 above), I consider this to be an effective process not just as a process by which academic standards in teaching and learning can be monitored, but also in generating new conversations by those academics engaged in the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. What are the best aspects of the Go8 QVS process?

The best part of the process is actually to use the review materials to reflect on one’s own pedagogical theory and practice. To explore another course in such detail, becomes an introspective and reflective exercise, which has the potential to be a very powerful initiator of change or consolidation. It is possibly a collaborative exercise in which those who review and/or are being reviewed gain as much as those who evaluate the outcomes.

5. What in your view are the aspects of the Go8 QVS process that could be improved and how might this most feasibly be achieved?

Improvements in the process, in my opinion, relate to logistics, not process. This refers specifically to timing, which should identify periods in which participating academics are less likely to have competing needs, on which their own performance depends, for their time.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer Details:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>SARA BEAVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Institution:</td>
<td>AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline area:</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of expertise:</td>
<td>HYDROLOGY, WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT, ENVIRONMENTAL GEOLOGY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject Review Coversheet

Prepare one of these reports for each subject or capstone project reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Go8 University:</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field of Education:</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Subject reviewed (Subject Code):</td>
<td>GEOS3014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size (number of student work items assessed):</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assessments</th>
<th>Below Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed in total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with grade awarded</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly high</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Adapted from the University of Cambridge’s report Coversheet for External Examiners (2009);  
www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf
Please tick one of the three options below that accords with your overall summary judgement of the subject you have reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments (optional)**

If you wish, please include further comments which may be used by the associated Faculty or Department in marketing materials.

The academics who submitted material for this review should be congratulated for their efforts. The way the material was organised and presented, with the exception of the exam, was very helpful. The anticipated difficulties associated with the formatting of the exam were acknowledged by the USyd academics, with apologies, and I shall comment on this in a later section.
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Statement of potential conflicts of interest

For example, being involved in collaborative teaching, research or consultancy work with colleagues teaching in the subjects being reviewed, or recent transfer from the institution being reviewed.

No conflict of interest

Review of specified learning objectives

1. To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

Not at all Somewhat Adequately Very well Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. The learning objectives (outcomes) are clearly articulated in the course outline and how they relate to the University of Sydney Faculty of Science Graduate Attributes is provided.

2. It is not specified which learning objectives (outcomes) are addressed by each of the assessment tasks. This would provide a clear directive to students, and others, of how the objectives and assessment are aligned. However, such alignment is evident when reviewing all the material.

3.

2. To what extent are the specified learning objectives appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

Not at all Somewhat Adequately Very well Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating
1. A list of learning outcomes, including specific skills, expected of students passing this course have been clearly articulated. These include skills that a graduate would need to undertake research/graduate entry employment in coastal management or in more general positions requiring advanced GIS skills. The emphasis on critical analysis, advanced practical skills and theoretical knowledge is appropriate for final year and graduate students.

2.

3.
3. How do the specified learning objectives compare with those of final year or postgraduate subjects (as relevant) from similar universities?

By referencing a cross section of Australian University offerings of courses in coastal management/science and GIS (UWA, UQ, Wollongong, Newcastle, JCU, Curtin, and Macquarie), it would appear that GEOS3014 at USyd is quite unique by combining these two areas of study into the one course and offering it at final year undergraduate level. The other university courses that I identified (and I concede that I may have missed courses that are very similar to USyd) are either part of Masters programs only, or, GIS and coastal management are discrete subjects. I am therefore unable to provide a comparative statement.

Review of assessment tasks

1. To what extent are the assessment tasks suitable for the specified learning objectives? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

Not at all Somewhat Adequately Very well Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. The assessments are very closely aligned to the stated objectives. The two reports required a very wide range of activities from students who needed to work independently and individually, as well as collaboratively with others. The work undertaken by students for the two reports required them to apply GIS skills, scientific knowledge of coastal processes and responses, as well as relevant planning theory. All of the learning required to complete these tasks are articulated as learning outcomes.

2. The third assessment, the exam, provided some indication of student’s overall understanding of general principles and concepts

3.

2. To what extent are the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

Not at all Somewhat Adequately Very well Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating
1. The assessment requirements are described in detail for the two reports. The set of directions are provided as a stepped progression, so that students would be in no doubt as to the sequence of work to be undertaken (provided as a series of detailed, numbered tasks), how marks would be allocated, and the relevant legislative tools and references to be accessed for successful completion of the report, the preferred structure of which is also provided.

2. The amount of direction provided for the assessments is extensive.

3. Information on how word limits are applied is not available. One report with a word limit of 2000 words was nearly 8000 words long and received a reasonable grade (upper level Distinction).
3. To what extent are the assessment tasks and marking criteria appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. The assessment and the marking criteria are both considered to be appropriate to final year or graduate students. The design of the course is framed around the specific statement that ‘a key learning outcome is an attitude shift whereby [the student starts to see themselves] as a professional rather than a student.’ The assessments require integration of research and application of spatial analysis of complex modified systems. The marking criteria are extensive and informative.

2. 

3. 

4. How do the assessment tasks and marking criteria compare with those of final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject from similar universities?

With reference to the same range of representative universities quoted in an earlier question, this appears to be a unique course in its integration of coastal management and GIS.
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Date: 13/2/2017

1. To what extent did the materials provided for the QVS Review give you the information needed to undertake the Review? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Please list up to three reasons for making this rating*

1. A total of 37 documents were examined as a part of this review. The supporting information on the course design and structure, as well as two pieces of assessments (the Marine report and the climate change report), was extremely useful in completing the first part of this review (learning objectives), and in undertaking the initial blind marking of those two assessments.

2. The formatting of the third piece of assessment made reviewing slow and difficult. This was anticipated by the academics submitting the material, but the problem could not be resolved as the assessment was online.

2. What other information or materials would have helped you undertake the review more effectively and efficiently?

This review process coincided with a period of intensive, conflicting time commitments. There were also a series of issues arising out of file corruption that limited timely access.

3. In your opinion, how effective is the current Go8 QVS process for monitoring and maintaining academic standards across universities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The University of Western Australia  Monash University  The Australian National University  The University of Adelaide  The University of Melbourne  UNSW Australia  The University of Queensland  The University of Sydney
1. The outputs of and responses to the review will, I consider, inform its effectiveness as a process to monitor and improve. How will these be disseminated and acted upon? As this is a future measure, I have not marked a response (not at all – completely) to this section.

2. Despite some issues (see Q 2 above), this is a useful process by which academic standards in teaching and learning can be explored and developed. I should also note the very positive opportunity it provides reviewers to reflect on their own teaching.

3.
4. What are the best aspects of the Go8 QVS process?

The best part of the process is actually to use the review materials to reflect on one’s own pedagogical theory and practice. To explore another course in such detail, becomes an introspective and reflective exercise, which has the potential to be a very powerful initiator of change or consolidation. It is possibly a collaborative exercise in which those who review and/or are being reviewed gain as much as those who evaluate the outcomes.

5. What in your view are the aspects of the Go8 QVS process that could be improved and how might this most feasibly be achieved?

The timing of this review process could be better considered, minimising the risk of placing additional loads on participants across the end-beginning of year period.
Reviewer Evaluation Form
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Date: 31 January 2017

Reviewer Details:
Name: Alan Reid
Home Institution: Monash University
Discipline area: Education
Area of expertise: Initial teacher education, curriculum renewal, research projects and teaching research

Subject Review Coversheet¹

Prepare one of these reports for each subject or capstone project reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Go8 University:</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field of Education:</td>
<td>MTeach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Subject reviewed (Subject Code):</td>
<td>EDMT6012_ProfessionalResearchProject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size (number of student work items assessed):</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assessments</th>
<th>Below Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed in total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with grade awarded</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Adapted from the University of Cambridge’s report Coversheet for External Examiners (2009); [www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf](http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf)
Please tick one of the three options below that accords with your overall summary judgement of the subject you have reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments (optional)

If you wish, please include further comments which may be used by the associated Faculty or Department in marketing materials.

---

The University of Western Australia  Monash University  The Australian National University  The University of Adelaide  The University of Melbourne  UNSW Australia  The University of Queensland  The University of Sydney
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Statement of potential conflicts of interest

For example, being involved in collaborative teaching, research or consultancy work with colleagues teaching in the subjects being reviewed, or recent transfer from the institution being reviewed.

Review of specified learning objectives

1. To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

- Not at all
- Somewhat
- Adequately
- Very well
- Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. There are aims and outcomes, but no objectives per se. Revisit whether topic areas could link to these directly?

2. 11 desired outcomes for any unit is simply a lot, and risks becoming a catalog of aspirations. Also, most are mapped to external standards, rather than Faculty, course or U of Sydney learning objectives. Missing a trick?

3. 

2. To what extent are the specified learning objectives appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

- Not at all
- Somewhat
- Adequately
- Very well
- Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. For a 12 credit point unit, the level of the desired outcomes are appropriate, and align with AQF course requirements.

2. My concern here is that they look like a scaled down version of a standard dissertation project, and to do justice to them (i.e., provide robust evidence to demonstrate they’ve been achieved), would require more work by students than a 12 credit point unit (largely unsupported by university staff) can realistically offer.
3. How do the specified learning objectives compare with those of final year or postgraduate subjects (as relevant) from similar universities?

As hinted at in my previous comments, I’m not convinced that this professional research project is quite there yet, particularly in terms of specified learning objectives that avoid it looking like an honours project masquerading as a professional research project (revisit the AQF categories?). This also raises questions about the demand and load on students (and whether they feel there is support in schools, and by uni staff) to be confident that the university is providing an appropriately challenging unit as part of their course, professionally and intellectually, as required to complete such a unit. In other words, I’d revisit the purposes and fit of the unit.

Review of assessment tasks

1. To what extent are the assessment tasks suitable for the specified learning objectives? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. These work with a standard model for tasks associated with a research project, but it isn’t quite as well aligned to professional aspects, e.g. the project could build partnership and capacity by working with schools on their research needs, and the communication of that (e.g. the presentation frames as infographic or poster, including responses from representatives of the schools/mentors/etc?) would better align with that?

2. A greater emphasis on recent/contemporary studies in the proposal literature review, including reviewing meta-analysis or review articles, would strengthen the alignment with intended outcomes, and 2nd and 3rd tasks.

2. To what extent are the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. These (especially grading criteria) could be linked back to the desired outcomes and clear statements of learning objectives in a narrative for each assessment tasks, rather than listed with a lot of overlap in the numbering in the unit guide: “Assessment tasks in this unit of study”. Also, I don’t suspect they are equally contributing in each task, nor offer a back up to students who don’t achieve a desired outcome by the end of the unit’s assessments.

2. The themes for the rubric / grading criteria for each task could be offered to the students in the unit guide, for transparency, and aligned to the desired outcomes. [Detail can be left to the rubric sheets]
### 3. To what extent are the assessment tasks and marking criteria appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

**Not at all**  | **Somewhat** | **Adequately** | **Very well** | **Completely**

*Please list up to three reasons for making this rating*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A simple pass [SR] / fail doesn’t allow for differentiation in achievement here. Also, if students want to continue with a research pathway, there is no way a reviewer will know how well the student did in their assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>While the online rubrics were supplied, the assessment criteria were not specified in the unit outline, nor tied back to those in the rubrics. Simple binaries don’t differentiate either on ‘meeting expectations’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The items on the PRP feedback sheet are primarily tied to meeting a standard, not the unit as a whole. How to sum across items isn’t explained to students either, e.g. on the project report, which items are key/relevant/crucial to the overall grade, and how better could a general comment relate to the unit goals and desired outcomes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. How do the assessment tasks and marking criteria compare with those of final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject from similar universities?

This is a very traditional model, culminating in a research report. Given a professional research project is about making improvements to practice, a focus on impact would be appropriate too as part of the marking criteria (reflecting unit introductory slides). A conference poster format could also tick off on many of the communication and interaction requirements, and more emphasis on deeper literature review before posing a research question/design always helps.
Reviewer Evaluation Form
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Date: 31 January 2017

Reviewer Details:
Name: Alan Reid
Home Institution: Monash University
Discipline area: Education
Area of expertise: Initial teacher education, curriculum renewal, research projects and teaching research

Subject Review Coversheet
Prepare one of these reports for each subject or capstone project reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Go8 University:</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field of Education:</td>
<td>BEd Common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Subject reviewed (Subject Code):</td>
<td>EDSE5010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size (number of student work items assessed):</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assessments</th>
<th>Below Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed in total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with grade awarded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly high</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Adapted from the University of Cambridge’s report Coversheet for External Examiners (2009); www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf
Please tick one of the three options below that accords with your overall summary judgement of the subject you have reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments (optional)
If you wish, please include further comments which may be used by the associated Faculty or Department in marketing materials.
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Statement of potential conflicts of interest

For example, being involved in collaborative teaching, research or consultancy work with colleagues teaching in the subjects being reviewed, or recent transfer from the institution being reviewed.

Review of specified learning objectives

1. To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. There are aims and outcomes, but no objectives per se. P.14 lists many tasks and only one appears to be linked to the outcomes.

2. 4 desired outcomes is a fair number. The presentation of the Australian Teacher Standards and Priority Areas would be better after a statement of learning objectives, and could be better aligned with the desired outcomes.

3. Where are the links to Faculty, course or U of Sydney learning objectives in the unit outline?

2. To what extent are the specified learning objectives appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. For a 12 credit point unit, the range and level of the desired outcomes are appropriate, and align with AQF course requirements.

2. However, they don't map onto much of the content specifically, or assessed tasks, or always link effectively to the standards and wider learning objectives possible for a final year / capstone subject, in this discipline.

3. More variety in verb clauses would be appropriate, e.g. not just 'demonstrate' (3 times) or 'show' (the only other), and other outcomes beyond understanding that can be demonstrated in the assignments?
3. How do the specified learning objectives compare with those of final year or postgraduate subjects (as relevant) from similar universities?

This unit doesn’t appear to develop a progressive and capstone approach for students on the theme of ‘Meeting the Needs of Cultural Diversity’ in the work and graduate capabilities of Education. It mainly provides a week-by-week issues-focused menu for looking at and understanding select theory and policies, through visitis, presentation, exposition, readings and critique, rather than, say, skills, competency, capability and capacity development. The intense schedule offers little opportunity to develop progressively in class the practical ways of meeting those needs, with outcomes and tasks that exemplify developing final year ‘collegial approaches’ (not just with fellow students/peers) and ‘reflective practice’, e.g. ATs 3 and 4 get a lot of coverage, but not other tasks.

Review of assessment tasks

1. To what extent are the assessment tasks suitable for the specified learning objectives? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. The total word count for this 12 credit unit is 12000, produced in 2 months. Surely this is too much?

2. P.14 of the outline doesn’t link the 6 separate tasks to the outcomes. There is also a lot of duplication in the ATS. The tasks and the associated don’t sufficiently align with demonstrating all the desired unit outcomes, e.g. 4.

3. commitment to lifelong learning, and 3. show an ability to plan for effective learning. Many seem to be about digesting content (e.g. readings, talks, visits, theory and constructs) than applying these to the work of a beginning or prospective teacher, or as preparation for life as a professional. More on this below.

2. To what extent are the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. These (especially grading and assessment criteria) could be better linked back to the desired outcomes and clearer statements of learning objectives to avoid mismatches (e.g. in AT2, on demonstrating research aspects).

2. AT4 makes sense in terms of clear explanation, but it seems a missed opportunity - so many words in reporting (3000) with so little of these on relevance or application to teaching (200), cf. a curriculum design exercise?

3. There are basic errors in mark sheets, e.g. in AT2, come instead of some, collegially when collegiality is meant.
3. To what extent are the assessment tasks and marking criteria appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

**Please list up to three reasons for making this rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>From my perspective, the load appears too high, the scope too broad, and the relevance too scattered in the assessment tasks, particularly to do justice to the desired outcomes, and what a final year subject could expect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>It could be to demonstrate, for example, application to professional practice through a portfolio activity, skills and capabilities development, and curriculum relevance for the subject discipline (On this, not just Australian Teaching Standards, but a vision of the graduate teachers going into and developing the profession, committed to enacting a social justice agenda they've worked up, rather than mainly understanding it). Criteria and tasks that are largely suited to a narrow range of academic literacies (reports and essays) is arguably a missed opportunity at this point in a student’s experience of a Go8 university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Teaching Standards, but a vision of the graduate teachers going into and developing the profession, committed to enacting a social justice agenda they've worked up, rather than mainly understanding it).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How do the assessment tasks and marking criteria compare with those of final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject from similar universities?

Not favourably is the short answer (more like penultimate year of BEd?). Two further comments: first, there is insufficient weight given to exemplifying skill and competence in using a (reasoned) range of research tools and approaches effectively (e.g. other theories, empirical research including practitioner inquiry on the topics); and second, coupled to this, critical depth to the core tasks aligned to the desired outcomes, because this is sacrificed to having simply so many of them, and so many topics to cover in the unit. In my view, this type of unit is crucial to a BEd, however, the QVC process would appear to suggest it isn’t as well served as it could be in this instance.
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1. To what extent did the materials provided for the QVS Review give you the information needed to undertake the Review? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. For these units, in general, the materials were sufficient and of appropriate quality for the task at hand.

2. Redactions weren’t consistent however, e.g. EDMT6012.Prop5 contained comments, while students names were part of the pdf bookmarks for all items.

3. EDMT6012_Report_2_Redacted was actually another proposal (EDMT6012.Prop) - the first task, not the third.

2. What other information or materials would have helped you undertake the review more effectively and efficiently?

Effectively: Access to evidence (e.g. from a VLE) of staff, student, or mentor and peer interactions to show how the unit guide is brought to life, so to speak. This could include selections of materials that show where the students found the activities ad tasks working well (e.g. from student mid- or end of unit evaluations of teaching and the unit), or were facing challenges (e.g. unit discussion boards). For the presentation component, a recording rather than the handout would be more appropriate.

Efficiently: perhaps move the whole process to something like an online journal article review system?

3. In your opinion, how effective is the current Go8 QVS process for monitoring and maintaining academic standards across universities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. ‘Very well’ isn’t grammatically correct, but it will do for the scale.

2. The process is clear and sensible, and allows comparison - a step forwards would be to try to compare ‘standard’ units across all Go8 members, e.g. final year research project units in education makes sense.

3.
4. **What are the best aspects of the Go8 QVS process?**

First, that it happens. Second, it is conducted at a good time of year. Third, non-Go8 universities would benefit from it too, while in the meantime, the point of difference could be exploited more? So I wonder if reporting summaries to the respective Councils of Deans would add to its value?

5. **What in your view are the aspects of the Go8 QVS process that could be improved and how might this most feasibly be achieved?**

I still see much of value in the external examiner processes in UK universities for monitoring and maintaining academic standards across universities - the personal aspect, the lively discussion and debate, it engenders, and the opportunities to talk back to reviewers, and avoid vested interests or closed shops developing if it is working well.
# Reviewer Evaluation Form
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**Date:** 30/01/17

## Reviewer Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Parshia Lee-Stecum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Institution:</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline area:</td>
<td>Classics and Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of expertise:</td>
<td>Roman culture, history and archaeology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Subject Review Coversheet

Prepare one of these reports for each subject or capstone project reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Go8 University:</th>
<th>The University of Sydney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field of Education:</td>
<td>090307 Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Subject reviewed (Subject Code):</td>
<td>ARCA3061 Research in Australasian Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size (number of student work items assessed):</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Number of assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assessments</th>
<th>Below Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed in total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with grade awarded</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Adapted from the University of Cambridge’s report Coversheet for External Examiners (2009); www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf
Please tick one of the three options below that accords with your overall summary judgement of the subject you have reviewed.

| The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate. | X |
| Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment. |
| The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate. |
| HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations. |
| There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed. |
| These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review. |

Comments (optional)

If you wish, please include further comments which may be used by the associated Faculty or Department in marketing materials.
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Statement of potential conflicts of interest

For example, being involved in collaborative teaching, research or consultancy work with colleagues teaching in the subjects being reviewed, or recent transfer from the institution being reviewed.

No conflict of interest.

Review of specified learning objectives

1. To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

   Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. Articulation of skills and knowledge appropriate to discipline.
2. Some outcomes are rather general/generic (would benefit from slightly more specificity).
3. 

2. To what extent are the specified learning objectives appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

   Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. SLOs are highly appropriate to level of unit and discipline overall.
2. The somewhat broad and generic phrasing of some SLOs might, arguably, apply to lower level units as well (e.g. 'exercise critical judgements and critical and creative thinking...').
3. 
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3. How do the specified learning objectives compare with those of final year or postgraduate subjects (as relevant) from similar universities?

The SLOs align with those of comparable final year/capstone units at similar universities in broad terms. However, some are more generic than similar units elsewhere (this is partly due to how the SLOs are phrased). Rephrasing to denote a more discipline-specific version of the skills and outcomes would more closely align with the subject's role as a final year/capstone unit focused on practical research methodologies.

Review of assessment tasks

1. To what extent are the assessment tasks suitable for the specified learning objectives? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. The assessment tasks appear very closely aligned with the SLOs.
2. I could not find any specific statement in the materials of how the assessment mapped to the various SLOs. However, this may be communicated to the students separately (?)
3. 

2. To what extent are the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. There is sufficient information for students to undertake the assessment tasks.
2. The broad, Departmental and University-wide grading criteria are very clear.
3. There is a lack of specific criteria for the marking of each assessment task. There are short descriptions but no detailed criteria. This may have been provided to students separately (?)
3. To what extent are the assessment tasks and marking criteria appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

Not at all    Somewhat    Adequately    Very well    Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. The assessment tasks are entirely appropriate for a final year/capstone subject in this discipline.
2. There is a lack of detailed information about marking criteria for specific tasks.
3. 

4. How do the assessment tasks and marking criteria compare with those of final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject from similar universities?

The assessment tasks align very closely with those in comparable discipline units at similar universities. The specific marking criteria for each task are difficult to judge due to the limited detail provided. However, there is nothing to suggest that the criteria applied do not align closely with those of final year/capstone units at similar universities.
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Date: 30/01/17

1. To what extent did the materials provided for the QVS Review give you the information needed to undertake the Review? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

   Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely

   Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

   1. The materials provided were extremely helpful.
   2. I suspect there may be further information that was provided to students (especially around assessment), perhaps through an online Learning Management System or similar (?).
   3. 

2. What other information or materials would have helped you undertake the review more effectively and efficiently?

   If possible, reviewer access to a limited version of the subject's online presence (e.g. LMS or similar) might expand the available information and enrich the evaluation. I understand that this would be challenging - not least because access to any information about student identities would need to be closed off. But it might be worthwhile exploring as an option for future review rounds.

3. In your opinion, how effective is the current Go8 QVS process for monitoring and maintaining academic standards across universities?

   Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely

   Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

   1. The process is beneficial as a simple quality check-up.
   2. The current process only reviews part of the picture in relation to overall academic standards.
   3. 

4. What are the best aspects of the Go8 QVS process?

Review and calibration of assessment standards.

5. What in your view are the aspects of the Go8 QVS process that could be improved and how might this most feasibly be achieved?

I would encourage exploration of either limited access to subject materials online (see my suggestion in regard to LMS, above) or a repository of materials online that reviewers can access. At the moment there seem to be too many email attachments sent back and forth (possibly passing through an unnecessary number of hands). I also found negotiation of the format of the pdf Reviewer's Evaluation Form a little clumsy - but that could be an indication of my own limited formatting skills!
Reviewer Evaluation Form
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Date: 30 April 2017

Reviewer Details:

Name: Dr Andrew Jamieson
Home Institution: The University of Melbourne
Discipline area: Classics and Archaeology
Area of expertise: Near Eastern Archaeology and Object-Based Learning

Subject Review Coversheet¹

Prepare one of these reports for each subject or capstone project reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Go8 University:</th>
<th>The University of Sydney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field of Education:</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Subject reviewed (Subject Code):</td>
<td>ARCA 3605 Dialogue of Civilizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size (number of student work items assessed):</td>
<td>5 Site Reports (SR), 5 Oral Presentations (OR, 5 Essays (ES))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assessments</th>
<th>Below Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed in total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with grade awarded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly high</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note: My comments on marks in the site reports and oral presentations are purely based on the slides supplied so I trust that the tutor’s assessment of the actual presentations were correct and well founded.

¹ Adapted from the University of Cambridge’s report Coversheet for External Examiners (2009); www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf
Please tick one of the three options below that accords with your overall summary judgement of the subject you have reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments (optional)

If you wish, please include further comments which may be used by the associated Faculty or Department in marketing materials.

I think the learning outcomes could be revised to better highlight the distinction between academic focused outcomes and those that are more based on transferable skills and capacities. Only around 20% of our students continue in this field of academia so giving them outcomes in a form that can be communicated to other areas (employers) is always a good idea.
Statement of potential conflicts of interest

For example, being involved in collaborative teaching, research or consultancy work with colleagues teaching in the subjects being reviewed, or recent transfer from the institution being reviewed.

- None

Review of specified learning objectives

1. To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).
   - Not at all
   - Somewhat
   - Adequately
   - Very well
   - Completely
   - Check mark

   Please list up to three reasons for making this rating
   
   1. As stated in my comments on the previous page they could be reorganised to academic and more transferrable outcomes
   2. They also could list some of the sources of archaeological evidence that students are becoming familiar with
   3.

2. To what extent are the specified learning objectives appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)
   - Not at all
   - Somewhat
   - Adequately
   - Very well
   - Completely
   - Check mark

   Please list up to three reasons for making this rating
   
   1. They show a requirement for source analysis which really is key at higher levels of archaeological research
   2. They highlight a progressive development of key competencies that is appropriate to a higher level of study
   3.
3. How do the specified learning objectives compare with those of final year or postgraduate subjects (as relevant) from similar universities?

The learning objectives are definitely pitched at the right level for final year students. The issue of transferable skills is one prevalued across higher education. This particular course is actually ahead of the curve in terms of highlighting a variety of skills-based outcomes, not just knowledge-based ones.

Review of assessment tasks

1. To what extent are the assessment tasks suitable for the specified learning objectives? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

Not at all                 Somewhat                 Adequately                 Very well                 Completely  

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. I can clearly see the connections between learning objectives and assessments both in terms of skills and knowledge

2. 

3. 

2. To what extent are the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

Not at all                 Somewhat                 Adequately                 Very well                 Completely  

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. There is a good indication of what is expected in terms of argumentation, analysis, and sources.

2. I wonder whether/how oral presentations might be marked differently to written assessments. For example, peer (student) assessment of oral presentations.

3. 
3. To what extent are the assessment tasks and marking criteria appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. They require students to use a variety of skills and do extensive independent research building on previous years of study.
2. 
3. 

4. How do the assessment tasks and marking criteria compare with those of final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject from similar universities?

They are excellent, definitely on par with other top tier universities
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Date: 19 May 2017

1. To what extent did the materials provided for the QVS Review give you the information needed to undertake the Review? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

   Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely  

   Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

   1. I found the oral presentations slightly difficult to assess purely on the basis of slides (PowerPoints)
   2. The subject guide is only one of many sources that students tap into for information - it would have been useful to see some other forms (LMS etc.)
   3. A grade distribution chart would have helped me better place the assessments I was given

2. What other information or materials would have helped you undertake the review more effectively and efficiently?

   Perhaps a print out of the LMS home screen (page) for the subject and some of the resources pages. Also a rough marking distribution chart for the class. I know the oral presentation issue is a difficult one to tackle, so not sure what the solution could be there.

3. In your opinion, how effective is the current Go8 QVS process for monitoring and maintaining academic standards across universities?

   Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely  

   Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

   1. It gives academics a chance to see what other universities with similar subjects/courses are doing
   2. It is undertaken by academics for academics so there is more understanding of the process of course coordination and the difficulties involved
   3. 
4. What are the best aspects of the Go8 QVS process?

The GO8 QVS process allows us to not only assess other subjects/courses, but also to consider our own programs in light of those we are assessing.

I can certainly think of some possible improvements to subjects/courses that I teach as a result of participating in this evaluation.

5. What in your view are the aspects of the Go8 QVS process that could be improved and how might this most feasibly be achieved?

More information would be useful. The course handbook is only one of the interfaces that students use to obtain information about the subject. Access to other sources, such as LMS could be useful in seeing what kinds of (on-line) resources the subject makes available.