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## 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apologies have been received from Nanda Jarosz and Professor Pip Pattison.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PROCEDURAL MATTERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Minutes of Previous Meeting</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Business Arising</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 2019 Meeting Dates</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STANDING ITEMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 Report of the Chair</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Report of Academic Board</td>
<td>Tony Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ITEMS FOR ACTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 Educational Services Agreements Policy 2017</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Academic Promotions Normative Criteria</td>
<td>Eric Knight &amp; Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ITEMS FOR NOTING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1 Higher Education Policy Quarterly Update, September 2018</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Educational Integrity Trend Report, Semester 1 2018</td>
<td>Peter McCallum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 Educational Integrity Decision-Making and Penalty Guidelines 2018</td>
<td>Peter McCallum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>OTHER BUSINESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1 Any Other Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next meeting: **2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 6 November 2018**  
Level 5 Function Room, F23 Administration Building

Respect is a core value of the Academic Board
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 by ensuring the body of academic policies and degree resolutions are internally consistent, incorporate the best ideas and are aligned with the strategic goals of the University.

2. To formulate, review and, as appropriate, recommend policies, guidelines and procedures relating to academic matters, particularly with respect to academic issues that have scope across the University, including equity and access initiatives.

3. To recommend to the Academic Board policy concerning the programs of study or examinations in any Faculty, University School 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 provide academic oversight of admissions, credit and recognition of prior learning in relation to domains 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.2.1, 5.2.2, 5.2.4, 6.3.1 (a), (b), (d), 6.3.2 (a), (d), (e), of the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015.

6. To provide academic oversight of research training in relation to domains 4.2.1 (a) – (e), and 6.3.1 (a), (b), (d), 6.3.2 (a), (d), (e), of the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015.

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 the University Executive to promote cross-referencing and discussion of matters relating to academic standards and policy.

9. To receive reports from, and provide advice to, the Deputy Vice Chancellors relating to the operation and effectiveness of policy in the areas of 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.
**ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY COMMITTEE**

2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 17 July 2018

Senate Room, Quadrangle (A14)

**Members of ASPC Present:** Professor Jane Hanrahan (Chair); Helen Agus (Science); Associate Professor Salvatore Babones (Academic Board); Professor Alan Fekete (Academic Board); Associate Professor Vincent Gomes (Engineering & IT); Imogen Grant (President, SRC); Kerrie Henderson (co-opted, Office of General Counsel); Nanda Jorsz (nominee of the President, SUPRA); Patty Kamvounias (Academic Board); Dr Adrienne Keane (Architecture, Design & Planning); Associate Professor Tony Masters (Chair of the Academic Board); Associate Professor Peter McCallum (Director, Educational Strategy) (for Pip Pattison); Professor Greg Murray (Dentistry); Associate Professor Maurice Peat (co-opted, Business); Associate Professor Alison Purcell (Health Sciences); Associate Professor Rita Shackel (Law).

**Members of the Admissions Sub-Committee Present:** Associate Professor Tim Wilkinson (Chair); Wencong Chai (Head of Admissions); Peter Finneran (nominee of Director, Student Recruitment); Sally Pearce (for Kubra Chambers); Associate Professor Michael Kertesz (Chair, Graduate Studies Committee); Mary Teague (Head, Widening Participation and Outreach).

**Attendees:** Linda Carmichael (Information Management Officer, Brand and Marketing Services); Dr Matthew Charet (Secretary); Dr Glenys Eddy (Committee Officer, University Secretariat); Dr Christopher Hartney (Member, Academic Board) (for Item 4.2); Associate Professor Eric Knight (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research - Enterprise & Engagement)) (for Item 5.1); Kathy Lynch (Acting Associate Director (Operations)) (for Item 5.1); Hugh O’Dwyer (Policy/Project Officer, Education Portfolio) (for Item 4.1).

**Apologies:** Kubra Chambers (Director, Institutional Analytics & Planning) (Admissions Committee, Sally Pearce attending instead); Dr Bret Church (Pharmacy); Professor Manuel Graeber (co-opted, Medicine); Professor Pip Pattison (Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)) (Associate Professor Peter McCallum attending instead); Associate Professor Jennifer Rowley (Conservatorium).

**UNCONFIRMED MINUTES**

1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The Chair welcomed members of the Admissions Sub-Committee, who were in attendance for Item 4.1, and members of the Academic Board, who were in attendance for Item 4.2.

The Committee also welcomed *in absentia* Weihong Liang as the new President of SUPRA.
2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

2.1 Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 22 May 2018 were approved as a true record.

Resolution ASPC18/4-1
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolved that the minutes of meeting 3/2018, held on 22 May 2018, be confirmed as a true record.

2.2 Business Arising

There was no business arising.

3 STANDING ITEMS

3.1 Report of the Chair

The Chair advised that she had nothing to report.

Resolution ASPC18/4-2
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the report of the Chair.

3.2 Report of Academic Board

The Chair of Academic Board advised that he had nothing to add to the written report.

Resolution ASPC18/4-3
The Academic Standards & Policy Committee noted the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 12 June 2018.

4 ITEMS FOR ACTION

4.1 Maths Prerequisites

The Director, Educational Strategy, spoke to this paper, advising that it finalises a proposal initially endorsed by the then-Admissions Committee in 2015 to mandate the satisfactory completion of HSC Mathematics for admission to specified undergraduate degrees. Members were informed that this requirement has been advertised to school students since 2016 and it is now necessary to amend the Coursework Policy 2014 and associated policy instruments accordingly. It is also necessary to determine arrangements for the operation of pre-requisites in Mathematics beyond those already advertised by the University, which currently apply only to students completing an Australian Year 12 qualification in 2018 seeking a place for 2019. It was noted in this connection that prerequisites will apply to all applicants from 2020. Decisions are needed about how students from educationally disadvantaged backgrounds, students transferring or entering on the basis of prior tertiary study, and students applying on the basis of preparation programs and other qualifications will be handled. The possibility of providing a ‘bridging course’ option (with maths support during candidature) to enable access by disadvantaged students was also proposed, and making MATH1111 available as a MOOC from November 2018 may also help address this (although requiring completion of a MOOC may reduce applications by in effect imposing an additional entry step). Discussion is ongoing about the extension of the prerequisite to international students (acknowledging that students require extended notice before implementation to ensure they can select appropriate subjects).

In discussion, the University Policy Manager drew the attention of members to the proposed amendment of the Coursework Policy 2014 to enable the Academic Board to set standards for admission. Mechanisms for student support were discussed, including whether the proposed MOOC is available on a fee-paying basis or free of charge and whether the Mathematics Learning Centre had sufficient resources to accommodate those who may need additional support. The types of mathematics or statistics that might be necessary to succeed in particular courses was also raised, with a question as to whether calculus is essential for some degrees and whether statistics-focused skills might be more helpful in some disciplines. In proposing multiple mechanisms for students to demonstrate that they have the required mathematics skills (including completion of a bridging course, 1000-level or Table A Maths during their early candidature), it
was questioned as to how these completions will be monitored and what consequences there will be if a course is not completed to the required standard (considering that the student has already been admitted to the degree).

Associate Professor Babones expressed concern regarding “essentialising” disadvantaged students by providing specific exemption for them, and he moved that the proposed pathway for disadvantaged students be extended to all applicants; Ms Chai concurred and advised that the Admissions Office has been suggesting this since the proposal was first discussed in 2015. The Director, Educational Strategy advised that deans (who have delegation to admit students) had rejected a “one size” approach and that this would effectively render obsolete the University’s advertised prerequisite requirement with potentially severe reputational impact and possibly opening the University to legal action by students who have jeopardised their ATAR by attempting a higher level of maths than they would have otherwise. The motion was put to the vote, with ten members for and seven against; it was therefore narrowly supported.

It was agreed that a revised version of the proposal would be circulated for endorsement before progression to the Academic Board.

[Note: Subsequent to the meeting, the Chair Admissions Sub-Committee, Chair Academic Standards & Policy Committee, Chair Academic Board and Director, Educational Strategy, agreed that the change proposed by the committee to extend the clause extending pathways for disadvantaged students to all who do not meet pre-requisites needs more examination for its impact, and it was agreed to withdraw this component from the proposal. An amended version of the proposal – excluding this provision – was circulated to members for endorsement on 24 July, and no objections were raised to its endorsement. The circulated version of the proposal will therefore be presented to the Academic Board for approval.]

**Resolution ASPC18/4-4**

The Academic Standards and Policy Committee endorsed an amended proposal pertaining to changes arising from the implementation of mathematics prerequisites.

**4.2 Educational Services Agreements Policy 2017**

Time did not permit this item to be discussed in detail and it was agreed to hold over discussion to the next meeting. In brief, matters for consideration include whether this policy needs to be more comprehensive or is fundamentally misguided, acknowledging that it does not exist in isolation and that several service agreements are already in place (with Singapore Institute of Management and Taronga Zoo). Members wishing to provide feedback before the next meeting were invited to do so via the Secretary.

**Resolution ASPC18/4-5**

The Academic Standards & Policy Committee agreed to hold over detailed discussion of this item to the next meeting.

**5 ITEMS FOR NOTING**

**5.1 Academic Promotions Normative Criteria**

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research - Enterprise & Engagement) informed members that in a shifting research funding landscape, academic demonstration of engagement and impact is becoming increasingly important. In late 2017, the Academic Board and UE Heads of School Committee discussed possible updates to academic promotion criteria to include criteria for impact and engagement, and a more structured discussion took place at the UE Heads of School Committee meeting of 21 June 2018 regarding specific elements of the proposal. An earlier version had previously been considered by the UE Heads of School, Education and Research Education Committees, with feedback from these bodies incorporated into the current paper. Through the consultation phase, it was agreed that engagement contributes to teaching, research and service and is not separate from these core activities; hence, the development of amended normative criteria incorporating engagement within the existing categories.

In discussion, members were advised that online training will be available to applicants as well as panel members to guide interpretation of the criteria, and that communication is planned regarding the changes. Clarification was sought as to how the new process is intended to modify
current behaviour, and how this will be rolled out. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research - Enterprise & Engagement) emphasised that the promotions process prompts a conversation between applicants and their supervisors, but that the process alone does not complete this conversation. Initiatives at school and faculty level are also vital, as are those emerging from central portfolios such as Research and Education. Associate Professor Fekete expressed his strong objection to the fact that the Academic Board is not the approving authority for academic promotion criteria and recommended that the Academic Board should express its dissatisfaction with this state of affairs. The University Policy Manager advised members that the Academic Board has never had authority to determine policy in this area.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research - Enterprise & Engagement) advised that the paper would be updated to include the current feedback before it is presented to the August meeting of the Academic Board for discussion, and that a final version would come back to the next meeting of the Committee for endorsement.

Resolution ASPC18/3-7

The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the changes to the normative criteria and additional criteria (within the Academic Promotions Procedures document) that includes information that explicitly acknowledges the work academics undertake around research engagement.

6 OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 Any Other Business

Ms Kamvounias asked whether items submitted to the Academic Quality Committee are also expected to be presented to the Academic Standards & Policy Committee. It may be helpful to discuss at a future meeting the distinction between academic standards and academic quality.

There being no further business, the meeting ended at 4:08pm.

Next meeting: 2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 11 September 2018
Senate Room, Quadrangle.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Quality Committee note the 2019 meeting schedule for the Academic Board and committees, as presented.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At its meeting of 27 June 2018, Senate approved its 2019 meeting schedule. To align with the proposed Senate meeting dates and with other University and governmental deadlines, the 2019 meeting schedule for the Academic Board and its standing committees is set out below. This schedule was approved by the Academic Board at its meeting of 7 August 2018, with the exception of the 3 September meeting of the Academic Board and the 26 September meeting of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies, which have been adjusted since presented to the Academic Board.

The Academic Board is to meet on Tuesday from 2pm-4pm on the following dates:
- 5 March (agenda distribution 19 February)
- 16 April (agenda distribution 2 April)
- 4 June (agenda distribution 21 May) [this is the final meeting for 2020 course approvals]
- 23 July (agenda distribution 9 July)
- 3 September (agenda distribution 20 August)
- 5 November (agenda distribution 22 October)

The Admissions Sub-Committee is to meet on Tuesday from 2pm-4pm on the following dates:
- 26 February
- 9 April
- 28 May
- 18 July
- 24 September
- 3 December

The Academic Quality Committee is to meet on Tuesday from 2pm-4pm on the following dates:
- 5 February
- 12 March
- 30 April
- 18 June
- 6 August
- 8 October

The Academic Standards & Policy Committee is to meet on Tuesday from 2pm-4pm on the following dates:
- 12 February
- 19 March
- 7 May
The Graduate Studies Committee is to meet on Tuesday from 10am-12pm on the following dates:
- 5 February
- 12 March
- 30 April [this is the final meeting for 2020 course approvals]
- 18 June
- 6 August
- 8 October

The Undergraduate Studies Committee is to meet on Tuesday from 10am-12pm on the following dates:
- 12 February
- 19 March
- 7 May [this is the final meeting for 2020 course approvals]
- 25 June
- 13 August
- 15 October

The Board of Interdisciplinary Studies is to meet from 2pm-4pm on the following dates:
- Wednesday 20 February
- Wednesday 10 April [this is the final meeting for 2020 course approvals]
- Wednesday 29 May
- Wednesday 17 July
- Thursday 26 September
- Wednesday 11 December (for first USC in 2020)

The dates of calls for agenda items, close-off for receipt of agenda items and agenda distribution will be publicised via the appropriate committee website.
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 7 August 2018.

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 17 July 2018 and:

• approved the amendment of the Coursework Policy 2014 to enable the Academic Board to approve the setting of prerequisites for admission to award courses and approve the introduction of Admissions Prerequisites Standards – Mathematics; and
• discussed the amendment of Academic Promotions Normative Criteria, as presented.

Items related to the Academic Quality Committee
The Academic Board noted the report from the meeting of the Academic Quality Committee held on 10 July 2018 and:

• noted the issues and initiatives outlined in the report ‘Towards an Institutional Response to Contract Cheating’.

Items related to the Graduate Studies Committee
The Academic Board noted the report from meeting of the Graduate Studies Committee held on 17 July 2018 and:

• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to introduce the Master of Professional Engineering (Accelerated); approved the introduction of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from the proposal; and agreed to recommend that Senate approve the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate for the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies, with effect from 1 January 2019; and
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the admission requirements for the Master of Speech Language Pathology and amend the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2019.

Items related to the Undergraduate Studies Committee
The Academic Board noted the report from meeting of the Undergraduate Studies Committee held on 10 July 2018 and:

• approved the amendment of the Resolutions of Faculty for the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies, with effect from 1 January 2019;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering (Honours) (Chemical and Biomolecular) and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2019;
Non-Confidential

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Advanced Computing and Bachelor of Science Table A and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2019;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering (Honours) and Bachelor of Commerce and approved the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2019; and
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering (Honours) and Bachelor of Arts and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2019.

Other matters
The Academic Board also:
- received a presentation from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) and the Deputy Dean (Business School) on strategies for improving education performance;
- approved changes to the membership of the Academic Board and committees;
- approved the 2019 meeting dates for the Academic Board and its committees;
- received and noted the Reports of the Chair and of the Vice-Chancellor;
- received and noted reports from the student members of the Academic Board;
- noted the process and timelines for the election of student members of Senate, faculties, faculty boards, University schools, University school boards and the Academic Board, and of staff members to the faculty board for the Faculty of Medicine and Health;
- noted changes to the membership of the Academic Panel 2018-2020;
- approved the amendment of the Resolutions of Faculty for the Sydney Conservatorium of Music; and
- approved the 2019 Academic Calendar for the Faculty of Health Sciences.

The agenda pack for the 7 August 2018 meeting of the Academic Board (excluding confidential items) is available from: sydney.edu.au/secretariat/pdfs/academic-board-committees/AB/2018/20180807-AB-Agenda-Pack.pdf

Associate Professor Tony Masters
Chair, Academic Board
Recommending that the Academic Standards & Policy Committee discuss the Educational Services Agreements Policy 2017.

Executive Summary

At a recent meeting, the NTEU passed a motion calling for the University to develop a policy on Education Agreements, to govern situations like the discussion with the Ramsay Centre for Western Civilisation to fund an award course offered by the University (as mentioned by the Vice-Chancellor at recent meetings of the Academic Board). At the October 2017 meeting of the Academic Board, the attached Educational Services Agreements Policy 2017 was approved for introduction, and members are invited to consider whether the policy should be reviewed to include consideration of issues raised by the current discussion.
EDUCATIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENTS POLICY 2017

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

Dated: 10 October 2017 (commencing 24 October 2017)

Last amended: 25 October 2017 (administrative amendment only)

Signature:

Name: Professor Philippa Pattison
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1 Name of policy

This is the Educational Services Agreements Policy 2017.

2 Commencement

This policy commences on 24 October 2017.
3  **Policy is binding**

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

4  **Statement of intent**

This policy:

(a) facilitates the expansion and dissemination of knowledge through academic collaboration; and

(b) provides for quality assurance of educational services provided in collaboration with, or on the University’s behalf by, other parties.

5  **Application**

(1) This policy applies to:

(a) the University, staff and affiliates; and

(b) except as provided in this policy, all educational services agreements, and proposals for such agreements

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

   **Note:** See clause 12.

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

6  **Definitions**

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

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

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

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

   **dean** includes Head of School and Dean of a University school.
educational services means any of:
- formulating the content or curriculum of an award course;
- facilitating, delivering or overseeing learning activities;
- assessing the performance of students.

faculty includes University school.

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

research agreement has the meaning given in the Research Agreements Policy 2011 which, as at the date of this document is:

agreement under which the University will undertake original investigation with the aim of generating new knowledge as a principal or incidental activity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 Principles

(1) Where:

(a) another party provides education or research training for or on behalf of the University under an educational services agreement; and
(b) that education or research training contributes to an award issued by the University,

the University accepts full accountability for the standards and quality of the education or research training provided.

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

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

Note: See clause 8 of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

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

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

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

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

and
(vii) registered in the University contracts register maintained by Archives and Records Management.

(8) Except in as provided in clauses 12 and 13 in relation to student placement agreements or research agreements, negotiations for establishment of potential educational services agreements must not begin before an expression of interest is approved as specified in clause 9.

8 Memoranda of understanding

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

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

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


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

## 9 Expressions of interest for potential agreements

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

(2) An expression of interest must be provided in writing and must:

(a) specify:
   (i) the proposed parties;
   (ii) the proposed agreement sponsor;
   (iii) the activities to be covered by the agreement;
   (iv) the proposed duration of the agreement; and
   (v) key performance indicators for success;

(b) explain:
   (i) the benefits of the proposed agreement;
   (ii) how the agreement would align with the University's strategic priorities; and
   (iii) the likely cost of the proposed arrangement;

and


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

(a) consistency with the principles set out in clause 7;
(b) consistency with the University's statutory object and strategic objectives;
(c) the likely cost and benefit of the proposed agreement to the University;
(d) consistency of the risk assessment with the University [Risk Appetite and Tolerance Statement](https://www.sydney.edu.au/corporate/governance/documents/declarations/risk-appetite-tolerance-2017.html); and
(e) the reputation of each of the other proposed parties;
10 Establishing and renewing agreements

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

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

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

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

11 Quality assurance and responsibilities

(1) The agreement sponsor is responsible for:
(a) obtaining approval for the initial expression of interest, if required;
(b) registering the agreement in the University contracts register;
(c) monitoring the implementation of the agreement during its term, against the University’s standards and expectations for education and research;
(d) reviewing the success of the agreement at its conclusion, against its stated purpose and benchmarks;
(e) monitoring student experience during the term of the agreement;
(f) arranging for student experience to be measured through surveys or other appropriate instruments each time a course is offered;
(g) reporting on the implementation of the agreement, including but not limited to student experience, as directed by the relevant dean; and
(h) in February each year, providing a written report to the relevant dean on activity undertaken under each agreement for which they are responsible.

(2) The relevant dean is responsible for:
(a) reviewing reports from agreement sponsors; and
(b) in March each year, providing a written report to the faculty leadership group and faculty board on activity undertaken pursuant to educational services agreements for which the faculty is responsible.

(3) **The faculty board** is responsible for:

(a) reviewing reports from the dean; and

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

(4) **The relevant delegate** is responsible for:

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

(b) reviewing reports from deans; and

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

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

**Note:** See clause 13.

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

(a) reviewing reports from delegates;

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

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

(7) **The Academic Board** is responsible for:

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

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

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

(ii) the University Executive;

(iii) any other relevant Deputy Vice-Chancellor;

(iv) any dean.

12 **Student placement agreements**

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

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

13 **Research agreements**

(1) Provided that they comply with the requirements of this clause, research agreements are not required to comply with the remainder of this policy.
(2) If a research agreement contains provisions relating to the provision of research training, the relevant delegate must not approve the agreement until the research training provisions have been endorsed by the Director of Graduate Research or the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).

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

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

14 Transitional provision

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

15 Rescissions and replacements

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

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

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

The amended normative criteria for performance at each academic level (Section 4 of the Academic Promotions Procedures 2015) and Schedule 2 (Criteria at Levels A-E) includes information that explicitly acknowledges the work academics undertake around research engagement – for noting by the Academic Standards and Policy Committee regarding.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the changes to the normative criteria (within the Academic Promotions Procedures document) that includes information that explicitly acknowledges the work academics undertake around research engagement.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

One change that can assist the University achieve the objectives of growing the number of academic staff engaged in engagement activities; have deeper relationships with large partners in multi-project, multi-disciplinary research and teaching engagements; and create a culture that shares and celebrates success in research/teaching enterprise and engagement activities is to address the promotions criteria to encourage changes in the focus of staff engaged in research.
CONSULTATION

Over the last several months discussions have been held with Heads of Schools and at the Academic Board to canvas views on this approach. In particular two options were developed together with various changes to the Academic Promotions Procedures and Promotions Guidelines: one which treated “engagement” as a new, additional category within promotions, and a second which embedded it more explicitly within the core mission of research and teaching activity. As a result of the feedback received, the second option was identified as the preferred go-forward option.

Submissions from across the university community were considered in terms of how “engagement” is defined and reflected within the various changes to Academic Promotions Procedures and Promotions Guidelines, as well as other programs affected. After reviewing these submissions, feedback received at UE Education, HoS and Research, and based on consultations, the amended criteria was put forward as a package of changes at the whole-of-university level to give recognition to engagement activity for consideration by the ASPC.

The ASPC committee requested that the criteria be presented in track changes to more clearly map the amendments made during the lengthy consultation process. The document was amended and then presented at the Academic Board meeting (in track changes) on 7 August as follows:

1. Academic Promotion Procedures document, with Section 4, Normative criteria for performance at each academic level, presented in track changes. What was previously presented as schedule 2 (Focused role expectations) was incorporated back into Section 4, Normative criteria.

2. Additionally, an excerpt from Section 4, Normative criteria for performance at each academic level, Sections 6-10, criteria at Levels A – E, is now presented as Schedule 2, to the procedures document, in table format.

After discussion at the Academic Board meeting, Associate Professor Knight invited AB members to email their concerns with the amended criteria for consideration and incorporation where relevant, into a further amended document to be presented at ASPC. Academic Board members were also invited to attend the ASPC meeting.

This amended criteria document does not preclude additional initiatives at the faculty and school level; indeed, this is actively encouraged.

IMPLEMENTATION

These promotions are planned to be implementation as of 2019. The following initiatives are proposed:

Changes to Promotions Procedures and Promotions Guidelines
- Edits and restructuring to the normative criteria in the Promotions Procedures (Schedule 1).
- Additional criteria for research-focussed and GLE focused roles (Schedule 2).
- Promotions Applicant Guidelines will be updated based on the above endorsed amendments.

Aligning of AP&D discussions to embed engagement
- Engagement will be aligned into AP&D discussions, embedded into the current domains within the online system and called out in the relevant document. AP&D discussions will be guided to differentiating between engagement activities contributing to the research, teaching, or service missions of the academic under discussion. This will be done in collaboration with the Office of Workforce Development, and will come into effect in 2019.

Committee (LPC) training
- Online training (20 minutes maximum) will be prepared for all members of LPC. This will give context to engagement within the broader context of the application overall. This is intended to improve consistency of approach amongst LPCs. This will be done in collaboration with the Office of Workforce Development, and will be available in 2019.

University-wide training to staff about engagement
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- The university will run an appropriate communications plan during 2018 and 2019 to educate staff on the changes, and make the changes accessible online.

COMMUNICATIONS

This process relates to promotion criteria. However, the overall endeavour of improving industry, government, and community engagement needs to be supported by the university as a whole. The initiatives highlighted above are just one dimension, and complement existing initiatives. Activities as diverse as resource planning (to ensure sufficient time is available to carry out these endeavours) through to infrastructure design (to ensure there are appropriate spaces available that are compatible with industry engagement) and embedded Business Development Managers need to be working in unison to support academics and our mission.

ATTACHMENTS

2. Criteria Comparison
3. ASPC Collated feedback
1 Purpose and application

(1) These procedures are to give effect to the Academic Promotions Policy 2015 (“the policy”).

(2) These procedures apply to:

(a) all academic staff employed by the University on a continuing or fixed term contract basis; and

(b) all applications for promotion of such academic staff.

(3) Section 4 of these procedures, Normative criteria for performance at each academic level, provide a guide as to University expectations and set out the generic attributes and responsibilities for each academic level. Within these levels staff undertake particular roles which may vary over time and over the course of a career and the University recognises that not all criteria will be met. The criteria should be read in conjunction with the Academic Promotions Policy 2015, Schedule 2, Minimum standards required for academic promotion.

2 Commencement

These procedures commence on 1 January 2016.
3 Interpretation

(1) Words and phrases used in these procedures and not otherwise defined in this document have the definitions they have in section 6 of the policy.

(2) In relation to clause 4 of these procedures:

**ERA** means *Excellence in Research Australia*, a report on research activity in Australian higher educational institutions compiled annually by the Australian Research Council.

**faculty** includes University school.

**will** means that staff at the relevant level are expected to meet this requirement.

**may** means that some but not all staff at the relevant level would meet this requirement.

**will normally** means that staff at the relevant level are expected to meet this requirement, but that compelling reasons in individual cases or the requirements of specific disciplines may mean that it is not met.

**will, where appropriate** means that staff at the relevant level are expected to meet this requirement where it is appropriate to their discipline.

4 Normative criteria for performance at each academic level

(1) **All academic staff** are expected to have the following generic attributes and responsibilities:

(a) will normally hold a relevant higher degree for appointment at Level A;

(b) will normally hold a PhD or other higher professional qualifications appropriate to their discipline for appointment at Level B or above;

(c) will develop expertise in either or both of teaching and research with an increasing degree of autonomy (for example, through enrolment in appropriate courses or workshops);

(d) will carry out the duties assigned to them under their school or faculty workload provisions, as appropriate to their academic level;

(e) will be actively engaged in research and scholarship;

(f) will disseminate their knowledge and expertise in education and their research skills as appropriate to their role and academic level;

(g) will be involved in both formal and informal staff or other mentoring programs, including beyond the University where relevant and appropriate;

(h) will engage in continuing professional development;

(i) will be institutionally engaged as a member of the University community through participation in committees, administrative duties and governance at...
any or all of school, faculty or University level, as appropriate to their role and academic level;

(j) will interact with staff and students in a professional and collegial manner;

(k) will seek to engage, with the wider community where appropriate, through research or education related activities with industry, government or community partners;

(l) will, where appropriate, engage in translational research with a view to establishing building strong, sustained partnerships with external organisations with outputs such as research and development, commercialisation, improved practice and policy development;

(m) will seek to use their expertise to inform the general public or engage in public debate on key issues of public importance, where appropriate and consistent with University policy.

(2) **Staff in education-focused roles** are expected to:

(a) devote most of their effort to excellence in, and contribution to, teaching;

(b) contribute to research in either their discipline or the pedagogy of their discipline;

(c) be building (at junior levels) and to have achieved (at senior levels) national and international reputations for their contributions to pedagogical issues within their discipline and more broadly; and

(d) to have a record of success in competitive grant applications or teaching awards; and

(e) may, where appropriate, demonstrate teaching engagement, for example through curricula involving industry, government or community, where appropriate partners.

(3) **Staff in research-focused roles** are expected to:

(a) devote most of their effort to research in their discipline;

(b) participate in teaching through supervision and instruction of postgraduate students, interaction with honours students or limited instruction to undergraduate students;

(c) be building (at junior levels) and to have achieved (at senior levels) national and international reputations for their research; and

(d) may, where appropriate, demonstrate sustained engagement, for example through research impact activities with industry, government or community, where appropriate.

(e) (d) to have a record of success in competitive external grant applications.

(4) **Staff applying on the basis of governance, leadership and engagement focus** are expected to:

(a) devote a significant proportion of their effort and focus on governance, leadership, engagement activities; and

(b) demonstrate sustained engagement over a substantial period of time in governance and significant leadership roles with one or more of the University, faculty, school, discipline or community; and
(c) may, where appropriate, demonstrate sustained engagement with industry, government or community or business organisations, where appropriate;

(d) (e) demonstrate meaningful quality outcomes from these activities that provide benefit to the University; and

(e) (d) provide evidence of the impact these activities have had in limiting achieving outcomes within their teaching and research portfolios.

Note: This stream applies only to applications for promotion to Level D or E. See clause 7(5) of the policy.

(5) The specific normative criteria for Level A to E staff are set out in subclauses 4(6) to 4(10), and summarised in the table in Schedule 2.

(5)(6) Level A staff:

(a) will undertake administration primarily relating to their activities;

(b) may supervise research students at undergraduate level;

(c) may be mentored in a formal University mentoring program;

General expectation:

(i) will normally work under supervision of staff at Level B or above, with an increasing degree of autonomy as they gain skill and experience;

(ii) may be pursuing education and professional development opportunities to enhance their expertise and professionalism in higher education.

(b) Education and education engagement: may supervise research students at undergraduate or honours level;

(c) Research and research engagement:

(i) (e) will normally conduct research or scholarly activities under limited supervision either independently or as a member of a team;

(ii) (f) may, where appropriate, where appropriate, be involved or mentored in translational research with a view to external collaboration and establishing partnerships with outputs such as research and development, commercialisation, improved practice and policy;

(d) Governance, leadership and or engagement:

(i) will undertake administration primarily relating to their activities;

(ii) may be mentored in a formal University mentoring program;

(iii) may participate in external activities related to the discipline or profession.

(6)(7) Level B staff:

(a) (6) General expectation:

(i) will contribute to any or all of research, scholarship or teaching, either independently or as part of a team, through professional practice and expertise;
(i) (ii) may be pursuing education and professional development opportunities to enhance their expertise and professionalism in higher education.

(b) will co-ordinate or lead the activities of other staff as appropriate to their discipline;

(b) Education and education engagement:

(i) will be involved in evaluating teaching and learning, both at the program level and in relation to their own practice;

(d) may be engaged in research evaluation and in the assessment of their own research practice through participation within the University or their discipline, whether as reviewer or subject of review;

(e) will engage in scholarly development and engagement in their subject area;

(ii) may have experience in education-related scholarly activities, which have resulted in demonstrated improvements in teaching quality or education outcomes, or successful outcomes in research supervision;

(iii) may be involved in training in either or both of pedagogical skills or research;

(h) may be required to perform the full academic responsibilities, and related administration, of co-ordination of a unit of study within a faculty, consistently with the faculty's workload provisions;

(i) may be mentored in a formal University mentoring program;

(j) will be an informal mentor for other staff at Levels A or B;

(iv) will normally contribute to teaching at honours, undergraduate and postgraduate level, including within appropriate units of study or through research supervision.

(c) Research and research engagement:

(i) will be able to demonstrate a record of research and scholarly activities relating to their discipline;

(ii) may, where appropriate, contribute to academic, practice or professional journals on issues relevant to their discipline or contribute more broadly as appropriate to their discipline;

Note: A premium may be placed on ERA recognised contributions;

(iii) will normally demonstrate evidence of competitive grant applications within the University or externally, either individually or as a part of a team;

(iv) May, where appropriate, be involved or mentored in translational research with a view to external collaborations and establishing partnership with outputs such as research and development, commercialisation, improved practice and policy.
(d) **Governance, leadership or engagement:**

(i) may be required to perform the full academic responsibilities, and related administration, of co-ordination of a unit of study within a faculty, consistently with the faculty’s workload provisions;

(ii) will co-ordinate or lead the activities of other staff as appropriate to their discipline;

(iii) will be an informal mentor for other staff at Levels A and B, or colleagues beyond the university;

(iv) may be mentored in a formal University mentoring program;

(v) will engage in scholarly development and engagement in their subject area;

(vi) (m) will, where appropriate, participate in continuing professional development (for example through seminars or conferences);

(n) may, where appropriate, be involved or mentored in translational research with a view to external collaboration and establishing partnerships with outputs such as commercialisation, improved practice and policy.

(vii) may have involvement in discipline or professional associations.

(7)(8) **Level C staff:**

(a) will make independent and original contributions to scholarship within their discipline and will disseminate these among colleagues;

(b) **General expectations:**

(i) will be able to demonstrate a strong record of research, scholarly activities, teaching or teaching practices relating to their discipline;

(ii) (b) will be acknowledged at national level as influential in expanding knowledge, or pedagogical and curriculum practice, within their discipline;

(iii) will normally make a significant contribution to any or all of the research scholarship, teaching or administration activities of an organisational unit or interdisciplinary area, at undergraduate honours or postgraduate level;

(iv) may be pursuing education and professional development opportunities to enhance their expertise and professionalism in higher education.

(b) **Education and education engagement:**

(i) expanding knowledge within their discipline; or

(ii) pedagogical and curriculum issues;

(c) will be able to demonstrate a strong record of:

(i) research;

(ii) scholarly activities relating to their discipline; or

(iii) teaching or teaching practices;
(d) will disseminate knowledge to benefit and promote good practice in their faculty and the University, in learning and teaching or research and research training;

(i) will provide leadership with a significant impact on their faculty or school in teaching, teaching innovation or curriculum development, or research training and supervision;

(ii) may be pursuing education opportunities and/or professional development to enhance their expertise and professionalism in higher education;

(c) Research and research engagement:

(i) will make independent and original contributions to scholarship within their discipline and will disseminate these among colleagues or the community;

(ii) teaching, teaching innovation or curriculum development; or

(iii) research training and supervision.

(ii) will contribute to academic or professional journals on issues relevant to their discipline or contribute more broadly as appropriate to their discipline. A premium may be placed on ERA recognised contributions;

Note: A premium may be placed on ERA recognised contributions;

(iii) will demonstrate evidence of competitive grant applications within the University or externally;

(iv) may, where appropriate, be involved or mentored in translational research with a view to external collaboration and establishing partnerships with outputs such as research and development, commercialisation, improved practice and policy;

(v) may contribute their research expertise and knowledge to broader forums of public debate, consistently with University policy.

(d) Governance, leadership or engagement:

(i) will contribute to governance in their school or faculty or the University, through activities such as participation in committees, membership of the Academic Board or administrative roles in centres or institutes;

(i) may be pursuing education opportunities to enhance their expertise and professionalism in higher education;

(ii) may be required to perform the full academic responsibilities, and related administration, of co-ordination of a large unit of study or award program or a number of small award programs, consistently with the faculty's workload provisions;

(iii) may be mentored in a formal University mentoring program and will be an informal mentor for other staff at Level C or below, or colleagues beyond the University;

(iv) may be a formal mentor for other staff at Level C or below;
(v) may contribute to, will disseminate knowledge of benefit to, and promote good practice in, their faculty and the University’s work of community and alumni engagement;

(n) may contribute their expertise and knowledge to broader forums of public debate, consistently with University policy;

(o) will normally make a significant contribution to any or all of the research, scholarship, teaching or administration activities of an organisational unit or interdisciplinary area at undergraduate honours or postgraduate level;

(vi) may be mentored in a formal University mentoring program;

(vii) will normally play a major role or provide a significant degree of leadership in scholarly, research or professional activities relevant to any or all of their profession, discipline or community;

(q) may, where appropriate, be involved or mentored in translational research with a view to external collaboration and establishing partnerships with outputs such as commercialisation, improved practice and policy.

Level D staff:

(a) General expectations:

(i) \(\text{will have attained and maintained recognition at national or international level in their discipline;} \) and

(ii) \(\text{will make original and innovative contributions to their field of study or research, which are recognised as outstanding nationally or internationally;} \) or

(iii) \(\text{will make original contributions to teaching, such as contributions to national efforts to enhance curriculum and providing high quality learning experiences in their discipline;} \)

(b) Education and education engagement:

(i) \(\text{will have a sustained record of effective leadership of either or both of leading to improvements in student learning and in research teaching teams; (in curriculum design, implementation, and innovations training)} \);

Note: If this criterion is not met a candidate will be required to demonstrate leadership in research, as set out in subclause 4(8)(c)(iv);

(ii) \(\text{leading to improvements in student learning); or}

(i) \(\text{research (in fostering the research activities of others, and in research teaching teams (in curriculum design, implementation and innovations training)} \);

(ii) \(\text{will demonstrate evidence of capability to lead developments in: education quality, which enhance major aspects of the faculty’s operations through program management, curriculum development, faculty and institutional teaching roles (such as Associate Dean, Academic Board, UE Education Committee); or}
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(iii) will demonstrate research leadership similar to that required by subclause 4(iii)(c)(iii).

(c) Research and research engagement:

(i) will contribute to academic or professional journals on issues relevant to their discipline or as recognised under the ERA, or more broadly;

(ii) will have a good track record of competitive or partnership-based research grants, as appropriate to their discipline;

(iii) may, where appropriate, be involved in translational research or collaboration with external partners with a view to establishing partnerships with outputs such as research and development, commercialisation, improved practice and quality;

(iv) will have a sustained record of effective leadership in research (in fostering the research activities of others and in research teaching teams)

(iv)(v) (i) research, will demonstrate evidence of capability to lead developments in research which enhance the reputation of the faculty or University (such as leading participation in internationally-funded research projects);

Note: If this criterion is not met a candidate will be required to demonstrate leadership in education, as set out in subclause 4(8)(b)(i).

(v)(vi) will, where appropriate, contribute their research expertise and knowledge to broader forms of public debate consistently with University policy.

(d) Governance, leadership or engagement:

(i) will normally make an outstanding contribution to governance and collegial life within the University, and in community and professional service;

(ii) (f) will be an informal mentor for other staff at Level D and below or colleagues beyond the University;

(iii) (g) will be a formal mentor for staff at Level C or below;

(iv) (h) may be mentored at in a formal University mentoring program;

(i) will normally have evidence of major original and innovative contributions:

(i) to curriculum development, which enhance the University’s standing as a national leader in education within their discipline; or

(ii) to the staff member’s field of study or research, which are recognised nationally or internationally as outstanding;

(i) will normally make an outstanding contribution to governance and collegial life within the University and in community and professional service;

(k) will, where appropriate, contribute to the University’s work of community and alumni engagement;

(l) will, where appropriate, contribute their expertise and knowledge to broader forums of public debate, consistently with University policy;

(m) will, where appropriate, assist the University in its development work;
(n) may, where appropriate, be involved in translational research with a view to external collaboration and establishing strong partnerships with outputs such as commercialisation, improved practice and policy;

(o) will, where appropriate, mentor and provide opportunities for other researchers to develop skills and engage in translational research.

(vi) will, may, where appropriate, demonstrate leadership or active involvement in strategic initiatives and partnerships with industry, government or community, external agencies, organisation and industry.

(9)(10) Level E staff:

(a) General expectations: will have achieved and maintained international recognition through original innovative and distinguished contributions to research and scholarship.

(b) Education and education engagement:

(i) will demonstrate evidence of leadership in all or any of curriculum development, program development and management or research and scholarship; or

(ii) will demonstrate evidence of capability to lead developments in learning and teaching which enhance the reputation of the faculty, or University will demonstrate research leadership similar to that required by subclause 4(9)(c)(ii).

(c) Research and research engagement:

(i) (a) will have achieved and maintained international recognition through original, innovative and distinguished contributions to scholarship and research;

(b) will have a track record of competitive research grants;

(ii) (c) will have publications in peer-reviewed international journals or creative works recognised under the ERA in their discipline or more broadly;

(d) will have evidence of recognition within the broader research community, such as membership or editorship of journals, membership of national or international consultative bodies, membership of specialist committees or advisory boards;

(e) will have evidence of leadership in any or all of curriculum development, program development and management or research and scholarship;

(f) will have evidence of mentoring colleagues to leadership positions;

(iii) will have a track record of competitive or partnership-based research grants, as appropriate to their discipline;

(iv) may will, where appropriate, demonstrate leadership in translational research or collaboration with external partners, with a view to establishing sustainable partnerships with outputs such as research and development, commercialisation, improved practice and policy;

(v) will, where appropriate, contribute their research expertise and knowledge to broader forums of public debate, consistently with University policy;
(vi) will demonstrate evidence of leadership in research and scholarship;

(vii) will have demonstrated evidence of capability to lead development which enhances major aspects of the University’s operations and its international reputation; developments in research which enhance the reputation of the faculty, or University (such as leading participation internationally funded research projects).

Note: If this criterion is not met a candidate will be required to demonstrate leadership in education, as set out in subclause 4.3(b)(ii).

(i) learning and teaching; or

(ii) research and scholarship;

(d) Governance, leadership or engagement:

(i) will make an outstanding contribution to governance and collegial life within and outside the University, for example by chairing school or faculty committees, undertaking significant administrative positions, or participating in or chairing University-level committees;

(ii) will demonstrate mentoring University colleagues to leadership positions, or senior individuals in the community or professions;

(iii) will be mentored in a formal University mentoring program;

(iv) will be an informal mentor for other staff at Level D or below, or colleagues beyond the University.

(v) will be a formal mentor for staff at Levels Level E or below;

(vi) will have demonstrated recognition within the broader research or professional community, such as membership or editorship of journals, membership of national or international consultative bodies, membership of specialist committees or advisory boards;

(vii) will, where appropriate, assist the University in its development work;

(viii) may, where appropriate, be involved in translational research with a view to external collaboration and establishing strong partnerships with outputs such as commercialisation, improved practice and policy;

(ix) may, where appropriate, mentor and provide opportunities for other researchers to develop skills and engage in translational research, demonstrate leadership or active involvement in strategic initiatives and partnerships with industry, government or community external agencies, organisations and industry.

5 Applications for annual promotion rounds

(1) Applications must be submitted electronically to the Academic Promotions Unit using the form specified in the announcement of the opening of applications.

(2) Applications must meet eligibility requirements in section 8 of the policy, including:
(a) discussing your intention to apply for promotion with the relevant person in the faculty no later than October 31 in the year prior to applying; and
(b) registering notice of intent using the online form on the academic promotions website by November 30 in that same year.

(3) Applications must comply with all maximum word limits.

(4) Applications must provide:
   (a) information about the applicant’s whole career;
   (b) a clear account of achievements and publications since the applicant’s last employment or promotion at the University;
   (c) evidence of appropriate upward career trajectory; and
   (d) the names of five referees (Levels B and C) and four referees (Levels D and E) and a statement of the applicant’s relationship to each.

(5) Applications for promotion by two levels must:
   (a) set out a strong case for such a promotion;
   (b) include a completed “application for two level promotion form”;
   (c) be supported by the relevant Head;
   (d) be approved by the relevant Dean; and
   (e) be provided to the Academic Promotions Unit at least 14 days before the advertised closing date for promotions for the level to which they are applying;
   (f) the Academic Promotions Unit will seek approval from the Provost and notify the applicant of the outcome.

(6) Applications should:
   (a) provide information sufficient to allow the promotion committees to assess the significance and impact of the applicant’s publications or creative works; and
   (b) provide an explanation, if necessary, of any known special circumstances or relevant to opportunity issues that have affected the applicant’s opportunity to meet the requirements for promotion.

6 Submissions for “out of round” promotion

(1) Submissions for “out of round” promotion must be initiated as provided in clause 17 of the policy.

(2) Where a submission is prepared by the relevant Head it must be endorsed by the relevant Dean and submitted to the Academic Promotions Unit.

(3) Submissions must contain:
   (a) where applicable, the application for employment originally made by the candidate to the other institution offering the staff member employment;
   (b) the referee details which were part of that application;
(c) if the “out of round” submission is based on a case for retention and an offer from another institution has not been made, the names and details of at least three referees;

(d) a clear statement of the case including:

(i) evidence to support achievement of the minimum standards required for promotion to the relevant level in all three areas of teaching, research and governance, leadership, engagement;

(ii) reasons for retaining the staff member;

(iii) reasons for promoting the staff member to the desired level; and

(iv) reasons for doing so “out of round”.

(4) Where a submission for an “out of round” promotion is received on behalf of a candidate who has a current promotion application already in process, the following materials will be used to assess the application:

(a) the “out of round” submission prepared by the relevant delegate;

(b) the application for promotion already received; and

(c) the assessor and referee reports already received.

(5) The relevant committee will consider the “out of round” promotion in accordance with policy if the original application:

(a) has not been considered by a final LPC meeting;

(b) has been considered by a final LPC meeting and the recommendation was not to promote;

(c) is for Level D or E and has not had a preliminary CPC vote; or

(d) is for Level D or E and the preliminary CPC vote is not to promote.

(6) The relevant committee will assess the submission as expeditiously as possible applying the standards and criteria for the applicable level specified in the policy and these procedures.

(7) Within two days of receipt of the submission, the Chair will circulate the documentation to all members of the committee and will request an electronic response within a nominated time frame.

(8) The committee may adopt a unanimous recommendation by circulation.

(9) Unless a unanimous response is received within the nominated time frame, the Chair will call a meeting of the committee; and

(a) may invite the candidate to attend a formal interview; and

(b) may request additional information which may include further reports.

(10) The committee will vote on the submission, which will be recommended if supported by a majority of votes.

(11) No appeal is available from an “out of round” promotion submission outcome.

(12) The relevant delegate must approve the “out of round” promotion if:

(a) a final LPC report in favour of promotion has been received in the case of promotion to Level B and C; or
(b) A final LPC report and a preliminary CPC vote recommending promotion has been received in the case of Level D or E.

(13) Where a request for “out of round” promotion is received on behalf of a candidate who has lodged an appeal in relation to the most recent promotion round, documents relating to that appeal must not be made available to the committee members considering the “out of round” promotion.

7 Updates to applications

(1) Applicants may provide updates to their application only in the manner provided in this clause.

(2) An update to an application may not exceed one A4 page listing significant additional information arising since lodgement of the application.

(3) The Academic Promotions Unit will notify applicants of the date when the academic promotions online system will be available for input of the update and due date for any such update.

(4) Applicants must enter updates online in the academic promotions online system.

(5) Level D and E applicants (and Level C applicants if the application is being considered by a CPC) may enter a second update to their application for consideration by the CPC.

(6) The Academic Promotions Unit will notify applicants of the date when the academic promotions online system will be available for input of the second update and the due date for any such update.

(7) The second update to application may not exceed one A4 page listing significant additional information of national/international importance arising since consideration of the application at the final LPC meeting (Level D) and interview (Level E).

(8) Applicants must enter second updates online in the academic promotions online system.

(9) Applicants may change the stream in which they have sought promotion provided that:

(a) they do so by notice in writing to the Academic Promotions Unit; and

(b) the notice is received before the application is considered for the first time.

8 Local promotion committees

(1) For LPCs considering promotions to Levels B and C, the nominated Chair should have had at least three years’ experience as a core LPC member in the previous five-year period.

(2) For LPCs considering promotions to Levels D and E, the nominated Chair should have had at least three years’ experience as a core member of LPCs considering promotions to the relevant level, or higher.

(3) To establish an LPC, the Chair must provide a list of recommended committee members, including reserves, to the Provost for approval.
(4) To ensure continuity of knowledge, experience and to foster leadership and career development, the Chair must request that proposed members commit to a membership term of three years where possible.

9 Communications between committees and applicants

(1) The Academic Promotions Unit will conduct, and keep appropriate records of, all communications between applicants and those considering their applications.

Note: See the University Recordkeeping Policy 2017 and Recordkeeping Manual.

(2) Requests from committees for further information from applicants will be communicated to the applicant in writing, through the Academic Promotions Unit.

(3) Replies to such requests must be provided in writing, within seven days.

(4) Requests from committees for further information from sources other than the applicant should also be communicated through the Academic Promotions Unit, although this is not always possible. Any such information received by a committee or committee member must be copied to the Academic Promotions Unit.

10 Heads’ reports: all levels

(1) The relevant Head will verify an applicant’s teaching and research supervision activities by completing the online Teaching and Research Student Supervision Activities form.

(2) The Head will consult relevant staff of the school and prepare a confidential written report on each applicant.

(3) The consultation process must exclude any staff member in the school or department who is also an applicant for promotion to the same level.

(4) The Head’s report must include:

(a) the names and positions of the staff who have been consulted;

(b) if a staff member who has been consulted objects to being named, then the report should not include the names of any of the staff consulted. The report must instead then list the number of and general description of the positions of staff consulted (for example, three lecturers and two associate professors);

(c) views of relevant staff who have been consulted, including divergent views; and

(d) comment on the standing of the applicant’s referees (all Levels and assessors (Levels D and E only).

11 Referees’ reports

(1) The Academic Promotions Unit will contact nominated referees to request that they complete a report online.

(2) Referees should where possible hold a higher academic rank than that of the applicant.
The list of referees should include at least two who are external to the applicant’s faculty.

Unless applying in the research-focused stream, applicants must nominate at least one referee who is familiar with and can comment on their teaching.

Referees’ reports should address:

(a) the nature and duration of the referee’s association with the applicant;
(b) the referee’s view of the applicant’s standing in their field at a national and, if appropriate, international level;
(c) some of the applicant’s notable achievements or contributions in any or all of research, teaching or governance, leadership and engagement; and
(d) the referee’s assessment of the applicant’s career trajectory, with reference to the normative criteria for the relevant academic rank.

12 Assessors’ reports

(1) The Academic Promotions Unit will contact assessors to request that they complete a report online.

(2) Assessors’ reports must be provided within 21 days of request.

13 Procedure for LPC preliminary meetings for promotions below Level E

(1) LPC preliminary meetings for promotions below Level E may be held face-to-face or by circulation.

(2) For all such meetings, whether held face-to-face or by circulation:

(a) each member of the LPC will consider each application in accordance with clause 4 of these procedures and the standards specified in Schedule 1 to the policy;
(b) particular attention should be paid to applications where special circumstances and “relative to opportunity” issues have been raised;
(c) the additional member of the LPC will be asked to comment on each application;
(d) the LPC will identify any applications which require further information or clarification from the applicant;
(e) the LPC will agree on the questions of clarification to be put to the applicant, which will be listed in the preliminary report template;
(f) core members may vote on applications for which no further information or clarification is required;
(g) applications which receive unanimous support will be recommended for promotion without further consideration;
(h) applications which do not receive unanimous support, or which require further information or clarification from the applicant will be considered at the final meeting;
(i) requests for further information or clarification from an applicant will be provided to the Academic Promotions Unit, which will collect the information and provide it to the LPC.

(3) Where the meeting is held face-to-face:
   (a) after discussion core members may vote on applications only where there are no questions of clarification for the applicant;
   (b) voting will take place in the absence of the additional member.

(4) Where the meeting is held by circulation:
   (a) each member of the LPC will identify any applications in relation to which they require further information or clarification, from either the additional member or the applicant;
   (b) each member of the LPC will forward by email to the LPC Chair:
      (i) the member’s clarification questions for or requests for information from the additional member; and
      (ii) the member’s clarification questions for or requests for information from each applicant;
   (c) the LPC Chair will collate the clarification questions for and requests for information from additional members and request a response via email:
      (i) the additional member will provide a response by email the LPC Chair;
      (ii) the LPC Chair will provide the LPC members with the responses received from the additional members no later than 7 days prior to the final meeting.
   (d) the Chair will collate the clarification questions for and requests for information from applicants and provide them to the Academic Promotions Unit;
      (i) the Academic Promotions Unit will seek responses from applicants and provide these to the LPC Chair for circulation to the committee at least 7 days prior to the final meeting.
   (e) the Chair will circulate to all members of the LPC a list of applicants from whom no further information or clarification is required;
      (i) each core member completing a voting sheet for preliminary meetings formal voting on these applications will be undertaken by means of and forwarding this sheet to the Chair;
   (f) the Chair will collate the voting sheets and inform each member of the LPC of the outcome of the voting.

14 Procedure for LPC final meetings for promotions below Level E

(1) The additional member will be asked to comment on an application under consideration.

(2) The committee will consider and discuss each application, including:
   (a) responses received from additional members to LPC core member questions of clarification; and
(b) responses received from applicants to LPC members questions of clarification; and

(c) any application updates received; and

(d) any documented special circumstances or “relative to opportunity” issues that have been raised; and

(e) information from the LPC Chair about the impact of special circumstances that have been flagged as confidential.

(3) The core members of the committee will vote on each application.

(4) Voting will take place in the absence of the additional member.

15 Procedure for LPC meetings for promotions to Level E

(1) The committee will interview the applicant.

(a) Wherever possible, interviews should be conducted in person.

(b) The LPC Chair may approve interviews being held by other means, provided that the applicant and all committee members are able to interact at the same time.

(c) The Academic Promotions Unit will inform the applicant as soon as possible if it is decided to conduct an interview otherwise than in person.

(2) The committee will consider and discuss each application, including any additional information or application updates that have been provided.

(3) Particular attention should be given to applications where special circumstances or relative to opportunity issues have been raised.

(4) Where special circumstances have been identified as confidential, the LPC Chair will inform the committee about their impact without divulging the confidential details.

(5) The core members of the committee will vote on each application.

(6) Voting will take place in the absence of the additional member.

16 LPC Committee reports

(1) LPC Committee reports must be prepared using the form supplied for this purpose by the Academic Promotions Unit.

(2) Reports must:

(a) note unanimous recommendations for promotion to Levels B or C;

(b) provide a detailed commentary in all other cases to explain the basis for each recommendation; and

(c) include information regarding the consideration of any special circumstances or relative to opportunity issues in the assessment of the application; and

(d) provide a detailed commentary on each application for promotion to Level D or E, regardless of the recommendation.
17 Procedure for CPC meetings

(1) Prior to the CPC meeting, the Academic Promotions Unit will ask each CPC member to provide a preliminary vote on each application.

(2) The Academic Promotions Unit will tabulate the preliminary votes and make the tabulation available to the CPC at its meeting.

(3) The CPC will consider:
   (a) the LPC report;
   (b) the application;
   (c) any updates to, or further information provided in relation to the application;
   (d) Head’s reports;
   (e) referees’ reports; and
   (f) assessor’s reports.

(4) After discussion, the committee will vote on each application.

18 Titles consequent upon promotion

(1) Successful applicants for promotion to Level E may select a professorial title in an appropriate specific field. The selected title must be endorsed by the relevant Dean and approved by the Vice-Chancellor.

(2) Successful applicants for promotion will otherwise have the titles specified in Schedule 1.

19 Appeals

(1) The only basis for appeal against an academic promotion decision is if:
   (a) there has been a significant breach of the policy; and
   (b) it can be demonstrated that this may have affected the outcome of an application.

(2) No appeal is available from an “out of round” promotion submission.

(3) Potential appellants should:
   (a) within 14 days of receiving notice of the outcome of their application, meet with the relevant LPC Chair and at least one of:
      (i) the relevant Head;
      (ii) the relevant Associate Dean (or equivalent);
      (iii) the Dean;
      and
   (b) within a further seven days, meet with the CPC Chair (if the application was considered by a CPC); and
(c) within a further seven days, submit an appeal lodgement form by email.

(4) Appeals will be determined by:
   (a) the Provost, for applications for promotion to Levels B or C; or
   (b) the Vice-Chancellor, for applications for promotion to Levels D or E.

(5) No further materials may be submitted after the appeal lodgement form is submitted.

(6) If the Vice-Chancellor chaired a CPC the subject of an appeal, the Vice-Chancellor will nominate a Deputy Vice-Chancellor to consider the appeal.

(7) In deciding an appeal, the decision maker will have regard to:
   (a) the appeal lodgement form setting out the basis of the appeal;
   (b) the application for promotion;
   (c) reports submitted by referees, Heads or assessors, as applicable;
   (d) LPC report;
   (e) CPC recommendation, if applicable; and
   (f) any other information expressly sought by the decision maker.

(8) The decision maker will determine only the issues stated in subclause 49(1), and will not reassess the application for promotion.

(9) If the appeal is upheld, the application will be reconsidered in accordance with the provisions of this policy:
   (a) The application will be reconsidered by the LPC and CPC which originally considered it;
   (b) Committee members whose conduct has constituted the basis of the appeal must not participate in the reconsideration;
   (c) If fewer than three quarters (to the nearest whole number) of an original committee is available, reserve committee members will be used. If, including reserve members, there are still fewer than three quarters (to the nearest whole number) of an original committee available, the Chair will appoint the required number of new committee members;
   (d) The reconsidering committee(s) will refer to the information originally considered plus any additional information related to the appeal;
   (e) The reconsidering committee(s) will apply this policy and its associated procedures, resulting in a recommendation to the relevant delegate as to whether or not the applicant should be promoted.

(10) If the appeal is not upheld, the application will not be reconsidered, and no further appeal will be entertained.
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# SCHEDULE 1

## PERSONAL AND POSITIONAL TITLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantive Position</th>
<th>Teaching &amp; Research</th>
<th>Research Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion Category</th>
<th>Teaching &amp; Research; Education Focused or Research Focused</th>
<th>Teaching &amp; Research; Education Focused or Research Focused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position Title</strong></td>
<td><strong>Personal Title</strong></td>
<td><strong>Position Title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>As per personal status (Dr, Ms, Mrs, Mr, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>As per personal status (Dr, Ms, Mrs, Mr, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level D</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level E</td>
<td>Professor or Professor in a specific field, as requested by the candidate, endorsed by the Dean and approved by the Vice-Chancellor</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SCHEDULE 2

**Normative criteria for Levels A to E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>General Expectations</th>
<th>Education and Education Engagement</th>
<th>Research and Research Engagement</th>
<th>Governance, Leadership and/or Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>i. Will normally work under supervision of staff at Level B or above, with an increasing degree of autonomy as they gain skill and experience; ii. May be pursuing education and professional development opportunities to enhance their expertise and professionalism in higher education</td>
<td>May supervise research students at undergraduate and honours level</td>
<td>i. Will normally conduct research or scholarly activities under limited supervision either independently or as a member of a team; ii. May, where appropriate, be involved or mentored in translational research with a view to external collaboration and establishing partnerships with outputs such as research and development, commercialisation, improved practice or policy;</td>
<td>i. Will undertake administration primarily relating to their activities; ii. May be mentored in a formal University mentoring program; iii. May participate in external activities related to the discipline or profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>i. Will contribute to any or all of research, scholarship or teaching, either independently or as part of a team, through professional practice and expertise; ii. May be pursuing education and professional development opportunities to enhance their expertise and</td>
<td>i. Will be involved in evaluating teaching and learning, both at the program level and in relation to their own practice; ii. May have experience in education-related scholarly activities, which have resulted in demonstrated improvements in teaching quality or education outcomes, or successful outcomes in</td>
<td>i. Will be able to demonstrate a record of research and scholarly activities relating to their discipline; ii. May, where appropriate, will contribute to academic, practice or professional journals on issues relevant to their discipline or contribute more broadly as appropriate to their discipline; <strong>Note:</strong> A premium may be placed on ERA recognised contributions; iii. Will normally demonstrate evidence of competitive grant applications within the University or</td>
<td>i. May be required to perform the full academic responsibilities, and related administration, of co-ordination of a unit of study within a faculty, consistently with the faculty's workload provisions; ii. Will co-ordinate or lead the activities of other staff as appropriate to their discipline; iii. Will be an informal mentor for other staff at Levels A and B, or colleagues beyond the University;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>General Expectations</td>
<td>Education and Education Engagement</td>
<td>Research and Research Engagement</td>
<td>Governance, Leadership and/or Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| C     | i. Will be able to demonstrate a strong record of research, scholarly activities, teaching or teaching practices relating to their discipline;  
      ii. Will be acknowledged at a national level as influential in expanding knowledge, or pedagogical and curriculum practice, within their discipline;  
      iii. Will normally make a significant contribution to any or all of the research, scholarship,  
         research supervision;  
         iii. May be involved in training in either or both of pedagogical skills or research;  
         iv. Will normally contribute to teaching at honours, undergraduate and postgraduate level in units of study through research supervision,  
      iv. May, where appropriate, be involved or mentored in translational research with a view to external collaboration and establishing partnership with outputs such as research and development, commercialisation, improved practice and policy.  
      v. Will engage in scholarly development and engagement in their subject area;  
      vi. Will, where appropriate, participate in continuing professional development (for example, through seminars and conferences);  
      vii. May have involvement in discipline or professional associations.  
|       | i. Will provide leadership with a significant impact on their faculty or school in teaching, teaching innovation or curriculum development, or research training and supervision;  
      May be pursuing education opportunities or professional development to enhance their expertise and professionalism in higher education;  
|       | i. Will make independent and original contributions to scholarship within their discipline and will disseminate these among colleagues or the community;  
      ii. Will contribute to academic or professional journals on issues relevant to their discipline or contribute more broadly as appropriate to their discipline;  
      Note: A premium may be placed on ERA recognised contributions;  
      iii. Will demonstrate evidence of competitive grant applications within the University or externally;  
      iv. Will provide governance in their school or faculty in their discipline and will disseminate these among colleagues or the community;  
      v. May be involved or mentored in translational research with a view to external collaboration and establishing partnership with outputs such as research and development, commercialisation, improved practice and policy.  
|       | i. Will contribute to governance in their school or faculty or the University, through activities such as participation in committees, membership of the Academic Board or administrative roles in centres or institutes;  
      ii. May be required to perform the full academic responsibilities, and related administration, of co-ordination of a large unit of study or award program or a number of small award programs, consistently with the faculty's workload provisions;  
      iii. Will be an informal mentor for other staff at Level C or below, or colleagues beyond the University;  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>General Expectations</th>
<th>Education and Education Engagement</th>
<th>Research and Research Engagement</th>
<th>Governance, Leadership and/or Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Will have attained and maintained recognition at national or international level in their discipline; and ii. Will make original and innovative contributions to their field of study or research, which are recognised as outstanding nationally or internationally; or iii. Will make original contributions to teaching, such as contributions to</td>
<td>i. May have a sustained record of effective leadership leading to improvements in student learning and in research teaching teams, (in curriculum design, implementation, and innovations training); Note: If this criterion is not met a candidate will be required to demonstrate leadership in research, as set out in subclause 4(b)(iv); ii. Will demonstrate evidence of capability to lead developments in</td>
<td>i. Will contribute to academic or professional journals on issues relevant to their discipline or as recognised under the ERA, or more broadly; ii. Will have a good track record of competitive or partnership-based research grants, as appropriate to their discipline; iii. May, where appropriate, be involved in translational research or collaboration with external partners with a view to establishing partnerships with outputs such as research and development, commercialisation, improved practice and quality; iv. Will have a sustained record of effective leadership in research (in fostering the research activities of others</td>
<td>iv. May be a formal mentor for other staff at Level C or below’ v. Will disseminate knowledge of benefit to, and promote good practice in, their faculty and the University; vi. May be mentored in a formal University mentoring program; vii. Will normally play a major role or provide a significant degree of leadership in scholarly, research or professional activities relevant to any or all of their profession, discipline or community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (If this criterion is not met a candidate will be required to demonstrate leadership in research, as set out in subclause 4(b)(iv);
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>General Expectations</th>
<th>Education and Education Engagement</th>
<th>Research and Research Engagement</th>
<th>Governance, Leadership and/or Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Will have achieved and maintained international recognition through original innovative and distinguished contributions to research and scholarship;</td>
<td>i. Will demonstrate leadership in all or any of curriculum development, program development and management or research and scholarship; or ii. Will demonstrate evidence of capability to lead developments in learning and teaching which enhance the reputation of the faculty, or University Will demonstrate research leadership similar to that required by subclause 4(9)(c)(vi).</td>
<td>i. Will have achieved and maintained international recognition through original, innovative and distinguished contributions to scholarship and research; ii. Will have publications in peer-reviewed international journals or creative works recognised under the ERA in their discipline or more broadly; iii. Will have a track record of competitive or partnership-based research grants, as appropriate to their discipline; v. MayWill, where appropriate, demonstrate leadership in translational research or collaboration with external partners, with a view to establishing sustainable partnerships with outputs such as research and development;</td>
<td>i. Will make an outstanding contribution to governance and collegial life within and outside the University, for example by chairing school or faculty committees, undertaking significant administrative positions, or participating in or chairing University-level committees; ii. Will demonstrate mentoring University colleagues to leadership positions, or senior individuals in the community or professions; iii. Will be mentored in a formal University mentoring program; iv. Will be an informal mentor for other staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: If this criterion is not met a candidate will be required to demonstrate leadership in education as set out in subclause 4(b)(ii).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>General Expectations</th>
<th>Education and Education Engagement</th>
<th>Research and Research Engagement</th>
<th>Governance, Leadership and/or Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>commercialisation, improved practice and policy; v. Will, where appropriate, contribute their research expertise and knowledge to broader forums of public debate, consistently with University policy; vi. Will demonstrate evidence of leadership in research and scholarship; vii. Will demonstrate evidence of capability to lead developments in research which enhance the reputation of the faculty, or University (such as leading participation in internationally funded research projects). Note: If this criterion is not met a candidate will be required to demonstrate leadership in education, as set out in subclause 4(9)(b)(i);</td>
<td>at Levels D or below or colleagues beyond the University; v. Will be a formal mentor for staff at Level E or below; vi. Will have evidence of demonstrate recognition within the broader research or professional community, such as membership or editorship of journals, membership of national or international consultative bodies, membership of specialist committees or advisory boards; vii. Will, where appropriate, assist the University in its development work; viii. May, where appropriate, demonstrate leadership or active involvement in strategic initiatives and partnerships with industry, government or community, external agencies, organisations and industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>New Criteria Ref</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>New Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>KL EK 1(3)</td>
<td>Section 1, Purpose and application</td>
<td>Section 4 of these procedures, Normative criteria for performance at each academic level, provide a guide as to University expectations and set out the generic attributes and responsibilities for each academic level. Within these levels staff undertake particular roles which may vary over time and over the course of a career and the University recognises that not all criteria will be met. The criteria should be read in conjunction with the Academic Promotions Policy 2015, Schedule 2. Minimum standards required for academic promotion.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AF 4(1)(g)</td>
<td>Generic</td>
<td>will be involved in both formal and informal staff or other mentoring programs, including beyond the University where appropriate</td>
<td>4(1)(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OG AF SC 4(1)(k)</td>
<td>Generic</td>
<td>will seek to engage where appropriate, through research or education-related activities with industry, government or community.</td>
<td>4(1)(k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SC MG AF 4(1)(l)</td>
<td>Generic</td>
<td>will, where appropriate, engage in translational research with a view to establishing strong partnerships with outputs such as research and development, commercialisation, improved practice and policy development;</td>
<td>4(1)(l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PMc OG AF 4(2)(e)</td>
<td>Education Focussed</td>
<td>may, where appropriate, demonstrate teaching engagement, for example through curricula involving industry, government or community.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PMc OG AF 4(3)(d)</td>
<td>Research Focussed</td>
<td>may, where appropriate, demonstrate sustained engagement, for example through research impact and activities with industry, government or community.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PMc AF 4(4)(b,c)</td>
<td>GLE focussed</td>
<td>(b) demonstrate sustained engagement over a substantial period of time in governance and significant leadership roles with one or more of the University, faculty, school, discipline or community; (c) may, where appropriate, demonstrate sustained engagement with industry, government or community;</td>
<td>4(4)(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>AF 4(4)(e)</td>
<td>GLE focussed</td>
<td>provide evidence of the impact these activities have had in achieving outcomes within their teaching and research portfolios.</td>
<td>4(4)(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>AF 4(6)(a)(i)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>may be pursuing education and professional development opportunities to enhance their expertise and professionalism in higher education.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AF 4(6)(b)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>may supervise research students at undergraduate or honours level.</td>
<td>4(5)(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MG 4(6)(c)(ii)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>may, where appropriate, be involved or mentored in translational research with a view to external collaboration and establishing partnerships with outputs such as research and development, commercialisation, improved practice and policy;</td>
<td>4(5)(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>AF 4(7)(a)(i)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>may be pursuing education and professional development opportunities to enhance their expertise and professionalism in higher education.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>New Criteria Ref</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>New Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>4(7)(c)(ii)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>may, where appropriate, contribute to academic, practice or professional journals on issues relevant to their discipline or contribute more broadly as appropriate to their discipline; Note: A premium may be placed on ERA recognised contributions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>4(7)(c)(iv)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>may, where appropriate, be involved or mentored in translational research with a view to external collaborations and establishing partnerships with outputs such as research and development, commercialisation, improved practice and policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>4(8)(a)(ii)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>will normally make a significant contribution to any or all of the research scholarship, teaching or administration activities of an organisational unit or interdisciplinary area, at undergraduate, honours or postgraduate level;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>4(8)(a)(iv)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>may be pursuing education and professional development opportunities to enhance their expertise and professionalism in higher education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>4(8)(b)(i)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>will provide leadership with a significant impact on their faculty or school in teaching, teaching innovation or curriculum development, or research training and supervision;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>4(8)(c)(iv)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>may, where appropriate, be involved or mentored in translational research with a view to external collaboration and establishing partnerships with outputs such as research and development, commercialisation, improved practice and policy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>MG</td>
<td>4(8)(d)(ii)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>will be an informal mentor for other staff at Level C or below, or colleagues beyond the University;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>4(8)(d)(v)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>will disseminate knowledge of benefit to, and promote good practice in, their faculty and the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>4(8)(c)(ii)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>will contribute to academic or professional journals on issues relevant to their discipline or contribute more broadly as appropriate to their discipline. Note: A premium may be placed on ERA recognised contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>New Criteria Ref</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>New Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>4(9)(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(a) General expectations: (i) will have attained and maintained recognition at national or international level in their discipline; (ii) will make original and innovative contributions to their field of study or research, which are recognised as outstanding nationally or internationally; or (iii) will make original contributions to teaching, such as contributions to national efforts to enhance curriculum and providing high quality learning experiences in their discipline;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>4(9)(b)(i, ii, iii)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>b) Education and Education engagement will have a sustained record of effective leadership, leading to improvements in student learning and in research teaching teams; (in curriculum design, implementation, and innovations training); (ii) will demonstrate evidence of capability to lead developments in education quality, which enhance major aspects of the faculty’s operations through program management, curriculum development, faculty and institutional teaching roles (such as Associate Dean, Academic Board, UE Education Committee);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>4(9)(c)(i)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>will contribute to academic or professional journals on issues relevant to their discipline or as recognised under the ERA, or more broadly;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>4(8)(c)(ii)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>will have a track record of competitive or partnership-based research grants, as appropriate to their discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>4(9)(c)(iii)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>may, where appropriate, be involved in translational research or collaboration with external partners with a view to establishing partnerships with outputs such as research and development, commercialisation, improved practice and quality;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>New Criteria Ref</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>New Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>4(9)(c)(iv) D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>iv will have a sustained record of effective leadership in research (in fostering the research activities of others and in research teaching teams) v will demonstrate evidence of capability to lead developments in research which enhance the reputation of the faculty or University (such as leading participation in internationally funded research projects);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>4(9)(c)(v) D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>will, where appropriate, contribute their research expertise and knowledge to broader forms of public debate consistently with University policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>MG</td>
<td>4(9)(d)(i, ii, iv) D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>(ii) will be an informal mentor for other staff at Level D and below or colleagues beyond the University; (iii) will be a formal mentor for staff at Level C or below; (iv) may be mentored at in a formal University mentoring program;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>4(9)(d)(vi) D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>may, where appropriate, demonstrate leadership or active involvement in strategic initiatives and partnerships with industry, government or community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>4(10)(b)(i, ii) E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>(b) Education and education engagement: (i) will demonstrate evidence of leadership in all or any of curriculum development, program development and management or research and scholarship; (ii) will demonstrate evidence of capability to lead developments in learning and teaching which enhance the reputation of the faculty, or University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>New Criteria Ref</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>New Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>4(10)(c)(iii)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>will have a track record of competitive or partnership-based research grants, as appropriate to their discipline;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>4(10)(c)(iv)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>may, where appropriate, demonstrate leadership in translational research or collaboration with external partners, with a view to establishing sustainable partnerships with outputs such as research and development, commercialisation, improved practice and policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>4(10)(c)(v)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>will, where appropriate, contribute their research expertise and knowledge to broader forums of public debate, consistently with University policy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>4(10)(c)(vi)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>c) Research and Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>4(10)(d)(vi)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>will have evidence of recognition within the broader research or professional community, such as membership or editorship of journals, membership of national or international consultative bodies, membership of specialist committees or advisory boards;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>4(10)(d)(viii)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>may, where appropriate, demonstrate leadership or active involvement in strategic initiatives and partnerships with industry, government or the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>4(10)(c)(ii)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>will have publications in peer-reviewed international journals or creative works recognised under the ERA in their discipline or more broadly</td>
<td>4(9)(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| a   | Consistency across language around leadership in teaching and research in Schedule 2  
**Note:** The original Schedule 2 (focused role expectations) has now been combined with the criteria by level document and forms section 4 of the procedures document. The criteria by level has been duplicated into a new Schedule 2, in table format for easier reading. | Jane Hanrahan; Peter McCullum | Well noted. This now appears amended in section 4(2)(e), 4(3)(d) and 4(4)(c), for consistency across teaching and research focused roles.                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Wording amended for consistency |
| b   | Recognize that promotion should be based on overall performance – not box-checking. The concept of “where appropriate” should therefore not be limited to the discipline (within which appropriateness may vary), but the situation of the particular academic in view of their overall performance and contribution to the relevant Faculty. | Michelle Roberts; Alan Fekete | This is the intended interpretation of ‘where appropriate’ – that is, it is appropriate to the individual case, based on disciplinary, personal, faculty, etc context. This needs to be left open to multiple interpretations. The Promotions Procedure is not intended as a box ticking exercise but offering indicators of the kinds of things that may be relevant. The proposal is to add the following text to the procedures and guideline documents –  
**Suggested text**  
Section 4 of these procedures, Normative criteria for performance at each academic level, provide a guide as to University expectations and set out the generic attributes and responsibilities for each academic level. Within these levels staff undertake particular roles which may vary over time and over the course of a career and the University recognises that not all criteria will be met. The criteria should be read in conjunction with the Academic Promotions Policy 2015, Schedule 2, Minimum standards required for academic promotion. | Overarching text has been added to Section 1 - “Purpose and application” of the procedures document |
### Item 4.2 Academic Promotions Normative Criteria

---

**Academic Promotions Procedures – Normative Criteria feedback since Academic Board**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c</th>
<th>Term ‘partners is too specific and could be construed as just organizations</th>
<th>Stephen Clibborn</th>
<th>Well noted. There are a range of options here. Thus, remove the word “partners” so that industry, government nor community is the language</th>
<th>Change made throughout 4(1)(k), 4(2)(e),</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Use of ‘will, where appropriate’ or ‘will, where relevant’ may be interpreted on an LPC that engagement was appropriate/relevant for that person and so they may be penalised.</td>
<td>Alan Fekete</td>
<td>There is one instance, 4(1)(g), of where relevant. It is changed to where appropriate</td>
<td>Change to the Generic attributes section 4(1)(g)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| e | **Will, where appropriate - means that staff at the relevant level are expected to meet this requirement where it is appropriate to their discipline.** Committee’s would be expected to assess an application using the term ‘will, where appropriate’ in this context. All applicants have assigned to the committee an expert in the area, who would be appointed due to their expertise of the area and expectations of the discipline. Propose change to ‘may’ or will, where they choose’  

4(8)(c)(iv), 4(9)(c)(iii) & 4(10)(c)(iv) Level C, D & E – proposed criteria has been changed from ‘may’ to ‘will’ where appropriate in regards to engaging in translational research. Overarching generic criteria 4(1)(l) states ‘will’ so it seems nonsensical to then state in the specific level ‘may’  

My preference is ‘may’ or ‘will, if they choose’ in the following instances:  


1- There is **no change from may to will**, or introduction of new ‘will; in generic attributes, Section 4(1). There are new statements regarding engagement for research and teaching engagement, in the education and research focussed roles respectively (in yellow 4(2)(e) & 4(3)(d)) and ‘may, where appropriate’ has been added for consistency.  

2 - Where appropriate is added against the wills to qualify the wills to discipline context  

3/ ‘Will’ reverts to ‘May’ for Levels C, D & E  
Sections 4(8)(c)(iv), 4(9)(c)(iii) & 4(10)(c)(iv), (in green)  
4/ Three additional clauses where no equivalent text in the current criteria  

1) Based on consistency (Level B, 4(7)(c)(iiii) added ‘may, where appropriate’  

2) Level D, 4(9)(d)(vi)  

3) Level E, 4(10)(d)(vii) | Changes applied for consistency per principles |
### Section 2 - No change

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a | Remove the word “translational” from the document throughout with no replacement. Reason is the term is politicized and the term ‘research’ is sufficient.  
*See attached schedule for identical occurrences of “translational” in current and proposed criteria (reference MG).* | Manuel Graeber | The term ‘translational’ features in the existing Promotions Procedures. It is true that its contextual use often links to engagement descriptors but given the purpose of this document is to give greater recognition to this work there is no need to remove this adjective.  
“May, where appropriate, be involved or mentored in translational research with a view to external collaboration and establishing partnerships with outputs such as research and development, commercialization, improved practice or policy” | No change |
| B | Remove reference to “industry, government, and community partners” in the text either by deleting [the sections where it appears, or its occurrence]  
Proposal 1: Deletion of the whole section where it arises e.g. 4.1.k, 4.2.e, 4.3.d, 9.d.vi, 10.c.iv.  
*See attached schedule for terminology in current and proposed criteria (reference OG)*  
Proposal 2, if this seems too radical, to formulate without the reference e.g.  
4.1.k will willingly further engage with the wider community where appropriate …  
4.2.e be open to ideas from the wider community, for example through curricula suggestions from …  
4.3.d be open to research activity with | Ofer Gal | The purpose of these changes is to recognize the very kinds of activities that are being proposed for deletion. This does not supplant other activities but rather gives form and definition to activities that were previously overlooked, under-recognized, or silenced in prior promotions processes.  
Clarifying the kinds of participants with whom we engage sheds further light on what is worth of recognition and the reference to these three is consistent with the ARC Impact & Engagement process | No change, except see comment [1(c)] re: use of terminology ‘partners’ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c</th>
<th>Proposal for a 4th engagement stream</th>
<th>Salah Sukkarieh</th>
<th>The notion of a 4th stream for engagement was discussed but ultimately settled as not the preferred view as engagement should feature within the core mission of research and teaching. It is possible for faculties and schools to provide local support for candidates wishing to major in this capacity e.g. via Professors of Practice</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Like the proposed format of ‘General Expectations, Education and Education Engagement, Research and Research Engagement and Governance, Leadership or Engagement’. Some consistency questions on the level of specificity offered, eg Level B - 4(7)(d)(vi) reference to conferences. General criteria do not say much about wider engagement (external stakeholders which has ‘impact’, make a difference) Seems restricted in its illustration to translational research, which is a small component of such activities. It can be difficult to understand the scope of engagement – more illustrations would be helpful</td>
<td>Ann Davis</td>
<td>No change is made to the text to vary level of specifications per original text. Changes through this process around ‘translational’ expand its meaning rather than replace it. Guidelines document will provide further examples and training session for committee members will assist with identifying and assessing engagement</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Change current language on “track record of competitive research grants” at Level E to the singular</td>
<td>Amanda Budde Sung</td>
<td>This is the current language and so propose no change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Page 6, Section 4 Will, where appropriate.....translational research</td>
<td>Ria Deamer</td>
<td>‘appropriate’ means suitable or proper in the circumstance ‘feasible’ means possible and practical to do easily or conveniently. In context the term ‘appropriate’ is the most suitable term to be used.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>“Significant” is a bit vague and open to interpretation, which should be avoided. E.g. in reference to “significant contribution” and “significant impact”</td>
<td>Patrice Rey</td>
<td>“Significant” is the term used in the current normative criteria, so no change is proposed here. Likewise with the reference</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to ERA contributions. The reason for this 'vagueness' is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>Subclause 4(4)(c) is inconsistent with subclauses 4(2)(e) and 4(3)(d). Is this intentional?</th>
<th>Stephen Clibborn</th>
<th>Change made for consistency.</th>
<th>Email sent and amendments for consistency made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Subclause 4(9)(c)(ii) contains a new requirement of a “good track record” which is a higher requirement for Level D than for Level E which only requires a “track record”</td>
<td>Stephen Clibborn</td>
<td>Removed the word “good”</td>
<td>Change made for consistency with Level E requirement of ‘track record’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Subclause 4(7) (normative requirements for Level B) contains no mention of engagement. Is this intentional?</td>
<td>Stephen Clibborn</td>
<td>Yes this is intentional.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Subclause 4(7)(c)(iv) – should this be in subclause 4(7)(b) instead as it relates to teaching, not research?</td>
<td>Stephen Clibborn</td>
<td>No, a referencing misread.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Subclauses 4(8)(d)(iii) and (v) have changed normative requirements from “may” to “will”</td>
<td>Stephen Clibborn</td>
<td>No, current criteria is ‘will’ reference 4(7)(k)</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Subclause 4(9)(b)(i) changes the wording from “will” to “may”, effectively downgrading the normative requirement for leadership in teaching for Level D</td>
<td>Stephen Clibborn</td>
<td>Revert to original language</td>
<td>Change made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cross-reference issues</td>
<td>Stephen Clibborn</td>
<td>Section has now been reworded</td>
<td>Changes made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Subclauses 4(9)(b)(i) and 4(9)(c)(iv) refer incorrectly to subclauses 4(8)... instead of 4(9)...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Subclauses 4(10)(b)(ii) and 4(10)(c)(vi) refer incorrectly to subclauses 4(9)... instead of 4(10)...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subclause 4(10)(d)(vi) – syntax error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Some other issues I’d also like to bring up that involve changes in this proposal 4(7)(b)(iv) seems to say that level B research supervision is all &quot;in units of study&quot;; I can’t see why this isn’t simply phrased as &quot;will normally contribute to research supervision, at undergraduate, honours, or postgraduate level, including within appropriate units of study&quot;</td>
<td>Alan Fekete</td>
<td>4(7)(b)(iv) Change made</td>
<td>Relevant changes made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>4(7)(d)(v) &quot;subject are&quot; should be &quot;subject area&quot;</td>
<td>Alan Fekete</td>
<td>4(7)(d)(v) Typo change made</td>
<td>Relevant changes made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>4(8)(a)(iv) duplicates much of 4(8)(b)(ii); I think this is better worded in (b), and also better placed there. I also think a similar clause should be included for levels A and B.</td>
<td>Alan Fekete</td>
<td>4(8)(a)(iv) duplicates much of 4(8)(b)(ii); wording in (b) adopted and added as a general expectation in Levels A &amp; B</td>
<td>Relevant changes made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>4(9)(a) is worded very badly, in linking (i), (ii), and (iii) by &quot;and&quot; and &quot;or&quot;. In logic, X and Y or Z is ambiguous, we need to make clear &quot;(X and Y) or Z&quot; versus &quot;X and (Y or Z)&quot;. Everywhere else, the clauses of expectations are implicitly &quot;and&quot;; I think it should stay that way, so I suggest to combine (ii) with (iii) in a single clause which makes clear the need for at least one aspect. I would also prefer more parallels in the wording. So how about &quot;either (a) will make original and innovative contributions to research which are recognised as high quality nationally or internationally; or (b) will make original and</td>
<td>Alan Fekete</td>
<td>4(9)(a)(i)(ii)(iii) removal of linkage between (i) and (ii)</td>
<td>Relevant changes made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### innovative contributions to teaching which are recognised as high quality nationally or internationally; or both.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>l</th>
<th>Similarly, 4(9)(b) has and mixing with or; as well I think it is a real mess to put in clause 4(9)(b)(iii) which has a research aspect coming in the education part of the criteria! Also, there seems deep confusion between the levels expected; whether it is &quot;sustained record of leadership&quot; or &quot;evidence of capacity to lead&quot;. I think this needs a complete rewording, and make sure there is parallel in what is expected under teaching compared with research.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alan Fekete</td>
<td>4(9)(b) &amp; 4(9)(b)(iii) new text provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant changes made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m</th>
<th>4(10)(b) has &quot;or&quot; between its parts, and (ii) refers to research which doesn't belong under Education. I also don't see why this is set up as &quot;or&quot;, given that promotion to level E requires BOTH teaching and research to be outstanding. Similarly why is there the Note in 4(10)(c)(vi) as both teaching and research leadership is required at this level. I also am discomforted by the lack of parallel between the wording and level of detail of 4(10)(b) compared to 4(10)(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alan Fekete</td>
<td>4(10)(b) &amp; 4(10)(c)(vi) new text provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant changes made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| n | Some other issues that seem to have been already there in previous form of the procedures:  
* The definition of ERA in 3(2) says the report is compiled annually, but that is not the case in recent times.  
* 4(4)(e) says "impact...in limiting outcomes" I have no idea what this means |
|---|---|
| Alan Fekete | 3(2) Annually removed  
4(4)(e) ‘Limiting’ amended to ‘achieving’  
4(6)(b) ‘honours’ added  
4(9)(a)(ii), 4(9)(d)(i)  
- No change to “outstanding” |
<p>| Relevant changes made |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The wording of 4(6)(b) existed before but I don't see why level A staff can't supervise Honours research; I would like to expand the wording to &quot;may contribute to research supervision at undergraduate or Honours level&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The word &quot;outstanding&quot; is used in a few places eg 4(9)(a)(ii), 4(9)(d)(i). This is very confusing, given the special meaning &quot;already performing at the next level&quot; used for that word in promotion evaluation. I would search and replace all uses except those that fit the special meaning, say by &quot;high quality&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slashes are also not permitted, and I have changed “and/or” to “or”. The usual meaning of “or” is to require one or other criterion to be met and this is so if both are met, making the “and/” redundant. I have also taken out a few references to “where appropriate” where they didn’t really add to the meaning ie where they relate to “may” clauses rather than “will” clauses, or where they relate only to illustrations or examples.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kerrie Henderson</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amended back to include “where appropriate”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee notes Mr Payne’s quarterly update on key external policy and funding developments relevant to the University’s activities.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The University is currently grappling with many external policy developments relevant to our activities. Brief summaries of key current issues are provided below under three categories: Education, Research and Cross-cutting.

**Education**

1. **Commonwealth Grant Scheme (CGS) funding freeze**

The Australian Government announced in December 2017 non-legislatives changes to university funding designed to deliver $2.2 billion in budget savings. Most of these savings are being achieved through the imposition of a two-year freeze (at 2017 levels) in the amount of CGS funding the Government will pay individual universities each year. The Government asserts the ‘demand driven’ system of funding for bachelor-level students remains intact. However, universities now receive only the ‘student-contribution amounts’ for any students they enrol above their CGS funding caps. As the CGS funding the University receives will not be indexed in 2018 or 2019 its real value will decline as staff and other operating costs continue to increase. However, student contribution amounts will continue to be indexed as normal over these two years.¹

2. **CSP funding for sub-bachelor, vertically-integrated and graduate entry coursework programs**

The Government also committed in December 2017 to consulting with the sector in 2018 over the design of new CSP allocation mechanisms for students enrolling in these programs from 1 January 2019. The Government is still to release any further details about its plans or its long-promised consultation paper. Professor Pattison stressed the problems the continuing uncertainty is causing for the University’s affected faculties and courses with senior DET officials in July. We are confident that DET will confirm the CSP allocation arrangements that will apply for these courses by October 2018 at the latest. We continue to make the case strongly to DET that our various courses affected by the continuing uncertainty should receive another year of ‘grandfathering’ to allow students to enrol in these courses as normal in 2019.²

3. **Performance funding**

The Government has announced that from 2020 it will only increase a University’s maximum annual CGS funding amount if it meets performance criteria that are to be finalised in 2019. If a university does meet the Government’s performance requirements, its maximum CGS funding amount will only be increased at the rate of growth in the Australian population aged between 18 and 64. Universities Australia (UA) and the Group of Eight (Go8) Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) groups have had some constructive discussion with DET

---

¹ For further information on the funding freeze see the letter included from the Department of Education and Training (DET) included at Attachment A.

² See Attachment A for limited further information on these issues.
officials about the design of the performance funding arrangements. Professor Pattison has been involved with these discussions and has also discussed these matters directly with senior DET officials.  

4. Admissions transparency

The Federal Government has in 2018 continued its focus on seeking to make higher education providers admissions policies and processes more accessible, transparent, consistent and comparable for the benefit of prospective students, parents, careers advisers and other stakeholders. All providers were required by May 2018 to present their admissions-related information for prospective students in 2019 and beyond consistently with an approach, terminology and definitions agreed between the Government, TEQSA and higher education sector through an Admissions Transparency Implementation Working Group. TEQSA has received additional funding and resources to monitor providers’ adherence to the new agreed transparency requirements and it is important that the University takes care to ensure full compliance with the new transparency requirements.  

5. Annual transparent cost reporting for teaching and scholarship

Another transparency measure the Government is in the process of implementing is the introduction of annual reporting on universities’ costs in delivering teaching and scholarship by Field of Education (FoR). This initiative builds on two ad hoc costing exercises undertaken in 2011 (for the Bradley Review of Base Funding) and in 2016 with which the University was closely involved. We have again been closely involved with the design of the framework for annual cost reporting by universities, with our Chief Financial Officer, Wayne Andrews and me serving as members of the Universities Australia Reference Group. Preparation of the University’s 2018 submission (based on 2017 financial data) is well underway, overseen by a Project Control Group chaired by the Vice-Principal (Operations). Our submission will be submitted by mid-September.  

6. Work Integrated Learning (WIL)

Education Minister Simon Birmingham is taking a close interest in WIL following concerning reports earlier this year about alleged exploitation of some students by employers while completing WIL as a requirement of their university courses. The Minister wrote to all Vice-Chancellors in March, asking them to outline the measures their institutions have in place to ensure the quality and safety of their students while on compulsory WIL. He also asked for examples of good and innovative WIL practice. In a related development, Universities Australia will shortly release the results of a major survey of universities WIL activities. This project, which is being overseen by a Steering Group Professor Pattison chairs, seeks to demonstrate the scale and breadth of universities’ engagement with industry in relation to WIL and to showcase outstanding WIL practice across the sector. With TEQSA expected to have a keen interest in institutional approaches to WIL quality assurance over the next few years, this is an area that the UEB Education Committee will need to monitor closely.  

7. Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) review

In the 2017-18 Budget, the Australian Government announced a review of the AQF. Peter Noonan, Professor of Tertiary Education Policy at Victoria University is chairing the expert panel undertaking the review, which is expected to commence consultations shortly. As a first step, the review has contracted consulting firm PhillipsKPA to provide contextual research for the review by analysing international qualifications frameworks and the domestic use of the AQF. PhillipsKPA’s report was released on 25 April 2018 and compromises 2 parts: a comparison of AQF against national frameworks from other countries and a detailed analysis of the use of AQF in educational and non-educational settings in Australia. To engage effectively with the review the University will need to form a view on the future role, shape and form that the AQF.  

---

3 Limited further information about the Government’s plans for performance funding from 2020 are included in the letter at Attachment A.  
5 For further information on the transparent costing initiative see the correspondence included at Attachment B.  
6 See the Minister’s letter on WIL and Professor Pattison’s response on behalf of the University at Attachment C.
8. **Provider Category Standards review**

In the 2017-18 Budget, the Government announced its intention to ask the Higher Education Standards Panel to undertake review of the continuing appropriateness of the registration criteria for different higher education provider types under the Part B of the Higher Education Standard Framework: Higher Education Provider; Australian University; Australian University College; Australian University of Specialisation; Overseas University; Overseas University of Specialisation etc. The Government has asserted that this review, which we understand will commence formally before the end of 2018, will seek to *ensure a coherent tertiary education sector with clear but permeable demarcations to reflect changing VET and higher education requirements and expectations*. The review will include public and stakeholder consultation around options to change provider categories, including the possibility of a teaching-only university category. Again, it will be important for the University of Sydney to establish and articulate clear positions on the issues on which this review will focus. These will include the issue of teaching-only ‘universities’ in Australia, and related to this, the continuing relevance and value-add of the ‘teaching-research nexus’ and research-intensive universities.

9. **2017 Universities Australia student finances survey**

Universities Australia released the results of its five-yearly national survey of student finances on 13 August 2018. The survey found that the while the financial circumstance of students overall appear to have improved slightly since the last survey (2012), this is because students are spending less while their incomes have stalled. It also found that one in seven university students regularly go without food or other necessities because they cannot afford them. This rises to one in four for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students and one in five for students from the poorest quarter of households. Other key findings include:

**All students**
- the median annual income for full-time university students is $18,300;
- three in five students say their finances are a source of worry, with low SES students (63 per cent) and regional students (64 per cent) even more likely to be worried;
- one-third of students have estimated living expenses exceeding their income;
- one in 10 of students deferred their studies because they could not afford to continue, while one-fifth reduced their course load for financial reasons;
- four in five students work while studying; nearly a third full-time students work more than 20 hours a week;
- two in five students say that their paid work has little value to them apart from money;
- two in five students said their paid work adversely affects their university performance; and
- one in three regularly missed classes because they had to work.

**International students**
- Almost 50 per cent of international undergraduate students have estimated expenses greater than their estimated income. International undergraduate students have a median income of $19,200 but a median annual spending of $20,000.
- 50 per cent of international undergraduate students are in paid employment and for those who do work have a median of 15 hours a week.
- Nine in ten (89 per cent) international undergraduate students are financially supported by family or partner.
- Around 50 per cent of international undergraduate students are worried about their financial situation, compared to almost 60 per cent for full-time domestic students.
- 14 per cent report regularly going without food or other necessities because they can’t afford them, which is consistent with domestic students.
- Almost 55 per cent of international undergraduate students have some savings that they can draw on in case of serious financial difficulties, with 38 per cent of students reporting that they have had

---

A summary of the PhillipsKPA contextual research report on the AQF is included at Attachment D.
Non-Confidential

to use savings in 2017. International undergraduates estimate much higher levels of debt at graduation than domestic undergraduates. The median estimate of debt on graduation $68,000.8

10. An emerging debate about the future of Australian post-secondary education policy

The first half of 2018 has seen momentum building towards a serious public policy debate about future directions for Australia's post-secondary system of education. Key developments have included:

- **CGS Funding Freeze.** The Government’s announcement of the CGS funding freeze late in December 2017 acted like a ‘pause button’ for higher education policy debates, following more than five years of successive governments (of both persuasions) failing to get substantial higher education funding cuts and policy changes through the Senate.

- **BCA policy paper.** The Business Council of Australia helped to get the ball rolling early in 2018 by running national consultations on its ‘Future Proof’ Tertiary Education Plan released in October 2017. Our proactive engagement with the BCA helped the Vice-Chancellor and Vice-Principal External Relations secure meetings with the Chief Executive of the BCA, which has resulted in further positive engagement and collaboration between the BCA and the University.9

- **Reflections of an ex senior Commonwealth bureaucrat.** Robert Griew, former DET Deputy Secretary released a thoughtful and provocative (for Vice-Chancellors) reflective paper in March 2018 on reasons for the now decade-long failure of successive governments to achieve substantial reform of the higher education policy and funding system. The paper included a call to arms for the sector’s leaders to put self-interest aside and engage more proactively, realistically and constructively with the public and the political class to help build support for meaningful reform of the sector in the national interest.10

- **Senate Select Committee inquiry on the future of work and workers.** World-wide, there are policy discussions underway about the implication of globalisation and technological advancement for the future of work and how education systems can best prepare and assist people to succeed in work and life. Australia is part of this discussion and in February the University made a submission to a Senate Select Committee’s inquiry into the future of work and workers. This resulted in Professor Pattison being called to give evidence before the Committee in April.11

- **Labor commitment to a major post-secondary education review.** Deputy Leader of the Opposition and Shadow Minister for Education, Tanya Plibersek, announced in February that should the Labor Party win the next election, it would commence a once-in-a-generation national inquiry into Australia’s post-secondary education system within 100 days of taking office. We have engaged actively and constructively with Ms Plibersek and her office in relation to the drafting of the terms of reference for the review, making a submission in March and holding follow-up discussions with her office.12

- **KPMG future of tertiary education policy paper.** On 1 August, Professor Stephen Parker AO, former Vice-Chancellor of the University of Canberra and now KPMG partner and Education Sector Practice Leader, released a detailed policy blueprint for a future, more integrated and coherently regulated and funded Australian tertiary education system. The paper, which Professor co-authored with a former policy adviser to Labor education ministers and former senior DET bureaucrat made 10 key recommendations for reform.13 While the University is still considering its position on the KPMG paper, there are similarities between some of its recommendations and positions we have argued within the last few years.14

---

8 The full UA Student Finances Survey 2017 is available [here](#).
9 A summary of the BCA’s discussion paper and the University’s response to it is available [here](#).
10 Mr Griew’s paper is available [here](#).
11 Our submission to the Senate Select Committee on the Future of Work is available [here](#).
12 The University’s submission to the ALP’s post-secondary education terms of reference consultation is available [here](#).
13 The full KPMG report and separate executive summary are available [here](#) through the company’s website.
14 See for instance our submission to the ALP post-secondary education review terms of reference consultation available [here](#).
Research

11. Parliamentary inquiry into funding Australia’s research

In May Minister Birmingham referred an inquiry into the arrangements for funding Australia’s research to the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Education, Employment and Training. The inquiry is examining Commonwealth funding of research, except for National Health and Medical Research Council funding and programs. Submissions to the inquiry closed on 30 June and we made our own submission while contributing significantly to those made by the Group of Eight, Universities Australia and the Australasian Society of Research Managers (ARMS). Professor Ivison was subsequently invited to give evidence to the Committee at a hearing held in Sydney on 7 August.15

Cross-cutting

12. National security bills

Throughout the first half of 2018 we have engaged extensively with the Government and other stakeholders regarding numerous new proposed national security laws that would have significant implications for our day-to-day teaching, research, public and political engagement activities. Pleasingly, in each instance, strong collaborative advocacy by universities and other affected groups has helped minimise the often-unintended negative consequences of the proposed reforms for universities, their staff and students. Professor Anne Twomey of the University of Sydney Law School has been very influential in these debates, providing expert and influential advice to members of the Government, Opposition and Parliament about the need for significant amendments to the proposed legislation.

13. Proposed new national data sharing and release Act

In May 2017 the Productivity Commission completed a major review of data availability and use in Australia. The objective of this inquiry was to determine how best to make public and private data sets more readily available for research and other purposes, while ensuring appropriate privacy and security safeguards. We engaged with the Commission’s review, making submissions and giving evidence at a hearing. We recently reengaged with this policy process after the Federal Government released an Issues Paper in July to inform consultation over the design of new national Data Sharing and Release Act. Our primary interest in this area is to ensure an outcome that gives our researchers improved access to data held by the Commonwealth. This legislation is also important to us given our role as a provider of data to the Commonwealth and as a custodian of data sets developed with direct or indirect funding support from the Commonwealth. On 5 September 2018 Professor Ivison will, through the Sydney Policy Lab, host officials from the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet for a roundtable discussion with experts drawn from across our disciplines.16

Attachments

A DET letter to the Vice-Chancellor about the CGS funding freeze, 19 December 2017
B DET and Vice-Chancellor letters about annual transparent cost reporting from 2018
C Correspondence between the Minister and DVC Education about Work Integrated Learning
D Summary of the PhillipsKPA contextual report on the AQF, released July 2018

15 The University’s submission to the research efficiency review is available here, while the Hansard transcript for the 7 August hearing Professor available here.
16 PM&C Issues Paper and the University’s submission in response is available here.
Dear Dr Spence

Funding arrangements for 2018–20

I am writing to you regarding The University of Sydney’s funding arrangements for 2018–20.

2017–18 Mid-Year Economic and Fiscal Outlook

The Australian Government made a number of announcements in the 2017–18 Mid-Year Economic and Fiscal Outlook (MYEFO) which will impact funding arrangements for your university (http://www.budget.gov.au/2017-18/content/myefo/html/).

From 2018, the Government will cap the amount of funding it pays to public universities for non-medical bachelor courses (non-designated courses). In 2018 and 2019, the cap will be set at the level of funding provided in 2017. From 2020 onwards, universities will be able to grow their Commonwealth Grant Scheme (CGS) funding in line with national 18 to 64 year old population growth if they meet certain performance requirements. The cluster funding rates and maximum student contribution rates will continue to be indexed as required by legislation. However, total payments for non-designated courses may not exceed the cap specified in your agreement. Once this cap has been reached, institutions remain free to continue enrolling students and charging up to the maximum student contribution from all students.

The performance indicators and performance targets will be subject to consultation with the sector in 2018 and may relate to improvements in student attrition, low SES participation and workforce preparedness of graduates. During 2019, the performance indicators and targets will be assembled and tested with the sector prior to their full implementation in 2020.

Funding agreements

The University of Sydney’s 2018–20 CGS funding agreement is attached. The funding agreement reflects the implementation of the Government’s MYEFO announcements, including a Maximum Basic Grant Amount (MBGA) for non-designated Commonwealth supported places (CSP). This is based on the university’s October 2017 estimates for 2017.
Should the amount at reconciliation for 2017 be higher, your MBGA will be revised upwards accordingly.

The funding agreement includes the allocation of designated places for your university in 2018. This reflects the implementation of the Government’s announcement that the current allocation of postgraduate CSPs will be reduced by about 3000 places in line with current utilisation from 1 January 2018. The Government will be consulting with the sector in 2018 on new arrangements for the allocation of sub-bachelor and postgraduate places from 2019.

Currently, a number of universities cross-subsidise between postgraduate and sub-bachelor allocations. This is contrary to the policy intent of the allocation of designated places and will no longer be permitted. The Department of Education and Training intends to monitor this closely from 2018. The funding agreement includes a new clause indicating that providers may be audited to determine whether actual enrolments in CSPs in designated courses of study align with providers’ allocations.

In 2018, the Government will be considering options for addressing the anomaly in legislative arrangements that permit the funding of integrated bachelor/masters courses from non-designated CGS places. Changes may take effect from 1 January 2019. There are no changes to current arrangements in 2018.

The Government will also consider arrangements regarding the establishment of controls over full fee paying medical students (both domestic and international), particularly in relation to implications for the health workforce and clinical training capacity. Please consult the department at an early stage if your institution is commencing planning to deliver additional full fee paying medical places.

I invite you to sign (but not date) the funding agreement and return it by email to:

   Katerina Lawler
   Branch Manager
   Funding and Students Branch
   Higher Education Group
   Department of Education and Training
   fep@education.gov.au

I am aware that funding agreements are being sent out later than usual this year. The usual payment schedule has been revised to provide for two payments in January 2018. You will receive payment for programs other than the CGS on 11 January 2018. A further payment will be made on 25 January which will include CGS payments so long as your funding agreement has been finalised.
If you wish to ensure that payments commence on 25 January 2018, the new funding agreement must be signed and returned to the department by **12 January 2018**. Funding agreements returned after this date will be processed for payments to start on the next feasible payment in the attached schedule.

**Commonwealth Grant Scheme and Higher Education Loan Program payments**

Information regarding your CGS and Higher Education Loan Program (HELP) payments for 2018 is at Attachment A. This includes details of regional, enabling and medical student loadings.

The Australian Government contribution amounts and the maximum student contribution amounts for 2018 have been published on the department’s website (www.education.gov.au/funding-clusters-and-indexed-rates).

**Higher Education Participation and Partnerships Program payments**

The total allocation of Higher Education Participation and Partnership (HEPPP) funds for the 2018 calendar year is $133,759,440. Information regarding your HEPPP allocation is shown at Attachment A. The funds have been calculated using the Statistical Area 1 (SA1) measure and 2016 data, based on the proportion of low socio-economic status students that attend your university. This is consistent with the allocation of HEPPP funding in 2017.

HEPPP grants are for initiatives that increase access to and participation in higher education by domestic undergraduate students from a low socio-economic status background, and that support the retention, success and attainment of those students. The HEPPP operates as set out in the Other Grants Guidelines (Education) 2012 (the Guidelines). Activities funded from your 2018 allocation must comply with the Guidelines.

Universities are required to fully expend funds in the year for which the grant is made and report to the Commonwealth on this expenditure. Any amount of unspent funds or any amount of funds not spent in accordance with the Guidelines will become a debt due to the Commonwealth and recoverable as a debt or by adjustment from future payment.

**Schedule of payments**

A schedule of payments for 2018 is shown at Attachment B.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

David Learmonth

19 December 2017

_Oppportunity through learning_

50 Marcus Clarke Street, Canberra ACT 2601
GPO Box 9880, Canberra ACT 2601 | Phone (02) 6121 6000
Commonwealth Grant Scheme

A summary of initial 2018 CGS payments amounts for your university is shown in the table below. The table details the advance payment amount for non-designated courses of study (based on the non-designated MBGA) as well as the total advance payment for designated courses of study (based on the designated MBGA). The table also details payments for medical student loading, enabling loading and regional loading, which have been calculated in accordance with the CGS Guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018 Commonwealth Grant Scheme Payments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Designated Course of Study</td>
<td>$256,608,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Course of Study</td>
<td>$46,024,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical student loading</td>
<td>$1,303,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional loading</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling loading</td>
<td>$16,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$303,953,065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Higher Education Loan Program

HECS-HELP
The following table shows the 2018 advance payments to the university for HECS-HELP. The initial payment has been based on 24,871 equivalent full-time students, which is the combination of the university’s 2017 non-designated estimate provided in October 2017 and the university’s 2018 allocated places.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HECS-HELP Deferred (Advance) (A)</th>
<th>HECS-HELP Upfront Payments (B)</th>
<th>HECS-HELP Total Liabilities (A+B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$177,996,409</td>
<td>$34,606,680</td>
<td>$212,603,089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FEE-HELP
For 2018, your initial FEE-HELP advance payment of $82,353,111 has been calculated by indexing the FEE-HELP payment the university has received in 2017.

OS-HELP
For 2018, your university has initially been allocated 829 nominal loans with a maximum value of $7,513,227. These initial values have been based on the university’s 2017 estimate provided in October 2017.

Under section 2.15 of the OS-HELP Guidelines, the number of OS-HELP loans allocated to institutions each year is capped. Institutions may not grant more than the maximum number of loans determined by the Minister’s delegate during each request round, even if they have extra funding available.

If your institution requires additional loans for 2018, please send an email to the FEP@education.gov.au mailbox, noting that requests are subject to approval.

SA-HELP
For 2018, your initial SA-HELP advance payment of $4,128,912 has been calculated by indexing the SA-HELP payment the university has received in 2017.

Higher Education Participation and Partnerships Program

For 2018, your Higher Education Participation and Partnerships Program (HEPPP) allocation is $2,295,831.

---

1 Your university’s initial CGS payment will be on 25 January 2018, provided a funding agreement has been finalised.
## PAYMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR PERIODIC PAYMENTS TO PROVIDERS - 2018 YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payment Number</td>
<td>Reference Month</td>
<td>Payment Date</td>
<td>Cumulative payment proportion of grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>January 1</td>
<td>11 January 2018</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>January 2</td>
<td>25 January 2018</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>February 1</td>
<td>8 February 2018</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>February 2</td>
<td>22 February 2018</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>8 March 2018</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>March 2</td>
<td>22 March 2018</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>12 April 2018</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>April 2</td>
<td>26 April 2018</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>10 May 2018</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>24 May 2018</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>June 1</td>
<td>7 June 2018</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>June 2</td>
<td>21 June 2018</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>12 July 2018</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>July 2</td>
<td>26 July 2018</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>August 1</td>
<td>9 August 2018</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>August 2</td>
<td>23 August 2018</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>September 1</td>
<td>13 September 2018</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>September 2</td>
<td>27 September 2018</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>11 October 2018</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>October 2</td>
<td>25 October 2018</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>November 1</td>
<td>8 November 2018</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>November 2</td>
<td>22 November 2018</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>December 1</td>
<td>6 December 2018</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>December 2</td>
<td>13 December 2018</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Dr Spence

Transparency in Higher Education Expenditure

I am writing to give you an update about the progress of the transparency in higher education measure that was announced in the 2017-18 Budget.

The Department ran a procurement process to find a consultant to collect the expenditure data and Deloitte Access Economics was the successful applicant. The contract with Deloitte has been signed and Deloitte will attend all future meetings of the working group that has been convened by Universities Australia (UA).

I understand there has been some concern in the sector about the ability to submit data before September 2018. Given the delays in engaging a consultant, I am proposing to revise the timeframe for the 2018 data collection as per the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refinements to survey methodology</td>
<td>Until end July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providers advised of survey requirements</td>
<td>Early August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection period</td>
<td>13 August – 21 September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report</td>
<td>9 November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of final report</td>
<td>7 December 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that the extension of the timeframe will apply to the 2018 data collection only. In 2019 and 2020, data will be due by 30 June as per the original proposed timeframe.

In addition, to make it an easier transition for universities that are less well positioned to provide this data, universities will be phased-in over a three-year period i.e. 25 universities will be required to participate in 2018, 32 universities in 2019 and 37 universities in 2020.

Following an exchange of letters with UA, it has been decided that the Department of Education and Training, in conjunction with Deloitte, will select 25 universities that will be required to participate in the data collection in 2018. It will be a representative sample of the sector and seek to include those universities that are best prepared to provide data in 2018. Once a decision has been made, I will write to those universities that have been selected to advise them of the decision.

Opportunity through learning
We will also be implementing a three-year data cycle. Under this model, the data methodology will be settled in 2018 and this methodology will be used to collect data in 2018, 2019, 2020. This will improve the comparability of the data between years and provide certainty to universities about future year reporting requirements ensuring less well positioned universities have sufficient time to prepare for the collection.

The survey from the 2016 cost of delivery project will be used as the starting point for the data collection. The survey will be refined over the next few months by Deloitte, the UA working group and the department, with the providers to be advised of the finalised data requirements in early August 2018.

The Government will provide $25,000 to each Table A university this financial year to assist with the costs of any systems changes required to implement this measure. Universities that wish to receive this money will need to submit a valid tax invoice for $25,000 to the department by 31 May 2018. Invoice should be addressed as follows:

Dr Andrew Herd  
Funding and Students Branch  
Higher Education Group  
Department of Education and Training  
GPO Box 9880  
CANBERRA ACT 2601  

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Date 23/4/18
Dr Michael Spence AC  
Vice-Chancellor and Principal

21 May 2018

Mr Dom English  
Group Manager  
Higher Education Group  
Department of Education and Training  
GPO Box 9880  
Canberra ACT 2601

By email: dom.english@education.gov.au

Dear Mr English,

Thank you for your letter of 23 April 2018 providing an update on implementation of the Government’s Transparency in Higher Education Expenditure Measure. As you know, the University of Sydney participated in the 2011 and 2016 costing exercises and continues to be involved closely with the Department’s and sector’s preparation for annual expenditure reporting through our representation on the Universities Australia Transparent Costing Reference Group and the more recently established Technical Working Group.

While we are disappointed that the Department has decided not to collect data on universities’ research expenditure for the first three years of this exercise, we welcome the commitment to work with the Reference Group to develop a robust methodology for the inclusion of research costs in the future. We also welcome the commitment to work with the sector to improve the survey methodology and to ensure that any public reporting of an institution’s cost data will respect both the commercial and confidential nature of this information and the potential for it to be misinterpreted by students and other stakeholders.

We are happy to participate in the 2018 data collection and believe we are relatively well placed to meet the reporting requirements. We remain concerned, however, that the proposed data collection period of six weeks will be extremely challenging even for those institutions which participated in the last two Deloitte costing exercises. We therefore strongly support the Reference Group’s suggestion that the Department and Deloitte aim to finalise the definitions, template guidelines and methodology as quickly as possible, ideally allowing the start of the data collection period to be brought forward by 2-4 weeks.

We know that the cost of preparing for this new reporting requirement in 2018 will far exceed the $25,000 the Department is offering to assist with the development of system changes. Nevertheless, we are happy to accept this funding contribution and will submit a tax invoice by the end of May as requested.
We look forward to working collaboratively with the Department, Deloitte and other universities to ensure this transparent cost reporting exercise delivers robust data to inform future policy development and institutional strategies to maximise quality, efficiency and cost-effectiveness.

Should you require any further information from us in relation to our participation in this exercise, our key contacts are:

Wayne Andrews, Chief Financial Officer and Universities Australia Transparent Costing Reference Group member: 02 9351 3133, wayne.andrews@sydney.edu.au

Antony Stark, Senior Financial Analyst, Financial Modelling & Business Partnering Unit, Financial Planning & Analysis, Financial Services, Operations Portfolio and Universities Australia Transparent Costing Working Group member: 02 9036 9465, antony.stark@sydney.edu.au

Yours sincerely,

Michael Spence AC

cc Andrew Herd, Funding and Students Branch, Higher Education Group, Department of Education and Training
Catriona Jackson, Chief Executive Officer, Universities Australia and Chair, Universities Australia Transparent Costing Reference Group
Senator the Hon Simon Birmingham

Minister for Education and Training
Manager of Government Business in the Senate
Senator for South Australia

Our Ref MB17-000660

Dr Michael Spence AC
Vice-Chancellor and Principal
The University of Sydney
SYDNEY NSW 2006

19 MARCH 2018

Dear Dr Spence,

I am writing to all vice chancellors concerning the issue of work experience requirements within academic courses. The issue has been brought to my attention by students who are required to undertake work placements but have been disappointed by what they see as limited assistance from some universities and course coordinators to help them identify suitable workplaces win which to complete their placements. This includes concerns by some students who have needed to complete a work placement to graduate, but who have been unable to secure a placement with which to do so.

It is a fundamental obligation of universities to provide comprehensive, meaningful and practical support to students who require job placements to meet the requirements of their course of study. The Higher Education Standards Framework outlines that where professional accreditation of a course of study is required for graduates to be eligible to professionally practise, the course of study is to be accredited by the relevant professional body. The Standards also require that work-integrated learning or other community-based learning for students must be quality-assured, including assurance of the quality of supervision of student experiences.

Providing work-integrated learning opportunities for students has significant benefits for the job readiness of graduates. I note that a National Strategy on Work Integrated Learning in University Education was developed in 2015 and a working group established with representatives from Universities Australia, Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, AiGroup, Business Council of Australia and Australian Collaborative Education Network.

In addition, Professions Australia’s recent National Professional Accreditation Best Practice Summit provided a good opportunity for participants to discuss the relationship between our higher education system, professional associations, industries, employers and students. I understand that in a final communique from the summit, members of Professions Australia, Universities Australia and other participants committed to ensuring the development of ethical, innovative and competent professional practitioners as a key to the workforce of the future and sustainability of our communities. Issues related to this, such as the completion of work placements to meet course and accreditation requirements will be critical to such an outcome.

Adelaide
107 Sir Donald Bradman Drive, Hilton SA 5033
Ph 08 8354 1644

Canberra
Parliament House Canberra ACT 2600
Ph 02 6277 7350
In line with the increased focus on work readiness and work experience in industry, I ask that you provide advice by the end of June 2018 on the strategies and actions your institution is undertaking to achieve positive outcomes for students in these areas. The Department of Education and Training will collate your responses and identify good practice examples for sharing back to the sector.

I will be writing separately to Australia’s peak employer groups encouraging them to also play a more proactive role in supporting students into suitable work placements.

Yours sincerely

Simon Birmingham
Senator the Hon. Simon Birmingham  
Minister for Education and Training  
Parliament House Canberra ACT 2600  
By email: minister@education.gov.au

Dear Minister Birmingham,

Thank you for your letter of 19 March to the Vice-Chancellor seeking advice about the steps the University of Sydney takes to achieve positive outcomes for students who must undertake Work-integrated Learning (WIL) as a requirement for graduation from their degrees. The Vice-Chancellor has asked me to respond on behalf of the University as WIL falls within my portfolio responsibilities.

Our educational objective is to equip our graduates with the qualities they will need to make productive, innovative and ethical contributes to society as they take on positions of intellectual and professional leadership after graduation. To this end, WIL represents a large, growing, valued and critical component of our curriculum, and underpins our approach to education across our diverse professional, generalist and research degrees. We are currently in the first year of implementing a new undergraduate curriculum designed to deliver a new set of graduate qualities for our students.

Your information request relates primarily to students who must complete WIL as a requirement of their courses. We currently have more than 14,000 domestic and international students enrolled in such courses across a wide range of disciplines, with almost 5,000 students commencing in these courses each year. However, as a core element of our new curriculum, we are also currently focused on developing an expanded range of innovative voluntary multi-disciplinary team-based WIL and other ‘experiential learning’ opportunities available to all of our students.

In the attached report we have endeavoured to give you a sense of the scale of our WIL activities (for both compulsory and voluntary WIL). We also provide a high-level overview of our approach to delivering, coordinating, monitoring, quality assuring and improving WIL services and opportunities provided to our students. We conclude, as requested, by providing some examples of good practice and innovation in WIL drawn from across our faculties and central units engaged in the delivery or support of our WIL activities.

Yours sincerely,

Professor Pip Pattison AO  
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)
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Work-integrated learning at the University of Sydney

There is currently no standard definition or terminology for WIL internationally or domestically. However, there are four key themes that emerge from existing definitions and literature:

- integrating theory with the practice of work;
- engagement with industry and community partners;
- planned, authentic activities; and
- purposeful links to curriculum and specifically designed assessment.

Our Student Placement and Project Policy 2015 defines a 'placement' as a student undertaking supervised learning at a workplace that is controlled by a placement provider, for the purpose of the student’s practical education. Such placements are 'vocational placements' as provided in the Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth).

Compulsory WIL encompasses all placements our students must complete successfully as requirements for graduation. The compulsory WIL requirements and standards embedded in many of our courses are set by the relevant professional accrediting bodies, with students only able to obtain registration in their chosen professions by demonstrating that they have completed an accredited course including a specified WIL component. Voluntary WIL includes all other WIL opportunities our students may choose to undertake at their discretion.¹

**Compulsory WIL**

Compulsory WIL forms a vital part of the overall learning experience for thousands of our students. As at 6 June 2018 more than 14,000 of our students were enrolled at different stages in coursework degrees with compulsory WIL requirements. This includes all students enrolled in courses that are accredited by, and meet the requirements for registration of, different Australian and international professional accrediting bodies. The disciplinary breakdown of these students is provided in Table 1 below along with the commencing cohorts in each field for 2017. Almost 5,000 students currently commence in our courses with compulsory WIL each year.

---

### Table 1 University of Sydney students enrolled in courses with compulsory WIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplines with compulsory WIL as part of degree</th>
<th>Total enrolments*</th>
<th>Commencing enrolments**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry and Oral Health</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technology</td>
<td>3226</td>
<td>1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise and Sport Science</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media and Communications</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Radiation Science</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition and Dietetics</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapy</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Counselling</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Pathology</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education (early childhood, primary, secondary, counselling)</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science (including Animal and Veterinary Bioscience and Veterinary Public Health Management)</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14073</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>4701</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Enrolments at 6 June 2018  
** Full year data at 31 December 2017  
*** Of these students 28% are international  
Source: IAP Insights, Sydney Courses  

### Voluntary WIL

Providing rich formal and informal WIL and other experiential learning opportunities to support students in acquiring our graduate qualities is also a high priority in degrees that do not have compulsory WIL. **Table 2** below sets out the graduate qualities we are seeking to deliver through our new undergraduate curriculum.
Table 2 University of Sydney undergraduate qualities: foundations for leaderships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualities</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depth of disciplinary expertise</td>
<td>To excel in applying and continuing to develop disciplinary expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader skills: - 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 capacity 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>

Source: The University of Sydney Strategic Plan 2016-2020, p.32

Expanding the availability of authentic, ‘real-world’ educational challenges across fields of study is essential to promoting the integration of knowledge with professional and personal ethics and values.

Our approach to WIL quality assurance

Quality assurances processes for our WIL activities operate within a comprehensive framework of external and internal regulations and policies. The external quality assurance framework consists of the following elements:

- The Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015 (Cth).\(^2\)
- The Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 (Cth).\(^3\)
- The National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018 (Cth) (the ‘National Code’).\(^3\)
- The Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 (Cth).
- The Higher Education Support Act 2003 (Cth).\(^4\)

---

\(^2\) Specifically standards: 1.4 Learning outcomes and assessment; 2.3 Wellbeing and safety: 5.1 Course approval and accreditation; 5.2 Academic and research integrity; 5.3 Monitoring review and improvement; 5.4 Delivery with other parties

\(^3\) Specifically the TEQSA Act’s registration and re-registration requirements and processes

\(^4\) Specifically, Division 18 Quality and Accountability Requirements and Sub-division 30-C Funding Agreements
• The Commonwealth’s Funding Agreement with the University drawn under the Higher Education Support Act.5
• The Health Practitioner Regulation National Law Act 2009 and the NSW Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (NSW) No 86a (The National Law) for many of our health professional courses.
• The requirements for student placements in public health services and schools set by the NSW departments of Health and Education.
• The accreditation, reporting, periodic review and reaccreditation requirements for our courses in health disciplines accredited by professional bodies not covered by the National Law and for courses in other professional disciplines.
• External audits conducted periodically in compliance with relevant legislative requirements, for example annually by the NSW Auditor General, every five years to ensure compliance with federal laws governing the delivery of education to international student and every seven years for re-registration as higher education provider by TEQSA.

Our internal WIL quality assurance framework is designed to assure both the safety and well-being of students undertaking WIL and the quality of their learning outcomes. This framework consists of the following policy elements:

- **Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions Rule 2016**
- **Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions Rule 2016**
- **Coursework Policy 2014**
- **Learning and Teaching Policy 2015**
- **Student Placements and Projects Policy 2015**.

The Student Placements and Projects Policy 2015 is of particular importance to WIL as it sets our requirements for the development and management of all student placements and ensures that students are properly supported while on placements or engaging in project work. It is a requirement of this policy that each student placement provider needs to enter into an agreement with the University, which is then listed on the University’s contracts register. The policy specifies under Section 7, Principles, that in order to maximise their learning, students working on a placement should:

a) be given a clear explanation of the professional and academic expectations and learning outcomes of the placement;
b) have access to quality supervision; and
c) be given work related responsibilities relevant to the intended learning outcomes; and
d) have structured opportunities for critical reflection.

Other elements of our internal WIL quality assurance framework include:

- **Legislative Compliance Register**: a constantly updated, comprehensive legislative compliance register, which allocates responsibility for all aspects of legislative compliance clearly across the University’s Senior Executive, mapping policies and processes back to each legislative requirement;
- **Risk Register**: a comprehensive University-wide risk management framework and register, which scans our activities and has a particular focus on ensuring student and staff safety and well-being in all delivery locations;
- **Internal audits**: a rolling cycle of strategic internal audits aligned with our legislative compliance obligations and identified operational risk issues;

---

5 Specifically, clauses 21 covering courses in health disciplines accredited under section 49 of the National Law and Clause 22 for initial teacher education courses accredited by the NSW Education Standards Authority
- Robust course approval requirements and processes: all new courses proposals and variations, including those with a WIL component, are subject to stringent business case and academic review and may not commence until the Senate has endorsed recommendations from the University Executive and Academic Board;
- Accreditation reviews: conducted regularly for our professionally accredited courses; most of which include compulsory WIL;
- Regularly thematic quality reviews: led jointly by the Academic Board and the University Executive and focused on issues and topics identified as priorities for attention to improve quality institution-wide;
- Regular course reviews: include review of WIL, and are undertaken on a rolling basis by faculties as a requirement of the Learning and Teaching Policy;
- Unit of Study Surveys: undertaken each semester to gather feedback on students’ learning experience at the Unit of Study level, including for WIL units;
- Performance monitoring and improvement: overseen by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and supported by a dedicated Quality and Analytics group with her portfolio, responsible for the ongoing monitoring and reporting on course quality issues against internal and external benchmarks;
- Education Innovation Grants: a competitive internal funding program administered by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) to support innovative proposals for quality improvement, including in relation to WIL, from across our faculties;
- Internal and external best practice networks: to share the latest research and ideas about WIL in order to improve learning outcomes across our disciplines, promote collaboration and reduce duplication; and
- Regular internal and external reporting on performance: for example on performance against our strategic goals and KPIs for our educational activities to the Senate and Academic Board, and annually to the NSW Auditor General and Parliament.

An important feature of this framework is that it ensures clear delegations of responsibility relevant to WIL. For example our Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) oversees the implementation of the University’s strategies to enhance all aspects of our learning and teaching, leading a portfolio of services that supports all aspects of the student experience.

The framework also has sufficient flexibility to allow faculties to implement local quality assurance processes in ways that are appropriate to their discipline and courses. For example, in the Faculty of Health Sciences – where professional placements are undertaken at scale in the context of long-established professional accreditation requirements – all students must complete an anonymous post placement survey. Aggregated data is then benchmarked against all responses by students for all placements for that discipline and provided in a report to the placement site with feedback and suggestions. WIL academics collaborate with the workplace to provide tailored support and training if required.

In the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences – where the number of placements is smaller and professional requirements less prescribed – a dedicated team manages feedback about student placements ensuring that adjustments can be made as necessary. In a first step the Internship coordinator receives the feedback from the host institutions and students. This information is then assessed by an academic coordinator who evaluates feedback on the experience as well as critical reflections about individual units of study. The evaluation is then fed back to the lecturers of those units of study to ensure our courses are relevant to the demands of the workplace.
Examples of good practice and innovation in WIL

An integrated approach to WIL requires oversight, coordination and ongoing review of core elements including:

- WIL coordination, administration, student preparation, safety and support;
- supervisor quality, innovation, improvement and support;
- industry partner engagement;
- inter-professional learning and team-based learning;
- WIL in remote and international locations;
- assessment of learning outcomes; and
- WIL research and ongoing evidence-based improvements.

We provide below selected examples of good and innovative WIL practice drawn from across many of our faculties and central units responsible for our WIL activities. This by no means represents the full extent of good practice occurring across the institution, but reflects the range of activities and different approaches that are occurring in different disciplinary and interdisciplinary settings.

Approaches to WIL organisation, coordination, student preparation, safety and support

School of Education and Social Work (preservice teachers and social workers)

The School’s Office of Professional Experience Management administers approximately 1,740 student placements each year across initial teacher education programs in early childhood education, primary education, secondary education and school counselling. All students in these courses have access to comprehensive information about all aspects of their professional experience through a dedicated Professional Experience in Education website and an online handbook. The website and handbook provide information on registration, general expectations, preplacement visits, roles and responsibilities, pre-service teacher assessment and detailed information for supervising teachers.

Pre-professional experience lectures provide preservice teachers (PST) with information relevant to their upcoming placement including about when and from whom to seek assistance should they require it. Assigned tertiary mentors visit each PST more than once, except in the case of interns who normally receive one visit. However, this is always differentiated according to need – those students who need it receive more support.

The School’s Social Work Field Education Program delivers similar preparatory, information, advisory and support services for our students enrolled in our social work programs ensuring we comply with accreditation standards set by the Australian Association of Social Work (Section 4.3 “Field Education” of the AASW’s Policy Australian Social Work Education and Accreditation Standards (AASW 2008)). For our social work field work program:

- students must spend a minimum total of 1,000 hours in at least two field placements;
- no placement may be less than 40 days;
- patterns of placement days may vary from five days per week to a minimum of three days per week;
- no placement may be an observational placement;
- in every placement students must be supervised by a qualified social worker who has a minimum of two years’ full-time practice experience;
students must undertake placements in at least two practice settings (for example, hospital, neighbourhood centre, government agency);

students must experience at least two fields of practice (for example, mental health and child protection, or refugee settlement and disability services); and

students must be able to practice using a diverse range of social work interventions, including casework, group work, community work, policy development, social action and research.

The program is delivered in deep, mutually beneficial partnerships with our collaborating agencies with the aims of facilitating student education, research, consultation and continuing professional development, providing high-quality field education opportunities for our students, and supporting field educators in assisting students’ learning.

School of Pharmacy Readiness for Practice Quiz

This barrier to clinical placement exam is held for first year Master of Pharmacy students to ensure students have the necessary communication and technical skills prior to undertaking their first placement. This includes:

1. An online case-based multiple-choice questions test: Students are required to “navigate” various aspects of a prescription, select appropriate resources to address typical scenarios encountered in pharmacy - therapeutic, legal and professional/ethical standards.

2. Oral component: Students are required to demonstrate their medical information gathering and communication skills (verbal and non-verbal) in an oral role-play.

3. Dispensing: Students are required to demonstrate their ability to dispense prescription medicines through a computer-simulated patient and pharmacy dispensary (MyDispense).

Faculty of Health Science Clinical simulation as a pre-placement preparation

All students enrolled in Faculty of Health Sciences (FHS) courses must satisfy a range of administrative and educational requirements prior to undertaking placement. These include complying with mandatory Pre-placement Requirements, attending preparatory lectures and tutorials as well as becoming familiar with all Work Health and Safety requirements that apply while on placement.

Clinical simulation has been a key feature for FHS in preparing their students for placements. The Faculty has an on-campus facility which consists of a fully equipped 6 bed ward, an outpatient and rehab department to simulate realistic workplace situations. Work simulation is aimed at enhancing clinical learning and preparing students for their onsite placements. Students are exposed to high fidelity simulation, including standardised patients (actors), mannequins and are supervised by experienced clinical educators. Clinical simulation provides a deep learning experience in a safe and supervised environment, helping students to gain confidence and develop skills in patient and case load management, self-reflection and peer-review.

Office of Clinical Education Support

We established the Office of Clinical Education Support (OCES) in 2014 to improve our coordination and provision of support services vital for the smooth delivery of our extensive compulsory WIL activities in the health disciplines. Governed by a high-level Board and academic advisory group the OCES works closely with our 13 health disciplines with courses with embedded WIL to support almost 7,000 students while on placements. The OCES is responsible for industry partner relationship management including the negotiation and implementation of Student Placement
Agreements (SPAs) covering all public, private and community-based health sites where our students undertake WIL. The OCE manages all aspects of the ‘Student Verification’ process required for entry to NSW public health and hospital sites (vaccination, working with children, criminal record checks etc) and ClinConnect (the NSW public health system online clinical placement system) coordination. The OCES also provides ongoing policy, planning and strategic support to the University and faculties regarding all aspects of student capability and compliance for placements. While a small office, the OCES is highly productive. University of Sydney students currently complete more than 450,000 unique WIL days annually in the NSW public health system alone. As the University’s ‘one-stop-shop’ for clinical education support, OCES deals with more than 5,000 unique enquiries from industry partners, staff and students a year.

Approaches to WIL and supervisor quality, innovation, improvement and support

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Media and Communications Internship
The Faculty’s Media and Communications Internship unit consists of a work placement of a minimum of 140 hours in a media organisation, co-supervised by the workplace and the department. Placement partners include organisations such as Fairfax, ABC, SBS, public relations firms, publishing houses and in-house communication teams in a variety of business sectors. The work placement is intended as a bridge between the Faculty and workplaces, encouraging a perceptive, reflective approach to their professional lives but under the auspices of the University's curriculum.

The host organisations are all either known to the Faculty or vetted prior to hosting a student. All students must attend an induction lecture on the role of practical experience in developing professional competencies and expectations of students while undertaking their Internships. During their placement students meet individually with the dedicated Internship Coordinator to discuss career goals, compile a professional CV, and to research their industry. Throughout the placement students stay in touch with the Internship Coordinator and Academic Coordinator via email. Students are required to maintain a journal throughout their placement, which needs to be submitted two weeks after they finish and address specific criteria, including:

- the role of the organisation and its position in the industry;
- analysis of the experience demonstrating students’ insights into the industry, the workplace and their own performance;
- an evaluation of how their academic studies prepare them for the role, commenting on at least three units of study;
- ideas for research on key issues in their industry;
- academically rigorous reflections on their learning experiences while on placement.

Faculty of Science Clinical Psychology Unit
The Psychology Clinic is an on-campus student led community clinic. Students are required to complete a total of 2 placements of 6 months duration each. They need to pass the first 6-month placement before being able to attend their external placements. The placements involve intensive supervision, and include observation, group and individual supervision sessions.

Supervisors in the Psychology Clinic take part in comprehensive training which includes 2-weekly meetings and participation in the workshop “supervision of their supervision”. University staff also visit each student at their external placement midway through the 6-month placement. They meet with the student and the supervisor separately, as well as together, to ensure both the quality of the placement and the supervision provided, as well checking that the performance of the student is as expected.
**Supervisor Training, Conferences and Mentoring Programs**

Preparing professionals from across our disciplines to supervise students has been a strong focus of ours to ensure excellence in student supervision. The project “Clinicians as teachers: a blended learning inter-professional Clinical Teacher Training Program” has received a University of Sydney Education Innovation Grant in 2017 and brought together professionals from 4 health care faculties. The project assisted junior health professionals to fulfill their multiple roles, across various institutions, and constitutes a unique professional development course that was not limited to one particular faculty.

Many of our faculties have developed mentoring programs to further support WIL supervisors. For example, our Sydney School of Education and Social Work has created two online mentoring modules that include 20 hours of professional learning material for supervisors of pre-service teaching students. The school has also developed the Tertiary Mentor Professional Learning program, which has been accredited as a Highly Accomplished Teacher Standard. This half-day course informs mentors about upcoming placements and engages them in discussions of research-based approaches to supervising and mentoring preservice teachers.

Offering conferences and workshops is another approach used effectively by many faculties to engage with and support professionals who provide our students with WIL opportunities. For example, the Sydney School of Education and Social Work has developed the Professional Experience Coordinators Conference, which is a one-day professional learning event for teacher educators provided free of charge and accredited at Highly Accomplished (HA) under the national standards framework.

**Approaches to WIL industry partner engagement**

**Interdisciplinary Studies Handbook 2018: Industry and Community Projects**

Under major reforms to our undergraduate curriculum, which commenced this year, students can access a breadth and depth of interdisciplinary excellence in disciplines, professional fields and subject areas that is unparalleled in Australia. The [Interdisciplinary Studies handbook](#) has 4 main components:

- a shared pool of 109 majors, minors, Advanced Coursework and Honours units of study available to all students undertaking an undergraduate liberal studies degree and selected other degrees;
- a collection of units offered in the Open Learning Environment (OLE). These units are designed to enable students to build novel skill combinations including advanced digital and communication skills, broader intercultural understanding and skills for entrepreneurship, and to extend their knowledge by exploring foundational concepts from other fields of study or broad interdisciplinary themes;
- The ‘Dalyell stream’: specialised units and enrichment opportunities offered for high-achieving students; and
- Industry and Community Projects (ICPUs): projects where students work in multidisciplinary groups on authentic problems and issues.

The ICPUs are units of study that are innovative and authentic WIL opportunities and are offered as electives within majors, where students work in multidisciplinary groups on authentic problems and issues.

The University’s 2016-20 Strategic Plan released in March 2016 proposed a significant transformation to our undergraduate curriculum and required us to provide a greater level of engagement with industry and community organisations.
We have now successfully worked with academic and professional staff across the University to facilitate disciplinary and multidisciplinary educational engagement across a range of activities, both project and practice-based. Genuine problems have been sourced from a range of partners on which teams of students work together under the guidance of our staff as well as industry and community expertise.

We have adopted a scaled model of participation with around 1000 students undertaking ICPUs in 2018, 2000 in 2019 before fully capacity of at least 3600-4000 students is reached in 2020.

Projects are run in partnership with a broad range of industry, community and government organisations and an academic project supervisor. Current participating industry include Accenture, AirBNB, CommBank, NSW Parliament, Telstra and the Western Sydney Local Health District. The ICPUs champion collaboration across discipline areas and are open to all third-year students who meet the eligibility requirements, including all fourth-year students who have a spare elective.

The specific projects available vary from year to year and can be found on the Interdisciplinary Projects website.

**Faculty of Health Sciences Multi-Layered Partnerships**

Our Faculty of Health Sciences is pursuing an innovative and highly proactive strategy to develop new WIL opportunities in non-tradition settings by engaging in industry partnerships that not only include student placements but also research and education. These multi-layered partnerships are mutually beneficial collaborations with industry so that students enhance service delivery and outcomes as well as engage in work activities that effectively develop their professional skills. Each relationship is individually negotiated and may include seed funding to assist in the development and establishment of a partnership until it is self-sustaining. Examples include:

- Deep partnerships with various Local Health Districts (LHDs) in NSW. These arrangements involve the appointment of conjoint professors to develop allied health professionals’ research capacity as well as building student placement capacity within the LHD.
- Partnership with the Palsy Alliance, a non-profit organisation dedicated to improving the well-being of people suffering from cerebral palsy. This placement program is designed to ensure the placements occur as part of a research trial to introduce a public health Cerebral Palsy Check-up program.
- Collaborative partnership with the Health Education and Training Institute NSW (HETI) where student-led services address specific provider needs resulting in outcomes such as decreased bed stays and increased discharges of patients.

**School of Veterinary Science**

Students are placed both on partner and non-partner sites. Engagement with industry occurs on several levels. The school awards Continuing Professional Development Points for partners through the Centre of Veterinary Education. The school also offers free specialist consultations for partners who can access academic staff at the school to seek advice for their patients. As part of the ongoing professional development for their partners the school organises an annual Partners in Veterinary Education Conference. This accompanied by an Awards evening to recognise partners.

**Approaches to inter-professional learning (IPL) and WIL**

The University has a strong commitment to interdisciplinary learning and research which is anchored in our Strategic Plan (2016-2020) and requires us to incorporate IPL into all curricula and programs. A particular focus in that context is Interdisciplinary Effectiveness which has been set as one of our graduate qualities (see Table 2 above).
Faculty of Medicine and Health: Health Collaboration Challenge

The Health Collaboration Challenge (HCC) is a large-scale health student interprofessional learning activity designed to provide core competencies in interprofessional collaborative practice.

In 2018 there will be approximately 1800 students working in teams of up to 6 members from Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, Nutrition, Pharmacy, Physiotherapy, Occupational Therapy, Speech Pathology, Diagnostic Radiology, and Exercise Physiology. The HCC will be run over 3 sites and 2 dates and students are orientated to the activity using a ‘flipped classroom’ module on Australian health professional roles.

The main objective of the HCC is to prepare our health graduates to be at the forefront of the workforce with well-developed skills to contribute to ILP team while facing increasing challenges due to an ageing population with complex conditions and diseases. It is crucial that students understand the contributions of a range of health professions in meeting patient needs and apply a collaborative approach to problem solving for challenging tasks.

Students undertake case-based learning in small teams around prepared complex patient cases mimicking the real-life cases of Australians struggling with heart disease, diabetes and obesity. Following the case analysis, teams are then assessed by practitioners drawn from across the health disciplines on a written academically marked management plan and a peer assessed short video of their interprofessional approach to care. Students are asked to rate the level of contribution and performance of their fellow team members, with this feedback fed back to students to constructively assist them with the learning and self-reflection on the exercise.

There is strong evidence to show that collaborative practice strengthens health systems as for example it decreases the number of patient complications, the length of hospital stays, as well as clinical error rates and mortality rates. For example, the figure below demonstrates the success of the HCC in strengthening the teamwork capabilities of participating students.
Rural and international WIL

Rural and international WIL opportunities are critical to provide an authentic experience that replicates the work environment our students will face after graduation. Medicine, Health and Education are sectors where rural and international exposure are very important.

Faculty of Health and Medicine Community Specialty Block and Elective programs

The Sydney Medical School’s Community Speciality Block Unit of study offers students an authentic workplace-based experience under-pinned by workplace-based assessment, self-directed learning based on authentic case studies derived from locally relevant population based general practice encounter data (BEACH) and Federal Government priority areas for Primary Health Care in Australia, in a programmatic assessment strategy.

Students are allocated to each of two socio-culturally different communities in a General Practice clinic placement. More than 60% of our medical students spend at least one of these placements in a rural community. Students spend 3.5 weeks in an immersive experience in the placements working with the community team including general practitioners, practice nurses, practice based allied health where possible and visiting local community health services related to their practice. General practice supervisors are supported with an information and support pack. Many supervisors attend teaching training activities to support their teaching activities.

Students have the support of the Clinical Placements Officer and their clinical school Education Support Officer while on placement. They have a comprehensive orientation before starting placements and have access to all the course materials online at all times.
During the 4th year of the Doctor of Medicine Program students are required to undertake an **Elective Placement**. In 2018 more than 79% students chose to do an international elective placement. Students may choose to undertake their elective anywhere in the world subject to safety provisions stipulated by the University. All elective placements are also subject to approval by Faculty, with clear guidelines. Students may undertake clinical work, research or any other activity demonstrably relevant to medicine, in either a single eight week placement or two four week placements. Students are required to undergo extensive preparation for their elective placements which includes attending briefing sessions, completing the mandatory preparatory online module and participating in a pre-departure seminar. Students are specifically briefed on how to manage difficult situations e.g. expectations of clinical performance beyond their knowledge and experience.

During their placement students are supported by their Clinical School, the Director of Electives or the Office of Global Health. At the end of each placement, supervisors evaluate the student’s performance and the student is required to write an assignment reflecting on his or her elective experience. This report is formally assessed.

**School of Education and Social Work rural and international partnerships**

Rural and international placements have been developed with a variety of different providers. Examples include Canobolas Rural Technology High and Public School in Orange, Forbes High School, and a placement provider in Maningrida, Norther Territory. Some of these placements are supported by DoE funding. The School was also successful in obtaining funding from the New Colombo Plan grant to send students to Bali, Timor Leste, and Vanuatu.

**Approaches to the assessment of learning outcomes from WIL**

Assessment of WIL is crucial to consolidate the effect and impact of the program and should go beyond meeting the official professional accreditation requirements. However, the complexity and wide range of WIL can make it challenging to identify appropriate targeted assessments. In 20017 the Chair of our Academic Board and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) established the University’s Assessment Working Group to develop and deliver the assessment initiatives in the University's 2016–20 Strategic Plan. As part of this work, the Working Group has developed the Graduate Qualities as outlined in **Table 2** above, initiatives to ensure that these are embedded as learning outcomes throughout our undergraduate curriculum, and a common assessment rubric to measure these graduate attainments.

Common assessment strategies adopted by numerous faculties and schools include supervisor reports following the completion of a student placement as well as assessments of standards as set by the relevant external accrediting bodies. For example preservice teachers are assessed against the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) graduate standards using the New South Wales Education Standards Authority (NESA) Evidence Guide. 

**Susan Wakil School of Nursing and Midwifery Clinical Performance Assessments**

The school conducts Clinical Performance Assessments (CPAs) for most subjects which have a clinical placement requirement. CPAs are conducted in Clinical Simulation Laboratories to assess students on a selection of clinical skills attached to a subject. Students are assessed by academics as well as external examiners and are required to gain a satisfactory pass in order to proceed on clinical placement.

**School of Education and Social Work Professional Learning Research Conference & Project**

The Post-Internship Conference is a unique opportunity for pre-service teachers to explore issues beginning teachers routinely face and communicate the results of their own research into some aspect of educational practice as part of their Internship. Together with the Internship and the Post-Internship Conference, the Action Research Project is the culminating task of the program. It
involves an original piece of research that is reported to peers at an intensive 2-day Post-Internship Conference and is also submitted as a written report.

**Nutrition and Dietetics Competency Based Student-led Assessment Process**

Nutrition and Diabetics have adopted an innovative assessment approach for their professional degree that is competency based and led by the students. The student-led assessment process is designed to facilitate the compilation of evidence and to ultimately demonstrate competence in each of the 50 competencies required by the relevant accreditation body. Students enter evidence into an e-portfolio platform, and evidence of competency is then assessed by clinical and university supervisors. Examples of evidence of competency were developed and endorsed through working parties of university academics and placement sites. Evaluation indicated both students and supervisors found them invaluable in interpreting competencies and collating relevant examples of evidence. It is worth noting that other universities have expressed an interest in this progressive system of assessment.

**WIL research**

WIL has and continues to be the subject to vigorous research domestically and internationally. University of Sydney academics from across our disciplines continue to make an important contribution in this field, but we have a particularly vigorous program of research in the clinical education health disciplines. One example is the Sydney Health Profession Education Network (SHERN) research network, which regularly hosts workshops and showcases to share innovative research and best practice in clinical education from across our health disciplines. Our Faculty of Health Sciences has focused on the evaluation and quality improvement of clinical placements. Important findings within the Faculty of Health Sciences include but are not limited to:

- The collection of quality measures data to inform development of supervisors and hence quality improvement.\(^6\)
- The project ‘Developing Validated and Reliable Measures of Student Clinical Placement Quality to Improve Student Learning Experiences’ has been awarded with an Education Innovation Grant and constitutes the first interdisciplinary measures of quality for work integrated learning.
- Research in speech pathology has shown that students on placement don’t detract time from patient care and can in fact enhance productivity.\(^7\)

In 2014, in collaboration with our health faculties we sponsored and released a comprehensive scoping study highlighting the value of clinical placements to the Australian public health system and drawing special attention to the key developments and issues threatening the sustainability of our national system of health education.\(^8\)

---


About the review of the Australian Qualifications Framework
The Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) is the national policy for regulated qualifications in Australian education and training. In the 2017-18 Budget, the Australian Government announced a review of the AQF. The review is being chaired by Professor Peter Noon, Professor of Tertiary Education Policy at Victoria University. Other members of the review panel are Professor Sally Kift, Adjunct Professor, College of Business, Law & Governance, James Cook University, Ms Megan Lilly, Head of Workforce Development, Ai Group, Professor Elizabeth More AM, Dean of the Australian Institute of Management School of Business. Two additional members will be nominated by the states and territories through the COAG Education and Industry Skills Councils. The review will include consultations with the sector and broad public consultation in response to a discussion paper that is expected to be released shortly. Consulting firm PhillipsKPA was contracted by the Department of Education and Training to provide contextual research for the review by analysing international qualifications frameworks and the domestic use of the AQF. Their report was released on 25 April 2018 and compromises 2 parts: a comparison of AQF against national frameworks from other countries as well as an analysis of the use of AQF in educational and non-educational settings in Australia.

Issues raised in previous reviews of the AQF
The AQF was last reviewed between 2009–2011. During the 2009 consultations stakeholder questions and comments primarily related to qualification types descriptors, appropriateness of attributes for each AQF level, and mechanisms to ensure consistency in the application of qualification requirements. A key concern that remains essential is the potential of market confusion when qualifications are issued by VET and higher education institutions. The boundaries between VET and the higher education remain prominent in the current AQF review debate (p.56, PhillipsKPA contextual review).

Current trends
Current trends that have been identified as crucial to be addressed by the 2018 review include the widespread use of micro credentials, flexible delivery options and mechanisms that allow learners to build their own programs (p. 9).

National Frameworks from other countries
The main merit of comparing the Australian AQF to the frameworks of other countries is a result of the trend of particularly some European countries, of moving away from regarding qualification frameworks as tools to establish transparency and equivalence of qualifications to a tool that facilitates an agile workforce able to adapt to technological and social change. However, it is worth noting that this evolution is still in its early stages (p.9-10).

A key distinguishing feature is that European countries tend to have higher employer engagement in the accreditation process, especially at the pre-tertiary level. While recognition of prior learning (RPL) arrangements are encouraged in the AQF, this operates in an unregulated system as there are no mechanisms in Australia to assign levels to non-standard learning options, or to regulate and quality assure these options. Many European countries use their qualification frameworks as resources for the general public to inform them about educational and employment choices. The PhillipsKPA
The report concludes that this is not the case in Australia as the AQF is exceedingly complex and not easily understood by lay audience or the wider community.

Key suggestions and recommendations of the PhillipsKPA report

- The report recommends the removal of regulatory policy details and instead the addition of those policies to the TEQSA/ASQA conditions of registration of providers and accreditation of courses. This change would simplify the AQF, making it easier to be navigated by international and lay audiences. It would also align with international practice as the majority of countries have supporting policy documents separate to their qualification frameworks (p.10-11).
- The PhillipsKPA report discusses the purpose and intent of the AQF at great length. It suggests that this review needs to clarify the AQF’s status in a new regulatory environment (since the establishment of TEQSA and ASQA). A key question that needs to be addressed is: Should the AQF be considered as a standard, framework, or only a reference point?
- The lack of clarity about the standing and purpose of the AQF could be addressed by the adoption of a governance framework. Most international qualification frameworks are managed by statutory authorities that have been appointed by governments or delegate agencies. These bodies help simplify the position of the qualification framework and respond to changing needs and policy aims (p.12).
- Common concerns raised by stakeholders across the board relate to inconsistencies in qualification descriptors, the level criteria and volume of learning, as well as ambiguity in terminology (p.9). Thus, the PhillipsKPA report recommends that a review of the structure and descriptions of AQF components (levels, qualifications and relevant explanations) is included in the Terms of Reference of this Review (p.13).
- The reports strongly advocates for the AQF to adopt a clearer, more relevant definition of volume of learning that is specific and recognises non-traditional formats of learning outside the traditional 2 semester per year structure for higher education providers. The more general concern of being considered as a ‘time served’ model rather than demonstrating competency and the achievement of learning outcomes (p.69-71) is also raised. PhillipsKPA suggests that volume of learning should be replaced with a credit-point-based system related to average hours required to achieve learning outcomes. Such a system would not only be in line with international practice, but would facilitate credit transfer to support pathways and recognise non-formal learning (p.11).
- In relation to addressing micro credentials and other non-traditional program structures, the report recommends that the review considers the integration of micro credentials into the AQF. This would be in line with the Productivity Commission’s recent recommendation to “develop a framework to facilitate the independent accreditation of skills obtained through any learning method”.¹

Points of particular interest to the University of Sydney

- The report has recognised that issues that were identified in 2009 remain pertinent.
- It has also been acknowledged that the foundations of the existing AQF are not particularly strong.
- The scope and nature of the AQF ranging from a guiding frame to a rigid framework remains to be determined. It is in this context that the suggestion of a more integrated VET/HE framework needs to be considered as well as the ambition to incorporate micro credentials and non-traditional learning methods.

The PhillipsKPA is available online here: https://docs.education.gov.au/node/50811

Further information about the AQF Review is available here: https://www.education.gov.au/australian-qualifications-framework-review-0

To provide an interim report on educational integrity trends across the University during Semester 1, 2018.

RECOMMENDATION

That Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the Educational Integrity Trend Report for Semester 1 2018.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Educational Integrity Trend Report for Semester 1 2018 (Attachment 1) demonstrates that alleged breaches of academic honesty have increased from 2017 levels and returned to those first recorded in 2016. This trend has not been universal, however, with a number of faculties and University schools recording fewer alleged breaches in Semester 1 2018 than in the first semester of the previous two years. The report also highlights the impact that increasingly aggressive external “tutoring” services are beginning to have on the academic integrity of units of study, particularly, though not exclusively, in the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. With the endorsement of the Academic Quality and University Executive Education Committees, the Office of Educational Integrity is now pursuing a suite of University-wide initiatives aimed at mitigating the increasing risks posed by external tutoring and custom writing (or contract cheating) services (Attachment 2).

The rate at which alleged breaches involving international students have been reported relative to their domestic peers has also increased on 2017 levels in almost all faculties and University schools. This is despite the Office of Educational Integrity’s addition of a series of preventative workshops in the early stages of Semester 1, which were promoted directly to all first year and international students. Of all faculties and University schools, the Business School has been the most successful in reducing the proportion of international students reported for breaches of academic honesty relative to the proportion of enrolled international students. The strategies employed by the Business School thus serve as a useful model for initiatives to be pursued locally by other faculties and University schools and by the Office of Educational Integrity at the University level.

COMMUNICATION

The Educational Integrity Trend Report will be submitted to the Academic Board via the Academic Quality Committee, the University Executive Education Committee, and to faculties via Educational Integrity Coordinators. The report has been provided to the Undergraduate and Graduate Studies Committees of the Academic Board, and the key findings of the report are being communicated to students and staff via institutional circulars.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Educational Integrity Trend Report, Semester 1, 2017
Attachment 2 – Towards an institutional response to the risks posed by contract cheating
Executive Summary

The *Educational Integrity Trend Report* for Semester 1 2018 demonstrates that alleged breaches of academic honesty have increased from 2017 levels and returned to those first recorded in 2016. This trend has not been universal, however, with a number of faculties and University schools recording fewer alleged breaches in Semester 1 2018 than in the first semester of the previous two years. The report also highlights the impact that increasingly aggressive external “tutoring” services are beginning to have on the academic integrity of units of study, particularly, though not exclusively, in the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. With the endorsement of the Academic Quality and University Executive Education Committees, the Office of Educational Integrity is now pursuing a suite of University-wide initiatives aimed at mitigating the increasing risks posed by external tutoring and custom writing (or contract cheating) services.

The rate at which alleged breaches involving international students have been reported relative to their domestic peers has also increased on 2017 levels in almost all faculties and University schools. This is despite the Office of Educational Integrity’s addition of a series of preventative workshops in the early stages of Semester 1, which were promoted directly to all first year and international students. With the highest increase in total international enrolments of all faculties and University schools, the Business School has been relatively successful at constraining the proportion of international students reported for breaches of academic honesty relative to the proportion of international enrolments. Though there is still more work to be done, the strategies employed by the Business School thus serve as a useful model for initiatives to be pursued locally by other faculties and University schools and by the Office of Educational Integrity at the University level.
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Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHEM</td>
<td>Academic Honesty Education Module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSI</td>
<td>The University of Sydney Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGI</td>
<td>Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSCI</td>
<td>Faculty of Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS</td>
<td>The University of Sydney Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDH</td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine and Health¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIE</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UADP</td>
<td>The University of Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The Faculty of Medicine and Health includes the former Faculty of Dentistry, Sydney Medical School, Sydney Nursing School and Faculty of Pharmacy. Figures reported for 2016 and 2017 for the Faculty of Medicine and Health represent the combined reporting figures of the merged faculties.
Education in academic honesty

To complement discipline-specific education in academic honesty delivered in units of study, all students enrolling in a coursework degree for the first time must complete the mandatory Academic Honesty Education Module (AHEM) within the first semester of their candidature. As shown in figure 1, over 20,000 students have completed the AHEM this year. Despite appearing as if there has been a significant decline in completions in Semester 1, this figure is closer to the actual number of students commencing a coursework degree for the first time. In previous years, students transferring between degrees were considered to be commencing students for AHEM purposes – a number of that has been falling as almost all current students have completed the module since it was introduced in 2016. The total number of students who have completed the AHEM now stands at over 65,000.

Figure 1: AHEM completions, 2016 to 2018

While the number of AHEM completions represents a significant milestone for the University, assessing its impact on preventing breaches of academic honesty has been difficult to quantify given the high number of student completions relative to the much lower number of students reported for breaches of academic honesty. However, recent analysis of AHEM completions relative to breaches reported in 2018 indicates that a high proportion of the reported students were reported within four months of having completed the AHEM (figure 2). Most of these students completed the AHEM within the first month of enrolling at the University, which is intended to be complementary to, not as a substitute for, unit of study level education in academic honesty and writing conventions, especially by way of formative assessment tasks and feedback.

Figure 2: Months elapsed between students’ completion of AHEM and reported breaches, Semester 1 2018

Students reported for breaches of academic honesty are also provided with access to development activities on quoting, paraphrasing and summarising source materials. These activities can be completed via an online module or via a three-hour workshop delivered by the University’s Learning Centre. Both options have proven to be effective in reducing rates of

---

2 Unless otherwise specified, all figures reported for 2018 represent year-to-date figures as at 10 August 2018.
recidivism (i.e., “repeat offending”): only 45 students who completed a development activity in 2016 were reported again in 2017; and only 32 students who completed a development activity in 2017 were reported again in 2018. As shown in figure 3, just over 600 students completed either the online module or a required workshop in Semester 1 2018.

Given their relative success, a series of voluntary, preventative workshops are now also scheduled across the first four weeks of each semester. Though they are available to all students, the preventative workshops are promoted directly to first year and international students to address the higher rates at which they have been reported in previous years. Approximately 280 students completed one of these preventative workshops in Semester 1 (figure 3).

Figure 3: Development course completions, 2016 to 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Online module</th>
<th>Required workshop</th>
<th>Preventative workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 YTD</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trends in detection and reporting

Volume, timing and distribution

In total, 1,840 incidents (i.e., suspected breaches of academic honesty) involving 1,639 students were reported across the University in Semester 1 (see figure 4 and table 1 on p.9). The number of reported students was marginally lower at 1,639 students, representing 2.9% of all students undertaking a coursework degree. As demonstrated in figure 4, this is equivalent to the figures recorded for Semester 1 2016, although it represents an increase of approximately 20% on the figures recorded for Semester 1 2017. The number of students reported in relation to more than one incident has also increased marginally in relation to the previous semester, although this is still broadly in line with historical trends at approximately 10% of reported students and less than 0.5% of all coursework students. The proportional volume and timing of reporting in 2018 has also remained broadly consistent with trends identified in previous years (see figure 5).

Figure 4: Reported incidents and students each semester, 2016 to 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Incidents</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sem 1 2016</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem 2 2016</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem 1 2018</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall increase in incidents reported in Semester 1 was not uniform, though, with most faculties and University schools recording marginally lower rates of reporting as compared to the previous two years (see figure 6 and table 1 on p.9). Increases were recorded in Arts and Social Sciences, and the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning. However, the principal driver of the overall increase in Semester 1 was a significant increase in the number of breaches reported in Engineering and Information Technologies. The distribution of incidents across undergraduate degrees also reflects the increased incidents reported in Engineering and Information Technologies, with six of the faculty’s degrees being amongst those recording the highest number of incidents in Semester 1.

The twenty undergraduate degrees recording the highest number of incidents in Semester 1 are shown in figure 7. The reported incidents involving students enrolled in these degrees accounted for close to 70% of all undergraduate incidents despite course enrolments in these degrees representing only 51% of all undergraduate coursework enrolments. A similar pattern was evident at the postgraduate level (see figure 8), with incidents associated with the twelve postgraduate degrees shown in figure 7 accounting for 67% of all postgraduate incidents despite enrolments in these degrees representing only 41% of all postgraduate coursework enrolments.
The significant increase in incidents reported in Engineering and Information Technologies is itself the result of an increased number of incidents reported for two core units of study in the School of Information Technologies, accounting for approximately 60% of the faculty’s total volume for Semester 1. On investigation, many of these incidents relate to the activities of an external “tutoring” service that has been particularly aggressive in its advertising to students enrolled in these units. The faculty is now working closely with the School of Information Technologies on identifying and mitigating further risks to the integrity of the affected units. The Office of Educational Integrity has also initiated work with stakeholders across the University to implement more robust institutional measures for addressing the impact of third party tutoring and custom writing services on the integrity of the University’s courses.

Detection methods and allegation types
The use of similarity detection software (SDS) has again underwritten the efforts of teaching staff to detect potential breaches of academic honesty. As a result, over two thirds of the incidents reported in Semester 1 related to allegations of plagiarism and collusion between students (see figures 9 and 10), although it is worth noting that allegations of plagiarism have declined from 55% of all allegations in 2017 to 42% of allegations made thus far in 2018.

3 The University uses Turnitin for similarity detection for text-based written assignments. Additionally, the School of Information Technologies uses the program MOSS (Measure of Software Similarity) to check work submitted by students enrolled in their large core programming units of study.
Notably, the use of similarity detection software in the two School of Information and Technologies units discussed above enabled the unit coordinator and faculty to detect the influence of the third party service insofar as this service had provided students with model answers derived from the instructions given for a number assessment tasks. This means that a number of the recorded allegations of collusion have involved behaviours increasingly associated with contract cheating. With explicit allegations of contract cheating made to date in 2018 already equal to those made annually in 2017 (49 and 51 allegations respectively), this indicates that contract cheating represents an increasing threat to the University’s educational integrity.

Outcomes

Almost one quarter of the incidents reported in Semester 1 2018 have yet to be resolved (see table 1 on p.9). The figures presented here are provisional and will be updated in the 2018 annual report due to the Academic Board in March 2019. Of those that have been resolved:

- 519 incidents (28%) were resolved with an outcome of no impropriety
- 265 incidents (14%) were resolved with an outcome of development completed
- 234 incidents (13%) were resolved with an outcome of plagiarism
- 372 incidents (20%) were resolved with an outcome of academic dishonesty and
- 29 incidents (2%) were referred to the Registrar on grounds of potential misconduct.

Figure 11 indicates changes in outcomes between 2016 and 2018 thus far, although the presently high number of unresolved incidents in 2018 makes it difficult to offer any conclusive analysis of changes in the proportionality of outcomes relative to previous years.
It is worth noting, though, that the number of incidents resolved with a finding of no impropriety thus far is artificially high. This arises from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies’ decision to withdraw a number of small, continuous assessment items from the two programming units impacted by the aforementioned tutoring company. The nature of this company’s advertising and recruitment of students to its services, particularly international students in their first semester of study, meant that many of the reported students were of the genuinely mistaken belief that the company was acting in a manner endorsed by, and consistent with the academic standards of, the University. These students have been issued with strong warnings against engaging with similar companies in future and informed that the relevant case records have been retained confidentially on their student files in case they should be reported again. Such warnings will also form part of the Office of Educational Integrity’s University-wide campaign in Semester 2. Importantly, no unreported students were disadvantaged by the faculty’s handling of this matter.

**Demographic trends**

Previous reports of the Office of Educational Integrity have identified that undergraduate students in their first year of study and coming to the University from overseas are reported in proportionally higher numbers than other categories of students (see tables 3 to 6 on pp. 10-11). As indicated in figure 12, these trends have continued and extended in Semester 1 despite the continuing efforts to improve mandatory and preventative education on academic honesty.
The change in the demographic profile of students reported in Semester 1 was driven in large part by the high number of incidents reported in Engineering and Information Technologies. However, all faculties except Health Sciences recorded a higher proportion of incidents involving international students relative to the proportion of international student enrolments (figure 13 and table 6 on p.11). At the University level, the proportion of incidents involving international students was more than one and a half (or 1.65) times higher than the proportion of total international student enrolments at approximately 62% of incidents and 38% of enrolments respectively. The difference in these proportions at the faculty and University school level was variable, however, with the incident ratio (16.7%) in Health Sciences being 0.12 times lower than the enrolment ratio (18.8%), ranging up to the Law School, which had an incident ratio (58.3%) three times higher than its international enrolment ratio (19.7%).

Figure 13: Proportion of incidents involving international students and proportion of faculty international student enrolments, Semester 1 2018

Despite having the highest volume of, and increase in, international student enrolments in 2018, the relatively lower difference between incident and enrolment ratios in the Business School (at about 1.23 times higher) is indicative of its longer-term effectiveness at managing this gap. It has achieved this through a variety of education programs and, in educational integrity cases, its model of one-on-one consultation sessions for students in need of developing their academic writing skills. Though not yet reaching parity, the experience of the Business School positively demonstrates that the higher proportions at which international students have been reported can be reduced through concerted action. It also highlights the need for all faculties and University schools to ensure that all students, particularly incoming international students, are provided with ongoing instruction on academic honesty beyond that provided through central modules and workshops by the Office of Educational Integrity and the University’s Learning Centre.
Tables

All figures summarised in the following tables are for Semester 1 2018.4

Table 1: Reported incidents by faculty and outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>No Impropriety</th>
<th>Development Completed</th>
<th>Plagiarism</th>
<th>Academic Dishonesty</th>
<th>Potential Misconduct</th>
<th>Pending</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSI</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGI</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSCI</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDH</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIE</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UADP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Reported incidents by use of similarity detection software (SDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Total Incidents</th>
<th>SDS Used</th>
<th>Incident Ratio</th>
<th>SDS Not Used</th>
<th>Incident Ratio</th>
<th>Invigilated Examination</th>
<th>Incident Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSI</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGI</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSCI</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDH</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UADP</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Incident reporting data relative to undergraduate and postgraduate degrees is not provided in this report due to the high number of unresolved cases and the considerable administrative work underway to amend the case records associated with the core first year programming course in the School of Information Technologies in which a number of assessment tasks were withdrawn. This data will be published in the next annual report to be submitted to the Academic Board in March 2019.
### Table 3: Incidents reported by level of coursework qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total Incidents</th>
<th>Undergraduate Incidents</th>
<th>Undergraduate Incident Ratio</th>
<th>Undergraduate Enrolment Ratio</th>
<th>Postgraduate Incidents</th>
<th>Postgraduate Incident Ratio</th>
<th>Postgraduate Enrolment Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSI</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGI</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSCI</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDH</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UADP</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1238</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Incidents reported by year of candidature (course block)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total Incidents</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSI</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGI</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSCI</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDH</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UADP</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Incidents reported by attendance pattern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Incidents</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
<th>Full-time Incident Ratio</th>
<th>Enrolment Ratio</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
<th>Part-time Incident Ratio</th>
<th>Enrolment Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSI</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGI</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSCI</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDH</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UADP</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Incidents reported by enrolment type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Incidents</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
<th>Domestic Incident Ratio</th>
<th>Enrolment Ratio</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
<th>International Incident Ratio</th>
<th>Enrolment Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSI</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGI</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSCI</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDH</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UADP</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards & Policy Committee note, and provide feedback on, the draft Educational Integrity Decision-Making and Penalty Guidelines 2018, as presented.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Educational Integrity Decision-Making and Penalty Guidelines 2018 (Attachment 1) are the culmination of work undertaken during 2017 and 2018 by the Educational Integrity Working Group, which was established under the auspices of the Academic Board at its 2 May 2017 meeting on the recommendation of the Office of Educational Integrity. The Working Group is chaired by the Director, Education Strategy, and includes the Educational Integrity Coordinators from each faculty and University school. The guidelines are intended to enhance the consistency of decisions taken by Educational Integrity Coordinators and nominated academics under the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 and the Academic Honesty Procedures 2016. They are presented here in draft form for feedback purposes. Based on this feedback, further revisions will then be considered by the Working Group ahead of endorsement being sought for the finalised guidelines from the Academic Board at its November meeting.

COMMUNICATION

In addition to the feedback provided by the University Executive Education Committee, feedback on the draft guidelines is also being sought from the Academic Standards and Policy Committee. Once endorsed by the Academic Board, the guidelines will be published in the University's Policy Register and distributed to all Educational Integrity Coordinators, nominated academics and relevant professional staff. They will then be linked to the academic integrity pages of the student website and the educational integrity pages of the staff intranet.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Educational Integrity Decision-Making and Penalty Guidelines 2018 (draft version)
1 Purpose

(1) These guidelines provide a practical guide for Educational Integrity Coordinators and other academics nominated by the deans of each faculty and University school to determine allegations of academic dishonesty and plagiarism in relation to coursework. They are to be read in conjunction with, and as a complement to, the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 and Academic Honesty Procedures 2016 (the “policy” and “procedures”).

(2) The guidelines may also be of informational or educational value to unit of study coordinators, teaching staff, examiners and students. However:

(a) A staff member must not use the guidelines in a manner inconsistent with actions and delegations set out in the policy or procedures. This includes but is not limited to:

(i) failure to afford a student procedural fairness as specified in clause 14 of the policy;

(ii) failure to report a suspicion of academic dishonesty or plagiarism to an Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic as specified in clause 15 of the policy.

(b) A student cannot appeal against an academic decision taken by an Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic under clause 3.2 of the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended) on the grounds that the student believes that the academic decision was made in a manner that was inconsistent with the guidelines.

Note: See subclause 2(c) below.

2 Principles

(1) These guidelines embody the following principles:
(a) **Procedural fairness.** Students alleged to have engaged in a breach of academic honesty must be made fully aware of the specific nature of the allegation, the available evidence, and be given the opportunity to respond to the allegation in accordance with the policy and procedures.

(b) **Transparency and defensibility.** The determination of an alleged breach of academic honesty shall be based on the open consideration of the available evidence, including any submissions made by or on behalf of a student, and a defensible assessment of the balance of probabilities.

(c) **Academic judgement and discretion.** These guidelines reaffirm the importance of academic judgement and discretion in determining whether a breach of academic honesty has occurred, and the specification of consequent actions or penalties. They do not prescribe the determination of specific forms of academic dishonesty or plagiarism, or circumscribe actions that may be specified otherwise under the policy and procedures.

(d) **No advantage.** Any corrective actions or penalties specified by Educational Integrity Coordinators and nominated academics to remediate a breach of academic honesty shall not enable a student found to have engaged in plagiarism or academic dishonesty to gain unfair academic advantage over other students.

(e) **Mitigation of educational disadvantage.** Any corrective actions or penalties specified by Educational Integrity Coordinators and nominated academics shall give due consideration to extenuating circumstances experienced by a student at the time the breach was made.

(f) **Harm minimisation.** Any corrective actions or penalties specified by Educational Integrity Coordinators and nominated academics shall give due consideration to the minimisation of harm. This includes, but is not limited to:

   (i) harm to a student’s capacity to develop the graduate quality of an integrated personal, professional and ethical identity;

   (ii) harm to other students, either through unfairness or to their capacity to develop an integrated personal, professional and ethical identity;

   (iii) harm to the educational or research integrity of the faculty or University school;

   (iv) harm to the good name and academic standing of the faculty, University school or University;

   (v) harm to the good order and governance of the University where such harm is realised as impeding the ability of others to pursue their education, research and work and to participate fully in the life of the University.

### 3 Definitions

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

**Note:** See part 2 of each of the policy and procedures.

In this document:

**academic dishonesty** has the meaning given in subclauses 7(1) and 7(2) of the policy. In relation to higher degree by research students, it
refers to academically dishonest conduct by such a student undertaking a coursework unit of study.

**Academic Honesty Education Module** means the mandatory online education module all students commencing a coursework award course after 1 January 2016 must complete prior to the census date in their first semester of enrolment.

**alternative work** means work completed by a student in lieu of work for which a student has been found to have engaged in plagiarism or academic dishonesty by an Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic.

**corrected work** means work that has been amended by a student to ensure appropriate acknowledgement of source material, including attribution of the source or sources of this material, at the instruction of an Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic.

**coursework** has the meaning given in the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 which at the time of approval of the guidelines was:

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

**dishonest plagiarism** has the meaning given in clause 6 of the policy and, under subclause 7(2)(b), constitutes academically dishonest conduct.

**donor (student)** means a student who has provided inappropriate information, including assessment questions or answers, to one or more other students, including via social media or other online platforms, and regardless of whether those students are known directly to the donor student or not.

**engagement (of or from another person)** means entering into a transactional relationship with another person in relation to the completion of assessable work, whether for payment or otherwise.

**fail item of assessment** means the application of a numerical mark between 0% and 49% and a Fail (FA) grade to work submitted by a student for a separately weighted item of assessment within a unit of study.

**fail unit of study** means the application of a numerical mark between 0% and 49% and a Fail (FA) grade to the overall result for a student within a unit of study.
formal development requirement/s (on record) means a central, confidential record is held for a student who has previously completed an approved development activity at the instruction of an Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic.

formative task means an item of assessment, typically of lower weighting, that has been designed to evaluate a student’s progress toward achieving learning outcomes for a unit that would be measured in a more substantial summative task.

further development means the further development activity a student is required to undertake after an Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic has formed the preliminary view that the student has engaged in academic impropriety as a result of prior educational failure.

further development activity means a workshop or online module designed to assist students to develop their understanding of, and proficiency with, academic writing conventions and standards.

illegitimate cooperation (i.e., collusion) means collaboration that is inconsistent with subclause 8A of the policy. It is characterised by a lack of transparency and openness, providing unfair advantage to a student or group of students over others, undermining the advancement of student learning, and preventing the accurate assessment of the knowledge and skills a student or group of students has developed through the learning process.

indicative outcome means a statement on the combination of corrective actions and penalties ordinarily specified by an Educational Integrity Coordinator or a nominated academic to remediate a breach of academic honesty as determined under the policy and procedures.

plagiarism has the meaning given in clause 8 of the policy.

policy means the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015.

prior finding or findings means a prior finding or findings of academic dishonesty, plagiarism or misconduct in an academic matter as determined by either an Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic under the policy and procedures, or the Registrar under the University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016, and as held on a central, confidential record.

procedures means the Academic Honesty Procedures 2016.

recipient (student) means a student who has received inappropriate information, including assessment questions or answers, from one or more donor students, including via social media or other online platforms, and regardless of whether the donor student or students are known directly to the recipient.
has the meaning given in subclause 7(2)(a) of the policy which, at the time of approval of the guidelines was:

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

means the requirement to give proper attribution to another person’s or source’s ideas, findings or words in accordance with an established referencing and citation style as determined by the relevant discipline.

Note: For examples, see the University Library’s Referencing and Citation Styles: Home.

means the reduction of a numerical mark by an amount expressed as a proportion of the total marks available for an item of assessment or unit of study.

Note: A specified mark penalty shall be applied in its absolute form, rather than as a multiplier. For example, where a mark penalty of 10% (i.e., 10 marks out of 100) of the total available marks is specified for work assessed at 70% (i.e., 70 marks out of 100), the final mark after the penalty is applied is 60% (70 – 10 = 60).

means the uppermost mark for which a student’s work is eligible, expressed as a proportion of the total marks available, for an item of assessment after it has first been assessed on its academic merit relative to the advertised criteria.

Note: A specified maximum mark does not immediately constitute the mark to be applied to a student’s corrected or alternative work. Rather, a specified maximum mark shall only be recorded if the merit-based mark exceeds the specified maximum. Where the merit-based mark falls below the specified maximum, the lower mark shall be recorded.

means the academic level to which a student has progressed as measured by the duration of the candidature and credit points gained relative to the requirements of the award course.

means an item of assessment, typically of moderate to higher weighting, that has been designed to evaluate the extent to which a student has achieved one or more learning outcomes.
### 4 Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No impropriety</th>
<th>Further Development</th>
<th>Plagiarism</th>
<th>Academic Dishonesty</th>
<th>Potential Misconduct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plagiarism – failure to understand referencing requirements</strong></td>
<td>Plagiarised material is minimal and limited to a very small number of instances.</td>
<td>Plagiarised material is of low to moderate volume.</td>
<td>Plagiarised material is of low to moderate volume.</td>
<td>Plagiarised material is of low to moderate volume.</td>
<td>Plagiarised material is of low to moderate volume.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genuine attempt to acknowledge sources, possibly with imprecision in use of referencing conventions.</td>
<td>Genuine attempt to acknowledge sources, possibly with imprecision in use of referencing conventions.</td>
<td>Genuine attempt to acknowledge sources, possibly with imprecision in use of referencing conventions.</td>
<td>Genuine attempt to acknowledge sources, possibly with imprecision in use of referencing conventions.</td>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any stage of candidature.</td>
<td>Early- to mid-stage of candidature.</td>
<td>Early- to mid-stage of candidature.</td>
<td>Early- to mid-stage of candidature.</td>
<td>Mid- to late-stage of candidature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No prior findings or formal development requirements on record.</td>
<td>No prior findings or formal development requirements on record.</td>
<td>No prior findings or formal development requirements on record.</td>
<td>No prior findings or formal development requirements on record.</td>
<td>No prior findings on record, although may have formal development requirements on record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrective feedback sufficient.</td>
<td>Specified maximum mark of 64%</td>
<td>Specified maximum mark of 50% or 64%</td>
<td>Specified maximum mark of 50% or 64%</td>
<td>Specified maximum mark of 50% or 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicative outcome</strong></td>
<td>No penalty</td>
<td>Further development activity</td>
<td>Further development activity</td>
<td>Further development activity</td>
<td>Further development activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submission of corrected work.</td>
<td>Submission of corrected work.</td>
<td>Submission of corrected work.</td>
<td>Submission of corrected work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specified maximum mark of 64%</td>
<td>Specified maximum mark of 50% or 64%</td>
<td>Specified maximum mark of 50% or 64%</td>
<td>Specified maximum mark of 50% or 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impropriety</td>
<td>Further development</td>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>Academic dishonesty</td>
<td>Potential misconduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plagiarism – negligence</strong></td>
<td>Plagiarised material is minimal and limited to a small number of instances. Genuine attempt to acknowledge sources, possibly with imprecision in use of referencing conventions. Any stage of candidature. No prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record. Corrective feedback sufficient. Plagiarised material is of low volume. Genuine attempt to acknowledge sources, possibly with imprecision in use of referencing conventions. Early- to mid-stage of candidature. Prior formal development requirements on record. Plagiarised material is of low to moderate volume. Genuine attempt to acknowledge sources, possibly with imprecision in use of referencing conventions. Mid- to late-stage of candidature. Prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record. Plagiarised material is of moderate to high volume. Limited attempt to paraphrase or acknowledge source material appropriately, demonstrating reckless disregard for academic standards. Mid- to late-stage of candidature. Prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicative outcome</strong></td>
<td>No penalty Further development activity Submission of corrected work Specified maximum mark of 50% or 64% Further development activity Submission of corrected or alternative work Specified maximum mark of 50% Further development activity (can incl. Academic Honesty Education Module) Submission of alternative work Specified maximum mark of 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism – deliberate</td>
<td>Further development</td>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>Academic dishonesty</td>
<td>Potential misconduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low volume of plagiarised material, with insufficient attempt to paraphrase and/or acknowledge all sources.</td>
<td>Moderate to high volume of plagiarised material.</td>
<td>No attempt to acknowledge source material appropriately or accurately, demonstrating willful disregard for academic standards.</td>
<td>Multiple findings of academic dishonesty on record.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early- to mid-stage of candidature.</td>
<td>Any stage of candidature.</td>
<td>May or may not have formal development requirements on record.</td>
<td>May or may not have prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May or may not have formal development requirements on record.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative outcome</th>
<th>Further development activity (can incl. Academic Honesty Education Module)</th>
<th>No prior finding of plagiarism or academic dishonesty: Fail item of assessment (0% - 49%)</th>
<th>Prior finding: Fail unit of study (0% - 49%)</th>
<th>Refer to Registrar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submission of alternative work</td>
<td>Prior finding: Fail item of assessment (0% - 49%)</td>
<td>Further development activity (can incl. Academic Honesty Education Module)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specified maximum mark of 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>No propriety</td>
<td>Further development</td>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>Academic dishonesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recycled material is relevant to task, minimal and limited to a small number of instances. • Genuine, but insufficient attempt to paraphrase from, or no acknowledgement of, the previously submitted work. • Any stage of candidature. • No prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record. • Cautionary feedback sufficient.</td>
<td>• Recycled material is relevant and of low or moderate volume without acknowledgement of prior use. • Any stage of candidature. • No prior findings on record.</td>
<td>• Recycled material is unacknowledged and of sufficiently high volume to demonstrate limited or no engagement with disciplinary content and/or learning outcomes specific to the unit of study. • Any stage of candidature. • May or may not have prior findings on record.</td>
<td>• Multiple findings of academic dishonesty on record.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicative outcome**

- No penalty
- Further development activity (can incl. Academic Honesty Education Module)
- Submission of corrected or alternative work
- Specified maximum mark of 50%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No impropriety</th>
<th>Further development</th>
<th>Plagiarism</th>
<th>Academic dishonesty</th>
<th>Potential misconduct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabricating data and/or sources</td>
<td>• Submitted work is relevant, contains no plagiarised content, and includes only</td>
<td>• Evidence of systematic or deliberate attempt to mislead the examiner,</td>
<td>• Multiple findings of academic dishonesty on record.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>single instance of inaccurate attribution to an unverifiable or non-existent source.</td>
<td>either by concealing: (a) the extent and/or quality of the empirical or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Any stage of candidature.</td>
<td>scholarly research or (b) the actual sources of paraphrased or plagiarised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No prior findings on record</td>
<td>material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Any stage of candidature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• May or may not have prior findings on record.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative outcome</td>
<td>• Specified mark penalty of 5% or 10%</td>
<td>• No prior finding of academic dishonesty: Fail item of assessment (0% - 49%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Further development activity (can incl. Academic Honesty Education Module)</td>
<td>• Prior finding: Fail unit of study (0% - 49%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Further development activity (can incl. Academic Honesty Education Module)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing (or attempt to provide) assessment answers to another student</td>
<td>No impropriety</td>
<td>Further development</td>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>Academic dishonesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • The task is a formative task or of low weighting relative to the overall assessment.  
• Provision of work was inappropriate but done in good faith.  
• Recipient and donor students known to one another, with the donor student potentially under duress.  
• Early stage of candidature. |  |  | • The task is a summative task and of moderate or greater weighting relative to the overall assessment.  
• Recipient and donor students known to one another.  
• Any stage of candidature.  
• May or may not have prior findings on record. | • Prior (equivalent) finding or multiple findings of academic dishonesty.  
• There is evidence of systematic or calculated provision of assignment answers, including via online platforms (e.g., social media or sharing websites), regardless of whether the donor student knows the recipient/s or not. | |

| Indicative outcome | No penalty |  | No prior finding of academic dishonesty: no penalty and warning.  
• Further development activity (can incl. Academic Honesty Education Module) | Refer to Registrar |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No impropriety</th>
<th>Further development</th>
<th>Plagiarism</th>
<th>Academic dishonesty</th>
<th>Potential misconduct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illegitimate cooperation (i.e., collusion) with another student or group of students in completing assessment task (incl. examination)</td>
<td>• Evidence of illegitimate cooperation is obvious.</td>
<td>• Any stage of candidature.</td>
<td>• May or may not have prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record.</td>
<td>• Systematic and/or sophisticated attempt to conceal extent of cooperation, which may span multiple units of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of illegitimate cooperation is obvious.</td>
<td>• Any stage of candidature.</td>
<td>• May or may not have prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record.</td>
<td>• Systematic and/or sophisticated attempt to conceal extent of cooperation, which may span multiple units of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Systematic and/or sophisticated attempt to conceal extent of cooperation, which may span multiple units of study.</td>
<td>• Multiple findings of academic dishonesty on record.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to Registrar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative outcome</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Refer to Registrar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No prior finding of academic dishonesty: (a) Fail item of low weighted assessment (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No prior finding of academic dishonesty: (a) Fail item of low weighted assessment (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Submit alternative work for moderate to highly weighted assessment with specified maximum mark of 50%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior finding: Fail unit of study (0% - 49%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Further development activity (can incl. Academic Honesty Education Module)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Illegitimate cooperation refers to any form of collaboration that is unauthorized or not specifically allowed by the course instructions.
- Plagiarism refers to the use of another person's work without proper attribution.
- Academic dishonesty includes a wide range of behaviors that violate academic integrity policies, including but not limited to cheating, fabrication, and plagiarism.
- Potential misconduct refers to actions that may lead to further sanctions or academic consequences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No impropriety</th>
<th>Further development</th>
<th>Plagiarism</th>
<th>Academic dishonesty</th>
<th>Potential misconduct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submitting work for assessment that has been completed by, or with contribution from, another person</td>
<td>• The work contains a low to moderate amount of material plagiarised or paraphrased from the work of another student of the University but which is counterbalanced by sufficient evidence of substantial contribution of original content by the student submitting the work.</td>
<td>• Submitting work for assessment that has been completed by, or with contribution from, another person (incl. from essay mills, sharing sites, or other third party sources).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fail for item of low weighted assessment (0%)</td>
<td>Refer to Registrar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submit alternative work for moderate to highly weighted assessment with specified maximum mark of 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Further development activity (can incl. Academic Honesty Education Module)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impropriety</td>
<td>Further development</td>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>Academic dishonesty</td>
<td>Potential misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging another person to complete or contribute to an assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Engaging another person to complete or contribute to an assessment (includes impersonation at examinations).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Refer to Registrar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting an engagement from another student to complete or contribute to an assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Accepting an engagement from another student to complete or contribute to an assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Refer to Registrar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbidden material in examinations (incl. textbooks, notes, calculators or computers)</td>
<td>• Possession of materials is inadvertent and/or the result of examination conditions (e.g., venue type), with materials surrendered voluntarily prior to start of examination or immediately upon discovery by student. • Any stage of candidature. • No prior examination incidents on record.</td>
<td>• Rudimentary attempt to conceal materials, with no attempt to surrender voluntarily prior to start of examination. • Any stage of candidature. • No prior examination incidents on record.</td>
<td>• Sophisticated attempt to conceal materials, including by hiding outside of venue (e.g., in bathroom), with no attempt to surrender voluntarily prior to start of examination. • Multiple findings of academic dishonesty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative outcome</td>
<td>• No penalty • Warning as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Honesty Education Module • Sit supplementary examination. • Specified maximum mark of 50%.</td>
<td>• Refer to Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impropriety</td>
<td>Further development</td>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>Academic dishonesty</td>
<td>Potential misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying (or attempt to copy or read from) another student during an examination</td>
<td>• Any stage of candidature.</td>
<td>• Any stage of candidature.</td>
<td>• Sophisticated or coordinated attempt to copy.</td>
<td>• Multiple findings of academic dishonesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative outcome (copying during an examination)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• No prior examination incidents on record.</td>
<td>• Refer to Registrar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating (or attempt to communicate) with another student during an examination</td>
<td>• Communication non-verbal and incidental (e.g., dropped pen).</td>
<td>• Any stage of candidature.</td>
<td>• No prior examination incidents on record.</td>
<td>• Multiple instances of academic dishonesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative outcome</td>
<td>• No penalty.</td>
<td>• Academic Honesty Education Module</td>
<td>• Sit supplementary examination.</td>
<td>• Refer to Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting (or attempt to consult) another person outside examination venue without permission</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Any stage of candidature.</td>
<td>• No prior examination incidents on record.</td>
<td>• Multiple instances of academic dishonesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Honesty Education Module</td>
<td>• Sit supplementary examination.</td>
<td>• Refer to Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impropriety</td>
<td>Further development</td>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>Academic dishonesty</td>
<td>Potential misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Possession or inappropriate use of communication device within or outside examination venue |                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | • Earliest stages of candidature.  
• No prior examination incidents on record.                                                                                                       | • Multiple instances of academic dishonesty                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Indicative outcome                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | • Academic Honesty Education Module  
• Sit supplementary examination  
• Specified maximum mark of 50%                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                      | • Refer to Registrar                                                                                      |
| Removal (or attempt to remove) confidential examination from venue            | • Removal of materials is inadvertent or result of examination conditions (e.g., open book exam; venue type), with materials surrendered voluntarily at first available opportunity.  
• Any stage of candidature.  
• No prior examination incidents on record.                                                                                                     | • Any stage of candidature.  
• May or may not have prior examination incidents on record.                                                                                             | • Multiple instances of academic dishonesty                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Indicative outcome                                                            | • No penalty  
• Warning as appropriate                                                                                                                                                                                    | • Academic Honesty Education Module  
• No penalty                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                      | • Refer to Registrar                                                                                      |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No impropriety</th>
<th>Further development</th>
<th>Plagiarism</th>
<th>Academic dishonesty</th>
<th>Potential misconduct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breach of rules, codes or policies other than the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 (see note below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Breach of other rules, codes or policies, including but not limited to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(a) misuse of University's ICT resources and intellectual property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) promoting or advertising commercial cheating service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) facilitating misuse of University resources or property by a third party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(incl. ICT resources, IP or venues)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicative outcome**

- Refer to Registrar

**Note:** Where an Educational Integrity coordinator or nominated academic detects a potential breach of rules, codes or policies other than the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015, the potential breach shall be referred to the Registrar for investigation under the University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016 on grounds of general, rather than academic, misconduct. While such breaches may be associated with an allegation of academic dishonesty or misconduct, their investigation and determination is beyond the scope of the policy and procedures.
NOTES

Educational Integrity Decision-Making and Penalty Guidelines 2018

Date adopted: [This is the date on which the guidelines are formally signed]

Date registered: [This is inserted by the Policy Management Unit, not all guidelines are registered on the Policy Register, this can be removed where they are hosted on a different website]

Date commenced: [This is the date on which the guidelines will commence, suggest at least two weeks from date of adoption/approval, consider if dates need to align with other documents]

Administrator: [List the position title of the most senior person responsible for the day to day operation of the guidelines]

Review date: [This date must be no more than 5 years from the date of commencement.]

Rescinded documents: [List here any documents replaced by these guidelines.]

Related documents:  
- Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015
- Academic Honesty Procedures 2016
- University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended)
- University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016

AMENDMENT HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
<th>Commencing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Educational Integrity Decision-making and Penalty Guidelines 2018