NOTICE OF MEETING

Meeting 2/2019 of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee will be held from 2:00pm – 4:00pm on Tuesday 19 March 2019 in Level 5 Function Room, Administration Building F23. The Agenda for the meeting is below.

Caroline North
Secretary

AGENDA

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES
Apologies have been received from Dr Vasiliki Betihavas (Jane Currie attending instead).

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS
2.1 Minutes of Previous Meeting
2.2 Business Arising

3 STANDING ITEMS
3.1 Report of the Chair
3.2 Report of Academic Board
3.3 Report of the Admissions Sub-Committee

4 ITEMS FOR ACTION
4.1 Academic Promotions Policy 2015
4.2 Code of Conduct for Students
4.3 Academic Board Annual Report 2018

5 ITEMS FOR NOTING
5.1 Curriculum Timetabling Policy 2019

6 OTHER BUSINESS
6.1 Any Other Business
Next meeting: 2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 7 May 2019  
Level 5 Function Room, F23 Administration Building

---

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolve that the minutes of meeting 1/2019, held on 12 February 2019, be confirmed as a true record.

MINUTES

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY COMMITTEE

2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 12 February 2019
Level 5 Function Room, F23 Administration Building

Members: Professor Jane Hanrahan (Chair); Associate Professor Helen Agus (Science); Dr Vasiliki Betihavas (Nursing); Dr Bret Church (Pharmacy); Professor Alan Fekete (Academic Board); Associate Professor Vincent Gomes (Engineering & IT); Professor Manuel Graeber (co-opted, Medicine & Health); Dane Luo (Vice-President, SRC) (for Jacky He); Kerrie Henderson (co-opted, Office of General Counsel); Associate Professor Elaine Huber (Business) (for Professor Peter Bryant); Patty Kamvounias (Academic Board); Kaylyn Ke (nominee of the President, SUPRA); Associate Professor Alex Lefebvre (Arts & Social Sciences); Associate Professor Tony Masters (Chair of the Academic Board); Associate Professor Peter McCallum (Director, Educational Strategy) (for Professor Pip Pattison); Associate Professor Maurice Peat (co-opted, Business); Associate Professor Alison Purcell (Health Sciences); Professor Rita Shackel (Law).

Attendees: Dr Matthew Charet (Secretary); Professor Ross Coleman (Director, Graduate Research); Allison L’Armour (SUPRA Student Advice & Advocacy Service).

Apologies: Associate Professor Salvatore Babones (Academic Board); Professor Peter Bryant (Business) (Associate Professor Elaine Huber attending instead); Jacky He (President, SRC) (Dane Luo attending instead); Dr Adrienne Keane (Architecture, Design & Planning); Dr Peter Knight (Medicine & Health); Professor Greg Murray (Dentistry); Professor Pip Pattison (Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)) (Associate Professor Peter McCallum attending instead).

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

1.1 Acknowledgement of Country

The Committee acknowledged and paid respect to the traditional custodians of the land on which they met: the Gadigal people of the Eora Nation; and paid respect to the knowledge embedded forever within the Aboriginal Custodianship of Country and to elders past, present and future.

1.2 Welcomes and Apologies

The Chair welcomed members and advised of apologies as recorded above. This was followed by a discussion of meeting protocols to be observed throughout the year.
2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

2.1 Minutes of Previous Meeting

Resolution ASPC19/1-1
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolved that the minutes of meeting 6/2018, held on 6 November 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 reminded that the revision of the Educational Services Agreements Policy 2017, which was discussed by the Committee on several occasions in 2018, is on the work slate for 2019 and is anticipated to return to the Committee later in the year.

Resolution ASPC19/1-2
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 ASPC19/1-3
That the Academic Standards & Policy Committee note the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 27 November 2018.

4 ITEMS FOR ACTION

4.1 Approval of Accredited Micro-Credentials

The Director, Educational Strategy, spoke to this paper, which opens discussion regarding the introduction of a micro-credential framework for post-Bachelor study at the University. The current proposal is to develop a 12 credit point Sydney Professional Certificate, to be available as a post-Bachelor credential which allows upskilling at a sub-Graduate Certificate level. Governance of the offering is intended to parallel that for the Master of Advanced Studies via the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies (BIS), with pathways and subject inclusion to be proposed by faculties and University schools. It is currently intended to offer a set program in defined specialisations comprised of selected units of study (that is, not enabling any combination of 12 credit points to be undertaken). Members were reminded that the Coursework Rule was amended by Senate in late 2018 to enable oversight of the certificate and other non-AQF qualifications by the Academic Board; amendment of the Coursework Policy is to follow, as proposed in this paper. Members were also advised that the proposal has been endorsed to proceed by the (BIS) but has yet to be seen by the Curriculum and Course Planning Committee. The interrelationship of the Sydney Professional Certificate with existing offerings was flagged as an area for further discussion (for example, whether transfer into a Graduate Certificate or Graduate Diploma would be possible and if so, under what mechanisms; the accumulation of study to a sufficient volume to be awarded a Graduate Certificate or longer qualification also needs consideration). Imposition of a time limit for completion is to be resolved.

In discussion, the treatment of prerequisites for component units of study needs to be addressed, noting that at present it is intended for this certificate to be composed of already-existing non-OLE units of study (to enable both agility and specialisation). The difference between this course and offerings currently available via the Centre for Continuing Education was also explored. Members were advised that exemplar learning outcomes for the certificate have been developed (as per the proposal), providing a higher level of attainment than completion of individual units of study; hence the attraction of this type of specialised study. Fees would be determined by the units of study undertaken, with a discussion to be held regarding whether students would pay the Student Services and Amenities Fee (SSAF).
Faculty feedback was invited as to whether the intended structure works; whether the inclusion of an unstructured version (that is, composed of any 12 credit points of units of study) as an exit pathway is advisable; and whether only 5000-level units of study and above should be included (rather than 4000-level as proposed in the current paper).

The discussion paper was endorsed to proceed to the Academic Board and to a full course proposal, to be presented to a future meeting.

Resolution ASPC19/1-4
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee:
(1) noted the discussion paper on a framework for the governance and approval of accredited micro-credentials; and
(2) endorsed the proposal to establish a Sydney Professional Certificate (noting that a full proposal will be submitted via the University’s course approval process).

5 ITEMS FOR NOTING

5.1 Continuing and Extra-Curricular Education Procedures (previously circulated)
This paper was noted by the Committee as circulated.

Resolution ASPC19/1-5
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the Academic Board’s endorsement of the Continuing and Extra-Curricular Education Procedures 2018, the Continuing and Extra-Curricular Education reporting template, and the course evaluation and approval template.

5.2 Further Actions to Address Increasing Risk of Contract Cheating (previously circulated)
This paper was noted by the Committee as circulated.

Resolution ASPC19/1-6
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the further actions endorsed by the University Executive to address the impact of third party services on the University’s educational integrity.

5.3 Availability of Unit of Study Materials and Canvas Sites (previously circulated)
In discussion, several members advised that Canvas sites for some 1000- and 5000-level units of study are not yet live. The Chair of Academic Board suggested that unit of study coordinators provide simple course-related information in the first week of class (such as census dates, where to find your SID and the like), and it was noted that the Canvas template could be adjusted for future semesters to include such information.

Resolution ASPC19/1-7
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

5.4 Postgraduate Research Support Scheme Procedures
The Director, Graduate Research, informed members that this paper had been presented to the Graduate Studies Committee for endorsement and had been provided to the Committee for noting. Members were advised that the procedures enable greater transparency and fairness in the allocation of Postgraduate Research Support Scheme funding by providing a consistent framework for allocations across the University. The procedures also encourage communication and feedback to students and applicants as to funding processes and priorities.

This paper was noted by the Committee.

Resolution ASPC19/1-8
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the draft Postgraduate Research Support Scheme Procedures, as presented.
6 OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 Any Other Business

There being no other business, the meeting concluded at 3:10pm.

Next meeting: 2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 19 March 2019
Level 5 Function Room, F23 Administration Building

A copy of the non-confidential Academic Standards and Policy Committee papers is available at:
**RECOMMENDATION**

*That the Academic Standards & Policy Committee note the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 5 March 2019.*

**REPORT OF ACADEMIC BOARD MEETING**

**Items related to the Academic Quality Committee**
The Academic Board noted the report from the meeting of the Academic Quality Committee held on 5 February 2019:
- noted the Committee’s approval of the reviews of five postgraduate coursework courses in the Susan Wakil School of Nursing & Midwifery; and
- noted the Committee's approval of an extension of the Educational Integrity annual reporting deadline, from March to April 2019.

**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 12 February 2019 and:
- endorsed a discussion paper from the Education Portfolio to develop a Sydney Professional Certificate post-Bachelor micro-credential, with a full proposal to be submitted via the University’s course approval process.

**Items related to the Graduate Studies Committee**
The Academic Board noted the report from meeting of the Graduate Studies Committee held on 5 February 2019:
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine and Health to amend the Doctor of Medicine and introduce the Master of Health Studies, approved the amendment or introduction of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from the proposal, and approve the amendment of the Resolutions of the University of Sydney Medical School for Coursework Courses, with effect from 1 January 2020;
- approve the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine and Health to introduce the Master of Global Health / Master of Philosophy, approved the introduction of course resolutions, as amended, and unit of study tables arising from the proposal, and agreed to recommend to Senate the amendment of the Resolutions of the Faculty of Medicine and Health, with effect from 1 January 2020;
- approve the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine and Health to introduce the Master of Health Policy / Master of Philosophy, approved the introduction of course resolutions, as amended, and unit of study tables arising from the proposal, and agreed to recommend to Senate the amendment of the Resolutions of the Faculty of Medicine and Health, with effect from 1 January 2020;
- approve the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine and Health to introduce the Master of Public Health / Master of Philosophy, approved the introduction of course resolutions, as amended, and unit of study tables arising from the proposal, and agreed to recommend to Senate the amendment of the Resolutions of the Faculty of Medicine and Health, with effect from 1 January 2020;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Economics (Dual pathway) and approved the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020; and
Non-Confidential

- approved the proposal from the Education Portfolio to introduce the Postgraduate Research Support Scheme Procedures 2019, with effect from 1 January 2020.

Items related to the Undergraduate Studies Committee

The Academic Board noted the report from meetings of the Undergraduate Studies Committee held by circulation on 12 February 2019:
- approved the proposal from the Education Portfolio to amend the Bachelor of Advanced Studies and approved the amendment of the course learning outcomes arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020; and
- noted the report from the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies on its business and decisions concerning the University’s interdisciplinary undergraduate curriculum in 2018.

Other matters

The Academic Board also:
- received updates from the Academic Director, Education Policy and Quality and from the Head of the School of Mathematics and Statistics, on the impact of the implementation of HSC Mathematics prerequisites for admission to selected Undergraduate award courses;
- received an update from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) on the University’s ARC Applications;
- received a report from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) on the Federal Government’s review of the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF);
- received and noted the Reports of the Chair and of the Vice-Chancellor, including a presentation by the Vice-Chancellor on the University’s top ten priorities for 2019;
- received and noted reports from the student members of the Academic Board;
- noted updates to the membership of the Academic Panel for the period 2019-2021; and
- noted a number of reports on Academic Promotion outcomes for 2018.

The agenda pack for this meeting is available from: sydney.edu.au/secretariat/pdfs/academic-board-committees/AB/2019/20190305-AB-Agenda-Pack.pdf

Associate Professor Tony Masters
Chair, Academic Board
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards & Policy Committee note the report of the meeting of the Admissions Sub-Committee held by circulation on 26 February 2019.

ITEMS FOR ACTION

No items for action were considered at this meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

The Admissions Sub-Committee noted:

- the discussion paper, *Performance-Based Funding for the Commonwealth Grant Scheme*
- the new UAC Schedules for 2019, as approved at its previous meeting on 22 November 2018
- the new Gao Kao Schedule 2019, as approved at its previous meeting on 22 November 2018

Full agenda papers are available from the Admissions Sub-Committee website, at
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee review and endorse the proposed changes to the Academic Promotions Policy 2015.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

With Faculty amalgamations nearly complete (FHS 2020) the Local Promotions Committee (LPC) constitution rules require amendments to acknowledge the new University Faculty and School structures.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

Schedule 2 of the Academic Promotions Policy 2015 stipulates Local Promotion Committee (LPC) constitution and compliance. The schedule has been amended to account for the new Faculty and University School structures, specifically that Faculties will no longer amalgamate but form single Faculty LPC’s, while the University Schools will continue to combine. Committee composition will remain the same at Levels B and C, however at Levels D and E the change we are proposing affects the core committee composition. Proposed changes are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Current policy (core members)</th>
<th>Proposed amendment (core members)</th>
<th>Current assessment and approval process (no change)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B &amp; C</td>
<td>3 core members from two different faculties</td>
<td>Faculty LPC - No change 2 members from within the faculty, one member external to the faculty</td>
<td>LPC assessment and recommendations to the Provost &amp; DVC for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3 core members from two different faculties</td>
<td>Faculty LPC 3 members each from a different school, or where there is no school structure, different disciplines from within the faculty</td>
<td>LPC assessment and recommendations put forward Central Promotions Committee (CPC) review the LPC operations and reports and make final recommendations to the Provost &amp; DVC for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Normally 4 and no more than 6 Professors from two different faculties</td>
<td>Faculty LPC Normally comprise 4 and no more than 6 Professors each from different schools, or where there is no school structure, disciplines from within the faculty</td>
<td>LPC assessment and recommendations put forward Central Promotions Committee (CPC) review the LPC operations and reports and make final recommendations to the Vice Chancellor for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-C</strong></td>
<td>3 core members from two different faculties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>3 core members from two different faculties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>Normally 4 and no more than 6 Professors from two different faculties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-University school LPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>three members with at least one from each University school which has applicants being considered for promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC assessment and recommendations put forward for Provost &amp; DVC approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC assessment and recommendations put forward for Provost &amp; DVC for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC assessment and recommendations put forward for Provost &amp; DVC for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC assessment and recommendations put forward for Provost &amp; DVC for approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSULTATION**

The proposed policy amendments have been approved by OGC and consultation will take place within the following University committees:

- Circulation to the NTEU (Feedback due 8 March)
- Disability Action Plan Project Implementation Officer
- UE Workplace Health and Safety (Scheduled for 11 March meeting)
- ASPC

The policy will then proceed to:

- Academic Board
- University Executive

**IMPLEMENTATION**

The amendments are planned to for implementation in 2019.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

Once approved the changes will be communicated to the following:

- Executive Deans
- Deans
- HoS and Deans
- Faculty General Managers
- HoS
- 2019 LPC Chairs
- 2019 LPC committee members

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Amended Academic Promotions policy 2015 (in track changes)
ACADEMIC PROMOTIONS POLICY 2015

With the endorsement of the Academic Board, the Vice-Chancellor and Principal, as delegate of the Senate of the University of Sydney, adopts the following policy.

Dated: 7 December 2015

Last amended: 31 August 2017, commencing 1 January 2018

Signature:

Name: Dr Michael Spence
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1 Name of policy

This is the Academic Promotions Policy 2015.

2 Commencement

This policy commences on 1 January 2016.
3 Policy is binding

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

4 Statement of intent

This policy:

(a) sets out the principles upon which, and the process by which, the University promotes its academic staff; and
(b) provides for the fair and consistent application of absolute indicators of academic performance, benchmarked across disciplines and against institutions of similar international standing.

5 Application

This policy applies to:

(a) all academic staff employed by the University on a continuing or eligible fixed term contract basis who wish to apply for promotion to a higher grade of employment; and
(b) holders of conjoint titles who wish to apply for a higher conjoint title.

Note: See Honorary Titles Policy 2013.

6 Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Board nominee</td>
<td>means an individual selected from the list of Academic Board nominees published by the Academic Board on the University website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td>As at the date of this policy, this list is available at <a href="http://sydney.edu.au/provost/promotions.shtml">http://sydney.edu.au/provost/promotions.shtml</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional member</td>
<td>means a member of a committee appointed as such in accordance with the committee’s terms of reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td>See Schedules 2 &amp; 3 of this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessor</td>
<td>means an expert in an applicant’s general field of expertise, external to the University and of high international standing, who is requested to provide independent and authoritative advice on the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>means Central Promotions Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day</td>
<td>means calendar day.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 Promotion generally

(1) The University is committed to equal employment opportunity, and promotion opportunity, for all staff. It does not discriminate against employees (including in promotion) on the grounds of:

   (a) sex;
   (b) pregnancy;
   (c) race (including colour, ethnic background or national identity);
   (d) marital status;
   (e) disability;
   (f) sexual preference;
   (g) transgender status;
   (h) political or religious belief; or
   (i) age.

(2) The University expects that, during their careers, all academic staff will:

   (a) be active in research and scholarship; and
(b) be committed to and participate in research-enriched teaching.

(3) Each academic staff member is appointed to a position at a particular level, classified from Level A to Level E. Within these levels staff undertake particular roles, which may vary over time and over the course of a career.

(4) The University will seek opinions from external assessors in relation to each applicant for positions at Level D or E.

(5) The streams for promotion are:
   (a) teaching and research;
   (b) education-focused;
   (c) research-focused; and
   (d) for promotion to Level D or E, governance, leadership and engagement focused.

(6) Applications made under the governance, leadership and engagement stream must be endorsed by the relevant Dean and approved by the Provost.

(7) Promotion committees must ensure that each applicant’s achievements are assessed relative to their opportunities to undertake tasks as compared to other members of staff at an equivalent level. This will include consideration of the impact of factors such as:
   (a) part-time or fractional employment;
   (b) significant parenting or other caring responsibilities;
   (c) clinical responsibilities; or
   (d) disability.

(8) Promotions commence as from the next effective date.

(9) A promotion approval does not constitute an extension of employment in circumstances where the staff member’s employment does not extend beyond the next effective date.

(10) The level of remuneration consequent upon a promotion will be determined by the relevant delegate, and will generally be at the first level of the payment scale applicable to the new appointment. An LPC or CPC may make recommendations in relation to remuneration.

(11) The academic promotion process will be administered by the Academic Promotions Unit.

8 Eligibility for promotion

(1) Academic staff at Levels A to D may apply for promotion if:
   (a) their appointment is continuing; or
   (b) their fixed term contract extends to the end of the year in which application is being made;

   and
(c) as at the relevant closing date, they have completed an academic planning and development or performance management and development review in the previous fifteen 15 months;

Note: See Performance Planning and Development Policy 2012.

(d) by the closing date for applications to the level for which they are applying, they have completed at least 12 months employment at the University at their current level;

(e) no later than October 31 in the year before applying, they have discussed their intention to apply for promotion with the relevant person in their faculty; and

(f) they have lodged a notification of intent to apply in the manner specified in the procedures.

(2) Applicants are only eligible to apply for promotion once every two years.

(3) Fractional and conjoint appointees may apply for promotion, and their applications will be assessed against the requirements expected for the relevant level, adjusted in terms of opportunities.

(4) Where a position is funded by a grant, eligibility for promotion will depend on the grant conditions governing the funding of employment. Staff holding such positions may only apply for promotion under this policy if the applicable grant does not:

(a) specify the classification or salary level; or

(b) prohibit personal promotion.

9 Criteria for promotion

(1) The Provost may, in procedures associated with this policy, publish normative criteria setting out the achievement expectations for each level of academic employment. Staff considering applying for promotion should refer to any such criteria when constructing their application for promotion.

(2) Applicants must provide:

(a) evidence of their capacity to perform at the level to which they are seeking promotion; and

(b) clear evidence of an upward trajectory in their performance, such as would warrant advancement to the next level of employment.

(3) Applicants must demonstrate achievement of at least the minimum standards set out in Schedule 1 to this policy.

10 Applying for promotion

(1) The Academic Promotions Unit will determine the closing date for applications for academic promotions, and will publish this date on the University website at least six weeks in advance.

(2) A staff member may apply for promotion in any stream, as provided in subclause specified in section 7 (5, 64), regardless of their current role or appointment.
(3) Applicants may change the stream in which they seek promotion provided that notice of such change is provided to the Academic Promotions Unit within the specified time limit.

(4) Applications must be provided to the Academic Promotions Unit in the form and manner, and with the content, specified in the procedures.

(5) In exceptional cases, applicants for promotion below Level E may apply to be promoted two levels.
   (a) Submissions for promotions of two levels must be lodged in the manner specified in the procedures.

(6) Applicants must provide details of a sufficient number of referees to enable at least three referees’ reports to be provided.

(7) The Academic Promotions Unit will notify each applicant of:
   (a) the membership of the LPC which will consider their application;
   (b) the membership of any CPC which will consider their application;
   (c) the names of all assessors who may provide a report on their application; and
   (d) any changes to committee memberships or assessors.

(8) For promotions to Level D or E, the Academic Promotions Unit will notify each applicant of at least:
   (a) three suitable assessors for Level D; and
   (b) four suitable assessors for level E.

(9) Assessors may provide reports for more than one applicant.

(10) An applicant must lodge any objection to the membership of either the LPC or CPC no later than seven days after the initial notification.

(11) An applicant must lodge any objection to any subsequently notified LPC or CPC member no later than four days after notification.

(12) An applicant who believes any of the proposed assessors has a conflict of interests must provide details of the alleged conflict no later than seven days after the initial notification.

(13) An applicant who believes any subsequently proposed assessor to have a conflict of interests must provide details of the alleged conflict no later than four days after notification.

(14) All objections or claims of conflicts of interests:
   (a) must be made in writing and provided to the Academic Promotions Unit; and
   (b) will be determined by the committee Chair or, if the objection is to the Chair, by the Provost.

(15) The Academic Promotions Unit will notify the applicant in writing of the outcome of the objection or claim of conflict of interests.

(16) Applicants must not propose members of LPCs, CPCs or assessors.

(17) An applicant may update his or her application in the manner provided in the procedures. Responses to requests for clarification do not constitute updates.
11 Local Promotions Committees

(1) All applications will initially be considered and assessed by an LPC.

(2) Each LPC is formed under the authority of the Provost and serves a faculty, group of faculties, or group of faculties, as the Provost deems appropriate.

(3) Subject to subclause 11(4):
   (a) each faculty will form an LPC; and
   (b) University schools will combine to form a multi-University school LPC.

(4) If there are fewer than six applications for an LPC to consider, the LPC Chair must seek the Provost’s approval to:
   (a) proceed as constituted; or
   (b) combine with another LPC as directed.

(5) The Academic Promotions Unit, in consultation with the relevant Deans, will convene LPCs and determine the optimum number of such committees.

(6) LPCs will be constituted, and have the terms of reference and operation, as specified in Schedule 2.

(7) Separate LPCs will consider applications for promotion to each level.

(8) The Provost may approve an LPC constituted to consider multiple levels, below E only.

(9) The Provost may approve a second LPC for a particular level if satisfied that the number of applicants for that level in a faculty or group of University schools requires this. The Provost may approve an LPC constituted to consider multiple levels, below E only.

(10) The Chair of each LPC must be:
   (a) An Executive dean, or Dean of a faculty, head of school, and dean of a University school, Dean of one of the participating faculties, or their nominee; and
   (b) approved by the Provost.

(11) The Chair of each LPC will provide a list of recommended core and additional committee members, including reserves to the Academic Promotions Unit.

(12) Applicants from centres outside the normal faculty structure will be assessed by the LPC for the faculty that in the opinion of the Provost is most relevant to the centre.

(13) An LPC may consider, but must not vote on, any application which does not have:
   (a) a completed Teaching and Research Student Supervision Activities form;
   (b) at least three referees’ reports;
   (c) one Head’s report; and
   (d) one assessor report (Level D); or
   (e) two assessor reports (Level E).
If a mandatory report is received after the required meeting or interview date, the LPC may vote on the application by circular resolution.

12 Central Promotions Committees

(1) The following applications must be considered by a CPC in addition to an LPC:
   (a) all applications for promotion to Levels D or E;
   (b) any application for promotion to Level C which is recommended by an LPC convened for a single faculty and which has considered only applicants from that faculty.

(2) CPCs will be convened by the Academic Promotions Unit.

(3) Separate CPCs will consider:
   (a) applications for promotion to Levels C or D; and
   (b) applications for promotion to Level E.

(4) CPCs will be constituted, and have the terms of reference and operation, as specified in Schedule 3.

13 Assessing applications for promotion to Levels B to D inclusive

(1) When notified by the Academic Promotions Unit of the applicants for promotion from their school, the Head will:
   (a) verify each applicant's teaching and research student supervision activities; and
   (b) prepare and submit to the Academic Promotions Unit a written report on each applicant.
      (i) The Head must not discuss the content of the report with the applicant.
      (ii) The Head’s report will remain confidential.
      (iii) Unsuccessful applicants will receive a copy of the Head’s report.

(2) Where a Head is also an applicant for promotion, the relevant Dean will nominate another member of the school or faculty to provide reports on applicants for promotion to the level to which the Head seeks promotion.

(3) For promotions to Level D, as soon as possible after receiving applicants’ details from the Academic Promotions Unit the relevant delegate will:
   (a) consult the relevant Dean or Head about possible assessors to provide independent reports on applicants;
   (b) check that each proposed assessor:
      (i) has no conflict of interests in relation to the application; and
      (ii) has agreed to participate and comply with applicable time frames;
   (c) forward to the Academic Promotions Unit a proposed list of assessors to from each school and, where applicable, discipline area;
(d) in consultation with the Academic Promotions Unit, check with each member of the committee that they have no conflict of interests in considering any of the applications;

Note: For the definition of conflict of interests, and further details of the University’s expectations about such matters, see the External Interests Policy 2010. For the avoidance of doubt, a committee member will have a conflict of interests if they act as a referee or assessor for an applicant to be considered by their committee.

(e) consider each possible conflict of interests and, if necessary, appoint a replacement member for the committee; and

(f) arrange one preliminary and one final committee meeting, and advise all members (including reserve and additional members) and the Academic Promotions Unit of the dates, times and places of the meetings.

(4) The LPC Chair, Dean and Head must not consult the applicant about any proposed assessor or reserve assessor and must not permit others to do so.

(5) The relevant LPC chair will notify applicants at least seven days in advance of the final LPC meeting dates.

(6) LPCs for promotion to Levels B-D will meet twice, being:

(a) once for a preliminary meeting to discuss each application and to determine what, if any, further information is required from applicants; and

(b) once for a final meeting at which final decisions are made about whether or not to recommend each applicant for promotion.

(7) LPCs will not interview applicants other than for Level E, except with the express authorisation of the Provost.

(8) Each of these meetings will be conducted in the manner specified in the procedures.

(9) No applicant may be recommended for promotion without the number of votes in favour being at least twice the number of votes against promotion.

(10) The LPC may recommend that:

(a) an applicant who applies for promotion by two levels be promoted by only one;

(b) an applicant who would otherwise be unsuccessful in the stream for which they have applied, be recommended for promotion in another stream; or

(c) an applicant for promotion to Level D who would otherwise be unsuccessful in the stream for which they have applied be considered for promotion under the governance, leadership and engagement stream:

(i) In such cases, a written application must be submitted to the Provost for approval as required by subsection 7(5); and

(ii) no decision to recommend promotion may be made before the relevant approval is obtained.

(11) The LPC Chair, in consultation with the core members of the committee, will prepare a final report on the committee’s recommendations in the format and with the content prescribed in the procedures.

(a) The report must be endorsed by each core member of the committee in writing or by email.
(12) The Academic Promotions Unit will provide copies of LPC reports to the relevant delegate:
   (a) for approval, in the case of promotions which do not need to be considered by a CPC; or
   (b) for confirmation that the report is in correct form and provision to the CPC Chair, in the case of promotions which need to be considered by a CPC.

(13) The CPC Chair will consider the LPC report and discuss any concerns about procedural matters with the Chair of the relevant LPC.
   (a) The CPC Chair may then, if necessary, request further reporting from the LPC or direct the reconvening of the LPC and the provision of a new report.
   (b) Any such request or direction must be made in writing and conveyed through the Academic Promotions Unit.

(14) As soon as possible after receiving the final LPC report, the CPC Chair will:
   (a) check with each member of the CPC that they have no conflict of interests in considering any of the applications;
      
      **Note:** For the definition of conflict of interests, and further details of the University’s expectations about such matters, see the *External Interests Policy 2010*. For the avoidance of doubt, a committee member will have a conflict of interests if they act as a referee or assessor for an applicant to be considered by their committee.
   
   (b) consider each possible conflict of interests and if necessary appoint a replacement member for the committee; and
   (c) advise all members through the Academic Promotions Unit of the date, time and place of the meeting.

(15) CPCs will meet once, and the meeting will be conducted in the manner specified in the procedures.

(16) No applicant may be recommended for promotion without the number of votes in favour being at least twice the number of votes against promotion.

(17) The CPC may recommend promotion in a stream other than the stream in which an applicant has applied if the CPC:
   (a) believes the alternative stream to be more appropriate; and
   (b) it is not prepared to endorse a recommendation for promotion in the stream applied for.

(18) The CPC may consult the Chair of the relevant LPC in considering any application, and must do so before making a final decision not to endorse an LPC recommendation. The LPC Chair will attend the CPC meeting for this purpose if required but may not be present for, or take part in, any vote.

(19) Where an applicant has applied for promotion by two levels, the CPC may endorse promotion by only one, even if the LPC has recommended promotion by two.

(20) The CPC Chair will provide a written statement to the LPC Chair on any decision not to endorse an LPC recommendation, including reasons. The LPC Chair will provide a copy of this statement to each member of the relevant LPC.
14 Assessing applications for promotion to Level E

(1) When notified by the Academic Promotion Unit of the applicants for promotion from their school, the Head will:
   (a) verify each applicant’s teaching and research student supervision activities; and
   (b) prepare and submit a written report on each applicant.
      (i) The Head must not discuss the content of the report with the applicant.
      (ii) The Head’s report will remain confidential.
      (iii) Unsuccessful applicants will receive a copy of the Head’s report.

(2) Where a Head is also an applicant for promotion, the relevant Dean will nominate another member of the school or faculty to provide reports on applicants for promotion to the level to which the Head seeks promotion.

(3) LPCs will meet only once to consider applications for promotion to Level E, at which meeting they will:
   (a) interview applicants; and
   (b) make final decisions about whether or not to recommend each applicant for promotion.

(4) As soon as possible after receiving applicants’ details from the Academic Promotions Unit, the relevant delegate will:
   (a) consult the relevant Dean or Head about possible assessors to provide independent reports on applicants;
   (b) check that each proposed assessor:
      (i) has no conflict of interests in relation to the application; and
      (ii) has agreed to participate and comply with the applicable time frames;
   (c) in consultation with the Academic Promotions Unit, check with each member of the committee that they have no conflict of interests in considering any of the applications;
      Note: For the definition of conflict of interests, and further details of the University’s expectations about such matters see the External Interests Policy 2010. For the avoidance of doubt, a committee member will have a conflict of interests if they act as a referee or assessor for an applicant to be considered by their committee.
   (d) consider each possible conflict of interests and, if necessary, appoint a replacement member;
   (e) arrange for the committee to meet, scheduling sufficient time for a 40-minute interview of each applicant plus discussion time;
   (f) advise all members and the Academic Promotions Unit of the date, time and place of the meeting.

(5) The LPC Chair, Dean and, where applicable, Head must not consult the applicant about any proposed assessor or reserve assessor, and must not permit others to do so.

(6) The relevant LPC Chair will provide each applicant with at least seven days’ notice of the date, time and place of the interview.
(7) The LPC must interview each candidate for promotion to Level E.

(8) No candidate may be recommended for promotion without the number of votes in favour being at least twice the number of votes against promotion.

(9) The LPC may recommend promotion in a stream other than the stream in which an applicant has applied if the LPC:
   (a) believes the alternative stream to be more appropriate; and
   (b) is not prepared to endorse a recommendation for promotion in the stream applied for.

(10) The LPC Chair, in consultation with the core members of the committee, will prepare a final report on the committee’s decisions. The report must:
   (a) be endorsed by each core member of the committee in writing; and
   (b) provide a detailed explanation for the committee’s decision on each applicant; and
   (c) where the alternate stream recommended is the governance, leadership and engagement stream; include a written case for promotion.

(11) The CPC Chair will consider the LPC report and discuss any concerns about procedural matters with the LPC Chair.
   (a) The CPC Chair may then, if necessary request further reporting from the LPC or direct the reconvening of the LPC and the provision of a new report.
   (b) Any such request or direction must be made in writing, through the Academic Promotions Unit.

(12) As soon as possible after receiving the final LPC report, the CPC Chair will:
   (a) check with each member of the CPC that he or she has no conflict of interests in considering any of the applications;
       Note: For a definition of conflict of interests, and further details of the University’s expectations about such matters, see the External Interests Policy 2010.
   (b) consider each possible conflict of interests and, if necessary, request the relevant nominator (as specified in Schedule 3) to appoint a replacement member; and
   (c) advise all members through the Academic Promotions Unit of the date, time and place of the meeting.

(13) CPCs will meet once and the meeting will be conducted in the manner specified in the procedures.

(14) No applicant may be recommended for promotion without the number of votes in favour being at least twice the number of votes against promotion.

(15) The CPC may recommend promotion in a stream other than the stream in which an applicant has applied if the CPC:
   (a) believes the alternative stream to be more appropriate; and
   (b) is not prepared to endorse a recommendation for promotion in the stream applied for.

(16) The CPC may consult the Chair of the relevant LPC in considering any application, and must do so before making a final decision not to endorse an LPC.
recommendation. The LPC Chair will attend the CPC meeting for this purpose if required, but may not be present for, or take part in, any vote.

(17) The CPC Chair will provide a written statement to the LPC Chair on any decision not to endorse an LPC recommendation, including reasons. The LPC Chair will provide a copy of this statement to each member of the relevant LPC.

15 Approving promotions

(1) Promotions recommended by LPCs and CPCs must be approved by the relevant delegate.

(2) The Academic Promotions Unit is responsible for providing delegates with the relevant recommendations.

16 Annual promotions rounds

The Academic Promotions Unit will call for applications for academic promotions annually.

17 “Out of round” promotions

(1) An “out of round” promotion may be initiated by any of:
   
   (a) a Head;
   
   (b) a Dean;
   
   (c) the most senior Director in a centre or institute;

   Note: See Centres and Collaborative Networks Policy 2017.

   (d) the Provost; or
   
   (e) the Vice-Chancellor;

   if:

   (f) a valuable staff member has been offered an appointment at another institution; or

   (g) the University wishes to offer promotion as a retention strategy.

(2) Submissions requesting “out of round” promotion must be prepared and lodged with the Academic Promotions Unit in the manner specified in the procedures.

(3) The Provost must approve convening of for an “out of round” committee.

(4) Where a request for “out of round” promotion is received on behalf of a candidate who has a current promotion application already in progress, the submission must be prepared and lodged with the Academic Promotions Unit in the manner specified in the procedures.

(5) “Out of round” committees will be constituted and have the terms of reference and operation, as specified in Schedule 4.
18 Appeals

(1) The only basis for appeal against an academic promotion decision is if:
   (a) there has been a significant breach of this 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) An appeal should be prepared and lodged in the manner specified in the procedures.

19 Confidentiality

(1) Subject to any legal requirement for disclosure, the following are confidential and not to be disclosed outside the academic promotions process:
   (a) names of applicants;
   (b) information contained in applications, referees’ reports or assessors’ reports;
   (c) the content of interviews; or
   (d) the content of discussions within LPCs or CPCs.

Note: See the Privacy Policy 2013 and the Privacy Management Plan.

(2) Any committee member who breaches confidentiality will be required to withdraw from the relevant committee and may be subject to disciplinary action.

(3) At the end of each LPC and CPC process, all hard copy committee papers must be collected by the committee Chair and returned to the Academic Promotions Unit.
   (a) The Academic Promotions Unit will retain only those materials required by the University Recordkeeping Policy 2017.
   (b) The Academic Promotions Unit will ensure that all other hard copy materials are confidentially destroyed.

(4) At the end of each LPC and CPC process, committee members must:
   (a) destroy any hard copy materials in their possession;
   (b) delete any electronic copy materials in their possession; and
   (c) confirm to the committee Chair that they have done so.

20 Roles and responsibilities

(1) Applicants are responsible for:
   (a) ensuring their applications are lodged on time and in the appropriate manner and form;
   (b) ensuring their applications address the relevant criteria for promotion;
   (c) ensuring their referees are willing and able to provide reports within applicable timeframes;
   (d) responding to requests for further information or clarification within applicable time frames;
(e) complying with this policy and its associated procedures;

(f) refraining from direct or indirect communication with any person involved in consultation about or consideration of their application; and

(g) for Level E applicants, ensuring they are available to attend scheduled interviews.

(2) Heads are responsible for:

(a) being available to give confidential advice and other forms of support to potential applicants before applications are submitted;

(b) providing reports on applicants for promotion to all Levels;

(c) verifying the appropriate section of the Teaching and Research Student Supervision Activities form for all levels;

(d) providing details of a sufficient number of suitable proposed external assessors to the relevant LPC chair;

(e) confirming that the proposed assessors are willing to provide reports;

(f) satisfying themselves that proposed assessors have expertise in the applicant's general field, and are qualified to provide independent and authoritative advice;

(g) providing guidance to relevant LPCs and CPCs on the research and teaching norms expected of their discipline, including an assessment of the standard of the mechanisms used for dissemination of research relative to the norms of the discipline; and

(h) providing guidance to unsuccessful applicants if requested.

(3) The Academic Promotions Unit is responsible for:

(a) calling for applications in annual promotions rounds and setting applicable dates;

(b) providing the relevant Head with lists of applicants who have registered their notice of intent to apply for promotion;

(c) convening LPCs and CPCs;

(d) constituting LPCs and CPCs in the manner provided in Schedule 2 and 3 of this policy;

(e) notifying applicants of the membership of relevant LPCs and CPCs, and assessors, including any changes;

(f) managing all communications between applicants and LPCs, CPCs, and assessors;

(g) requesting referees’ and assessors’ reports, and seeking further information from third parties where requested to do so by an LPC or CPC;

(h) providing policy and procedural advice to LPCs, CPCs and their Chairs;

(i) publishing relevant important dates on the academic promotions website; and

(j) providing committee recommendations to the relevant delegates for approval.

(4) LPCs and CPCs are responsible for:

(a) assessing academic promotions applications presented to them;
(b) following all required policies and procedures;
(c) making clear recommendations in relation to each applicant as to:
   (i) whether the applicant should be promoted;
   (ii) the stream in which the applicant should be promoted; and
   (iii) the level to which the applicant should be promoted.

(5) **Chairs of committees** are responsible for:
(a) arranging and conducting committee meetings;
(b) distributing materials and papers to the committee members as required;
(c) ensuring that the committee follows all required policies and procedures and
    that all members are aware of these;
(d) appointing replacement committee members when required;
(e) preparing and submitting necessary reports and forms;
(f) for Chairs of LPCs, ensuring they are available to attend any CPC meeting
    which is considering recommendations made in their reports; and
(g) providing feedback to unsuccessful applicants if requested.

(6) **Members of committees** are responsible for:
(a) ensuring their availability to attend all scheduled committee meetings;
(b) declaring any conflict of interests (actual, potential or perceived) to the
    relevant Chair as soon as they are aware of it;
    **Note**: See the definition of conflict of interests in the [External Interests Policy 2010](#)
(c) appropriately managing any conflicts of interests;
(d) ensuring that they understand and comply with all policy and procedural
    requirements; and
(e) providing all necessary feedback to the Chair of their committee in a timely
    fashion.

### 21 Breaches by applicants

(1) If an applicant fails to comply with the requirements of this policy and its associated
procedures the Provost may direct that their application be withdrawn from the
process for that round.

(2) Failure to comply includes, but is not limited to:
(a) failing to meet relevant deadlines;
(b) interfering in the process in a manner which renders it unfair to others; or
(c) communicating directly or indirectly with individuals consulted about, or
    involved in considering, their application.

### 22 Rescissions

This policy replaces the Academic Promotions Policy 2014, which is rescinded with effect
from the commencement date of this policy.
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TO BE COMPLETED BEFORE FINAL Approval
SCHEDULE 1

MINIMUM STANDARDS REQUIRED FOR ACADEMIC PROMOTION

The following definitions apply in this schedule.

Exceptional
Demonstrates highly significant achievements and contributions, which already well exceed the minimum criteria applicable to the level to which promotion is being sought.

Outstanding
Demonstrates achievements and contributions which already clearly meet the minimum criteria for the level to which promotion is being sought.

Superior
Demonstrates highly significant achievements and contributions at the level at which the applicant is currently classified.

Satisfactory
Demonstrates achievements and contributions at the level at which the applicant is currently classified.

TEACHING AND RESEARCH STREAM – Minimum required standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion sought</th>
<th>Teaching standard</th>
<th>Research standard</th>
<th>Governance, Leadership, Engagement standard</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level A to Level B; Level B to Level C; Level C to Level D.</td>
<td>Superior or Outstanding</td>
<td>Superior or Outstanding</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>At least one Outstanding in either Teaching or Research is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level D to Level E</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDUCATION-FOCUSSED STREAM – Minimum required standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion sought</th>
<th>Teaching standard</th>
<th>Research standard</th>
<th>Governance, Leadership, Engagement standard</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>Superior or Satisfactory</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Satisfactory is allowable in Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RESEARCH-FOCUSSED STREAM – Minimum required standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion sought</th>
<th>Teaching standard</th>
<th>Research standard</th>
<th>Governance, Leadership, Engagement standard</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Superior or Satisfactory</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Satisfactory is allowable in Teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOVERNANCE, LEADERSHIP and ENGAGEMENT FOCUSSED STREAM – Minimum required standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion sought</th>
<th>Teaching standard</th>
<th>Research standard</th>
<th>Governance, Leadership, Engagement standard</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level C to Level D</td>
<td>Superior or Satisfactory</td>
<td>Superior or Satisfactory</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>One Satisfactory is allowable in either Teaching or Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level D to Level E</td>
<td>Superior or Outstanding</td>
<td>Superior or Outstanding</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>One Outstanding is required in either Teaching or Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHEDULE 2

LOCAL PROMOTIONS COMMITTEES

TERMS OF REFERENCE AND OPERATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

(1) LPCs will assess faculty and University school applications for academic promotion.

(2) Each Faculty will form an LPC.

(3) University schools will combine to form a multi University school LPC.

(4) LPCs will not act as advocates for such applications.

(5) Having assessed the applications before them, LPCs will vote on each application and recommend successful candidates for promotion.

CONSTITUTION

LPC for Levels B–D inclusive

(1) An LPC for promotion to Levels B–D inclusive will consist of at least five and no more than seven core members, plus one additional member, as follows:

(a) Chair, being the Executive dean or a dean of a faculty, head of school and dean of a University school of one of the participating faculties or a nominee approved by the Provost;

(b) Core members of faculty LPCs for Levels B and C:

(i) For levels B and C: a faculty LPC will have three core members, two members each from a different school or, where there is no school structure, discipline within the faculty;

(ii) one member external to the faculty from at least two different faculties, including one member from the applicant’s faculty;

(iii) one Academic Board nominee; and

(iv) up to two other core members in exceptional circumstances.

(c) Core members of faculty LPCs for level D, a faculty LPC will be:

(i) three members each from a different school or, where there is no school structure, discipline within the faculty;

(ii) one Academic Board nominee; and

(iii) up to two other core members in exceptional circumstances;

(d) Core members of a multi-University school LPC will be:

(i) have three core members with at least one from each University school which has applicants being considered for promotion;

(ii) one Academic Board nominee; and
(c)(f) up to two other core members in exceptional circumstances from two different faculties.

(2) LPCs with five or six core members must include at least two male and two female members, excluding the Academic Board nominee. LPCs with seven core members must include at least three male and three female members, excluding the academic board nominee.

(3) Where extenuating circumstances prevent compliance with clause (2) above, any variance to gender representation will require approval from the Provost.

(4) An LPC may only be convened for a single faculty:
   (i) if there are at least six applications at any one level, and
   (ii) at least two of the members in clause (1)(b) above are from outside the applicants’ faculty.

(5) Where a faculty or multi University school LPC has fewer than six applications, the LPC Chair must seek Provost approval to: it must form a joint LPC with one or more other faculties.

(6) If a joint LPC has fewer than six applications, the LPC Chair must seek Provost approval to proceed.

(7) Where Provost approval is not obtained, clause (5) above will apply.

(8) The Provost may direct an LPC with fewer than six applications to:
   (a) proceed as constituted; or
   (b) combine with another faculties LPC as directed.

(9) Each faculty LPC must have a two reserve core members:
   (a) For levels B and C:
      (i) one reserve member from within the faculty; and
      (ii) one reserve member external to the faculty. If the reserve core member is called upon to replace the Academic Board nominee, the reserve core member may do so even if they are not themselves on the list of Academic Board nominees.
   (b) For level D: two, each from a different school or, where there is no school structure, disciplines within the faculty.

(10) A multi-University school LPC must have a one reserve core member from each University school which has applicants being considered for promotion.

(11) If a reserve core member is called upon to replace the Academic Board nominee, the reserve core member may do so even if they are not themselves on the list of Academic Board nominees.

(12) Each LPC must also have one additional member (plus one reserve additional member) specific to individual applications, who will have expertise in the applicant’s general field. These members will be appointed by the Chair, in consultation with the relevant Heads.

(13) Except with the authorisation of the Provost, members of the LPC must be of academic rank equal to or higher than the grade to which applicants under consideration are seeking promotion.

LPC for Level E
(1) An LPC for promotion to Level E will consist of at least six and no more than eight core members as follows:

(a) Chair, being the Executive dean or a dean of a faculty, head of school and dean of a University school of one of the participating faculties, or a nominee approved by the Provost;

(b) Core members of faculty LPCs:

(i) A faculty LPC will normally comprise four and no more than six professors from each from a different school, or where there is no school structure, discipline within the faculty; and

(ii) One Academic Board nominee at least two different faculties; and

(c) Core members of multi-University school LPCs

(i) A multi-University school LPC will normally comprise four and no more than six professors, with at least one from each University school which has applicants being considered for promotion. Where there are multiple members from one University school, members must be from different disciplines; and;

(ii) one Academic Board nominee.

(2) LPCs with six core members must include at least two male and two female members, excluding the Academic Board nominee. LPCs with seven or eight core members must include at least three male and three female members, excluding the Academic Board nominee.

(3) Where extenuating circumstances prevent compliance with clause (2) above, any variance to gender representation will require approval from the Provost.

(4) An LPC may only be convened for a single faculty if there are at least six applications.

(5) Where a faculty or multi-University school LPC has fewer than six applications, the LPC Chair must seek Provost approval to form a joint LPC with one or more other faculties.

(6) If a joint LPC has less than six applications, the LPC Chair must seek Provost approval to proceed.

(7) Where Provost approval is not obtained, clause (5) above will apply.

(8) The Provost may direct an LPC with fewer than six applications to;

(a) proceed as constituted; or

(b) combine with another faculties LPC as directed.

(9)(6) Professors external to the University may sit on an LPC for promotion to Level E if it is considering applications from a small faculty without a large professoriate (whether it is considering applications from a single faculty or multiple faculties).

(10) The individual who completed the Teaching and Research Supervision Activities data verification report for the applicant may sit as a core member of an LPC at this level.

(7) The A faculty LPC must have atwo reserve core members, each from a different school or, where there is no school structure, disciplines within the faculty. If the reserve core member is called upon to replace the Academic Board nominee, the reserve core member may do so even if they are not themselves on the list of Academic Board nominees.
(8) A multi University school LPC, must have one reserve core member representing each University school which has applicants for promotion.

(11)(9) If then reserve core member is called upon to replace the Academic Board nominee, the reserve core member may do so even if they are not themselves on the list of Academic Board nominees.

(12)(10) Each LPC must also have one additional member (plus one reserve additional member) specific to individual applications, who will have expertise in the applicant’s general field. These members will be appointed by the Chair, in consultation with the relevant Heads of School.

MEETINGS

Quorum

The quorum for any meeting of an LPC for promotion to Levels B – D inclusive is five, being either five core members or four core members plus the reserve core member.

The quorum for any meeting an LPC for promotion to Level E is seven, being either seven core members or six core members plus the reserve core member.

Number of meetings

(1) The LPC will meet twice for applications for Levels B – D:
   (a) a preliminary meeting; and
   (b) a final meeting

(2) The LPC will meet once to consider applications for Level E.

Format of meeting

(1) Preliminary meetings may be held in person or by circulation.

(2) Final meetings, and meetings considering applications for Level E, must be held in person.

(3) With the consent of the Chair, the additional member, (but not other members), may attend any meeting by telephone, video link or similar arrangement.

(4) With the consent of the Chair, the applicant may be interviewed by telephone, video link or similar arrangement.

Voting

(1) All core members present must vote on each application.

(2) Additional members are not entitled to vote and must not be present when votes are taken.

(3) Each core member’s vote must be declared. Voting must not be done by secret ballot.

(4) No applicant may be recommended for promotion unless the number of votes in favour of promotion is at least twice the number of votes against.
SCHEDULE 3
CENTRAL PROMOTIONS COMMITTEES
TERMS OF REFERENCE AND OPERATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

CPCs will review the operation and reports of LPCs in applications for promotion to Levels C –E inclusive.

(1) CPCs will be guided by the advice of the LPCs but will make the final recommendation for or against promotion.

(2) CPCs will ensure that standards for promotion to senior academic ranks are consistent and equitable across the University.

CONSTITUTION

CPC for Levels C and D

(1) A CPC for promotion to Levels C or D will consist of:
   (a) a Chair, being the Provost or nominee (ex officio)
   (b) the Chair of the Academic Board or nominee (ex officio)
   (c) one senior academic from another university, nominated by the Provost
   (d) three members of the University’s academic staff, nominated by the Provost
   (e) three members of the University’s academic staff, nominated by the Chair of the Academic Board.

(2) The CPC must include at least three male and three female members, excluding the Chair.

(3) Where extenuating circumstances prevent compliance with clause (2) above, any variance to gender representation will require approval from the CPC Chair.

(4) There must also be two reserve members, being members of the University’s academic staff nominated jointly by the Provost and the Chair of the Academic Board.

(5) Members other than ex officio members should not serve for more than three consecutive years.

(6) Individuals may not serve as members of a CPC if they have also been members of an LPC considering applications for promotion to the same level.

(7) Where available a representative from the equity and diversity strategy centre should be present for the scheduled CPC meeting.

CPC for Level E

(1) A CPC for promotion to Level E will consist of:
   (a) a Chair, being the Vice-Chancellor or nominee (ex officio)
   (b) the Provost or nominee (ex officio)
(c) the Chair of the Academic Board or nominee (ex officio)
(d) two deans, nominated by the Provost
(e) One senior academic from another university, nominated by the Vice-Chancellor
(f) Three professors, nominated by the Chair of the Academic Board

(2) The CPC must include at least three male and three female members.
(3) Where extenuating circumstances prevent compliance with clause (2) above, any variance to gender representation will require approval from the CPC Chair.
(4) There will be two reserve members, being members of the University's professoriate, nominated by the Chair of the Academic Board.
(5) Members other than ex officio members should not serve for more than three consecutive years.
(6) Individuals may not serve as members of a CPC if they have also been members of an LPC considering applications for promotion to the same level.
(7) Where available a representative from the equity and diversity strategy centre should be present for the scheduled CPC meeting.

Voting
(1) Each member’s vote must be declared. Voting must not be done by secret ballot.
(2) No applicant may be recommended for promotion unless the number of votes in favour of promotion is at least twice the number of votes against.
SCHEDULE 4

“OUT OF ROUND’ OOR PROMOTIONS COMMITTEES

TERMS OF REFERENCE AND OPERATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

(5) The OOR committee will assess the submission as expeditiously as possible.

(6) The OOR committee will apply the standards and criteria for the applicable position specified in this policy and the procedures.

CONSTITUTION

OOR committees for Levels C and D

(A) An OOR committee for promotion to Levels C or D will consist of:

(a) a Chair, being the Provost or nominee (ex officio)

(b) the Chair of the Academic Board or nominee (ex officio)

(c) the relevant Dean or nominee.

OOR committee for Level E

(B) An OOR committee for promotion to Level E will consist of:

(d) a Chair, being the Provost or nominee (ex officio)

(e) the Chair of the Academic Board or nominee (ex officio)

(f) a nominee of the Provost who is a senior member of the University

(g) the relevant Dean or nominee.

(7) Where the originator of the submission would otherwise sit on the committee, a nominee must be appointed.

Voting

(1) The OOR committee may adopt a unanimous recommendation by circulation. Otherwise a meeting must be held, at which a submission will be recommended if supported by a simple majority of votes.

(2) The Academic Promotions Unit will forward the recommendation to the relevant delegate.

(3) Where promotion is recommended and approved, only one offer may be made.

(4) No appeal is available from an “out of round” promotion submission.
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| Purpose | To review the scope of the Code of Conduct for Students and propose updates. |

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee:
- provide feedback on the current Code of Conduct for Students; and
- discuss issues to be considered in the review.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During late 2018 a Student Experience Strategy (Attachment 1) was released. Proposition E1.4 of the strategy commits the University to developing a new Code of Conduct for Students (Attachment 2) to better reflect a student-centric approach. The review will be under the auspices of the University Executive Student Life Committee (UESL) and led by the interim Pro Vice-Chancellor (Student Life) and Education portfolio, who will meet with student groups, University College representatives and relevant University units to formulate proposals for UESL consideration.

Initial thoughts are that the Code of Conduct for Students (the Code) could be revised to be more collegiate in tone, reflecting the aim for this document to set out a concept of the University in which students and staff are partners in creating a supportive scholarly environment. The scope of the Code could be amended to place greater emphasis on student representation and to pair obligations of students with those of other parts of the University in building a culture of freedom, respect and the pursuit of knowledge.

The Code should be a concise expression of principles and values and point to, rather than replicate, other University statutes, policies and procedures. For brevity, definitions and procedural responsibilities which are set out elsewhere could be removed. It could instead concentrate on acting lawfully, ethically and respectfully towards all regardless of gender, religion, race, sexuality or disability. The Code could also aim to articulate more clearly the role that students take on as ambassadors for the institution in terms of their academic conduct, behaviour, integrity and professionalism in all contexts and mediums such as social media.

BACKGROUND

During March 2018, the University Executive endorsed a program of work on the student experience. Building on the work of the 2017 International Student Experience Taskforce and the Transition, Advising and Careers (TAC) Steering Group the following year, during late 2018 a Student Experience Strategy was released (Attachment 1). It advances a vision for improving the student experience at the University of Sydney and a set of guiding principles to achieve it. Part 4 of the strategy calls for a more student-centric approach in response to indications in national survey data that student satisfaction with student support at the University remains low. As part of a suite of initiatives to address this, proposition E1.4 commits the University to developing a new student code of conduct:

“The University should review the Student Code of Conduct and ensure that it is aligned with the culture strategy, the Principles for the Student Experience and all other aspects of the student experience strategy.”
The draft Student Experience Strategy recommends consultation take place during October 2019. Given that the Code of Conduct for Students (Attachment 2) was developed in 2005 and has been subject only to administrative amendments since 2012, this work has been brought forward. Consultation will commence in the first half of 2019 with a view to approving the new policy during the second half of the year.

**ISSUES**

**Aims**
In its current state the Code of Conduct for Students (the Code) reaffirms a set of University’s commitments but its aim is formulated in terms of expectations of students rather than the joint scholarly culture it seeks to foster. This could be revised into a rationale that:

- defines the University as a scholarly community in which students play a crucial collegial role;
- sets out key principles underpinning the partnership between students, staff and the public; and,
- establishes an aim to provide an experience for students that recognises their agency and is consistent with the University's values and guiding principles.

**Scope**
The Code has been subject to administrative amendments only since approval in 2005. To better reflect the student-centric approach that has been committed to in the University Student Experience Strategy, the Code could aim to balance obligations of students with obligations of the University in building a culture of freedom, respect and the pursuit of knowledge. This would bring it in line with similar codes of conduct at peer institutions.

| Scope of Group of Eight University student codes and charters |
|--------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| **University**           | **Policy document** | **Characterisation of institutional obligations towards students** | **Structure** |
| University of Adelaide   | Student Charter   | ‘Student Expectations’           | Standalone section of the policy |
| University of Melbourne  | Student Charter   | ‘All students are entitled to’    | Standalone section of the policy |
| Monash University        | Student Charter   | ‘Students can expect that Monash will’ | Each section is structured in a two-fold way: clauses about the University obligations and then companion clauses about the student obligations in return. |
| UNSW                     | Student Code of Conduct | Section 2.2 ‘The University Experience’ | Standalone section of the policy |
| University of Queensland | Student Charter   | ‘You can expect’                 | Each section is structured in a two-fold way: clauses about the University obligations and then companion clauses about the student obligations in return. This is set out in a table with two columns, with each clause being a row. |
| University of Western Australia | University Charter of Student Rights and Responsibilities | ‘Each student has the right’ | Each section is structured in a two-fold way: clauses about the University obligations and then companion clauses about the student obligations in return. |
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Length, duplication and relation to other policies
The Code should aim to be a concise expression of principles and values and point to rather than replicate other University statutes, policies and procedures. Definitions, notably that of ‘student’, should be consistent with other University policies. For brevity, procedural responsibilities which are set out in guidelines elsewhere could be removed – such as with respect to checking emails.

Tone
The Code could be revised to be more collegiate, supporting the objective for this document to set out a concept of the University in which students and staff are partners. Statements such as “students must” and “the University expects students to” could be reframed to emphasise students’ agency and joint responsibility.

Reputational risk
The Code should establish students’ joint obligation with staff to uphold the University’s reputation and academic standing. The new undergraduate curriculum provides students with increased opportunity for undertaking placements, projects and global mobility experiences. It also emphasises attainment of the University graduate qualities. Accordingly, the Code could aim to articulate more clearly the role that students take on as ambassadors for the institution in terms of their academic conduct, behaviour, integrity and professionalism. To modernise the document, the channel of social media could be noted, as the Code is currently silent on this front.

Legality, ethics and agency
Emphasis should be placed on acting lawfully, ethically and disagreeing well in all contexts and mediums in a way that respects the rights of all regardless of gender, religion, race, sexuality or disability. To better align with the aim of characterising students’ role as participants in the scholarly community, the Code should emphasise freedom of speech and academic freedom that is expressed in a manner that respects the rights of others and is within the law. It could also be expanded to cover the joint responsibility of staff and students to provide a supportive environment that assists students in realising their ambitions.

CONSULTATION
The review be under the auspices of the University Executive Student Life Committee (UESL) and led by the interim Pro Vice-Chancellor (Student Life) who will meet with student groups, University College representatives and relevant University units to formulate proposals for UESL consideration. The review will be supported by the Education portfolio.

Following the University Executive Student Life Committee meeting in February 2019, the consultation pathway is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee/Stakeholders</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UE Student Life</td>
<td>27 February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Culture Strategy, Office of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal</td>
<td>February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Unit</td>
<td>February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE College Consultative committee</td>
<td>4 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University student representatives and case workers</td>
<td>8 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standards and Policy Committee</td>
<td>19 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE Student Life – report on discussions to date</td>
<td>27 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE Student Consultative Committee</td>
<td>27 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Board</td>
<td>16 April 2019 (TBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE Student Life – initial proposals</td>
<td>1 May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE Student Life – draft Code</td>
<td>29 May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Board Academic Standards and Policy Committee (ASPC)</td>
<td>25 June 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UE Education Committee</td>
<td>3 June or 12 August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Executive</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Board</td>
<td>3 September 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1 – Student Experience Strategy
- Attachment 2 – Code of Conduct for Students 2005
A strategy for the student experience at the University of Sydney

Professor Pip Pattison

DVC Education

Education Portfolio
A strategy for the student experience at the University of Sydney

Executive Summary

Building on the work of the 2017 International Student Experience Taskforce, this paper sets out a vision for the student experience at the University of Sydney and a set of principles and a strategy to guide our efforts in realising it. We conceptualise the student experience as a loosely structured sequence of interactions of three broad types: a kernel of interactions and relationships that support learning and participation in student life and thereby students’ academic and social connection to the University; a suite of interactions that provide vital support for key student transitions and choices, from the moment of first encounter with the University to sustained participation as alumni; and encounters with the essential supporting services, processes and systems that enable active and meaningful engagement in university life. A commitment to student-centricity – quality and integration across the constituent interaction types and a contextualised, personalised experience – will ensure a seamless, coherent and satisfying experience that is supportive of each student’s and the University’s educational goals. We describe the University of Sydney’s aspiration for an outstanding student experience in these terms, and articulate a set of guiding principles for the student experience at the University. We then present a strategy in four parts: a student-centric design; an enriched educational and student life experience; outstanding transition to University and support for academic and career choice and development; and effective and targeted essential student support services.

Conceptualising the student experience

We represent the student experience as a clustered suite of interactions and relationships of different types (see Figure 1). The characterisation is intended to encompass the entire experience students have with the University, from being prospective students through to becoming alumni and possibly returning students. The clusters differ in the extent to which their constituent encounters and relationships occur early, later or throughout a student’s trajectory. They also differ in the extent to which they reflect one-off transactions or interactions that are repeated and more relational in character. Some types of interactions occur for all students and in a more-or-less regular sequence (e.g. consideration before application, selection before enrolment, transition in before transition out) whereas others can occur at any time and in ways that are individually distinctive (e.g. need for financial assistance, need for multiple forms of support at times of serious illness). Hence any characterisation of the student experience is necessarily an abstraction, but we use the representation of Figure 1 to frame our vision for the student experience and set out the steps to achieve it.

The core of the student experience is seen as being interactive and relational in character and linked very closely to learning and participating in the life of the University and, through these core forms of educational and social participation, coming to belong to, and feel a part of, the University community. The three aspects of learning, participating and belonging are anchored in interactions and relationships among students and between staff and students, interactions that not only support students’ social and academic connection to the University but also frame the ways in which students engage with the University in future. A primary focus for the student experience should therefore be to ensure that students have a positive and intellectually stimulating experience of these core interactions as well as genuinely realisable opportunities for some of these interactions to lead to more lasting relationships, such as friendships with fellow students and advising or mentoring relationships with staff. Keeping connected after graduation gives ongoing expression to these core relationships.

Enabling these core relational aspects of the student experience are moments of significant transition and choice. These include joining the University community, navigating the options...
and choices within degrees and the broader University experience in terms of aspirations for life and career, and preparing for finishing a degree and successfully transiting to a next phase, whether it involves further study, paid employment or starting a venture of one’s own. Also included is accessing liaison support during periods of sustained or intense challenge when many forms of support may be needed at once and liaison or case management support can ensure more seamless and effective access to multiple University and external services. These are all moments at which carefully targeted University support can have particularly significant impact. The initial encounters with outreach and the recruitment process and the decision to accept an offer from the University – the mutual process of selecting on the part of a student and the University – can also be included among these key moments of transition and choice.

Serving as a foundation for the student experience are the essential supports in place to assist students to participate fully in University life. This may include overcoming or at least mitigating barriers to full participation, and also providing enriching opportunities, such as access to mobility, that might otherwise be unavailable because of life circumstances. Included here are not just the fundamental living requirements for engagement in university life – such as accommodation, transportation, financial resources, health and wellbeing – but also the University systems for transacting with the University and the University’s enabling environment (the inter-related physical, virtual, policy, social and cultural infrastructure) that shape the unfolding sequence of encounters and developing relationships that go to make up students’ University experience. The inter-relationships are important, and reflect, for example, the way in which the University’s policies give expression to the University’s core values.

![Figure 1. Conceptualising the student experience](image)

While we can distil the student experience into these three broad types – the relational kernel of the student experience, the critically important encounters that support transition and choice, and essential supports for active and meaningful engagement – it is, of course, important to recognise the rich diversity of relationships and interactions that populate these three broad types and the unique trajectories and patterns of encounter that make up each student’s

---

individual experience. It is also important to emphasise that the quality of the overall experience for each student is vitally dependent not just on the quality of each constituent relationship and interaction but also on the extent to which each individual student’s unique trajectory is able to meet their individual need and be experienced as seamless and coherent through effectively integrated supporting processes and systems. A student experience that comprises high quality, tailored, seamless interactions is genuinely student-centric in its design.

A vision for an outstanding student experience

Our overarching aspiration is for an outstanding student experience, one that results in each student’s being and feeling connected to the University community, fully engaged in learning and achieving excellent educational outcomes. This connection should be underpinned by broadly satisfying and intellectually stimulating day-to-day interactions with fellow students and staff and sustained by some more enduring social relationships with peers and, ideally, advising or mentoring relationships with one or more staff members. It will also involve participation in the broader life of the University community, including in social, cultural, voluntary and sporting activities, and contribution to the University community, whether through engagement as a peer or mentor for others, or active participation in the work of the University. Many of these forms of participation will be enabled by engagement not only with the faculties, Library, portfolios and PSUs, but also with organisations that are part of the broader University community, such as student organisations, colleges and other residential settings.

Connection to the University community depends for many students on support to address barriers to engagement and/or opportunities for engagement that go beyond the curriculum. Of course, the form of desired and actual connection will vary considerably from one student to the next, but in an ideal world, all students will be able to point to interactions and relationships that positively enrich their academic, social and cultural experience of the University, contribute to their engagement with learning and participation in University life, and have a positive impact both on the value that they ascribe to their university experience and to the quality of their educational and career outcomes. Ideally also, all students will regularly experience positive interactions that support learning and engagement across many parts of the University community and the University community itself will have a high level of internal and external connectivity in its interaction and relationship structures.

To bring about these relational aspirations, the University will have in place systematic opportunities for their development, including support for students to find the academic and social settings that facilitate the desired forms of interaction and engagement, and structured opportunities to reflect on life aspirations and learning and career goals and make academic choices that support their realisation. The University will ensure seamless access to accurate, integrated and comprehensive information resources covering all aspects of joining the University community and to its systems, resources and support services, for example, through a well-structured student portal sensitive to a student’s changing circumstances, such as whether they are commencing or returning students, or new to the city and/or country. This digital portal will be supplemented by an integrated relationship management system, a University-wide advising and careers service, and ‘pop up’ enquiry services at key transition moments to support students who require specialised assistance, such as for more complex queries or for issues that require coordination across different parts of the University.

Through a focussed transition program as part of every student’s initial educational engagement, the University will also ensure that the experience of commencing at the University attends jointly and coherently to academic and social transition. It will set expectations for study at the University and support students’ preparedness for their studies through systematic efforts to identify their strengths as well as opportunities for targeted support to increase the likelihood of success. It will also provide a milieu that is intentionally facilitative of meaningful academic and social interactions among students within classes, within cohorts and across the University. From their earliest encounters with the University, students...
will be encouraged to: explore and come to understand their strengths and opportunities for
development; articulate their current and emerging aspirations and what that means for the
academic choices they make and their developing sense of themselves; engage in student life
and the exploration and further development of extra-curricular interests; and reflect on and
make choices about next steps and opportunities. In this way, the University will provide
structured and scaffolded opportunities through which students can take responsibility for the
learning choices they make, broaden their participation in the life of the University, and
develop the tools for a considered and reflective approach to ongoing learning.

The opportunity to focus early on self-awareness, life aspirations and academic choice will be
the first step in a more sustained commitment to the support of students’ academic trajectories
and choice; students will be able to connect at critical moments of choice to supporting
frameworks, relevant information about careers, further study opportunities and emerging
societal and labour market trends and, ideally, discussion with an appropriate and skilled
advisor or facilitator. The University will also offer experiential opportunities to explore next
career steps or further study options in both curricular (e.g. industry and community project
units, placements and internships, research or entrepreneurship projects) and co-curricular (e.g.
volunteering, work experience, entrepreneurship opportunity) forms.

The University will also have in place systems and support structures to facilitate students’
effective engagement in University life. This includes dealing as a University student with the
basic requirements for living, including health, wellbeing and safety, addressing personal
and other barriers to participation, and engaging efficiently and seamlessly with University systems
and supports. Necessarily, these systems and support structures will focus on essential supports
in areas of greatest unmet need, as well as on liaison and coordination with available
community and specialist external services, including those related to accommodation, health
and wellbeing, and childcare. They will also include additional liaison support for students
who are experiencing intense periods of challenge, and for whom the need to engage across
multiple services and processes can itself become a source of additional challenge.

An effective systems and support environment will also foster engagement with the University
community through the further creation of student spaces and formal and informal learning
spaces aligned to the University’s aspirations for the student experience just described.
Libraries and physical and virtual environments will support informal learning, including
interactive educational activities, as well as social interaction and mixing. University- and
student-led programs will also foster academic and social interaction. The University’s culture
and organisational and policy framework will also reflect the University’s values and its
aspiration of an outstanding educational experience and excellent graduate outcomes.

The University will know that it has achieved its vision for an outstanding student experience
when its existing Key Performance Indicators for Education and the Student Experience, as well
as additional indicators to be developed as part of this strategy, demonstrate that the
University is among the leading universities within Australia and, in time, a leader
internationally, for the quality of its educational experience and student life.

Principles for the student experience

To test and prioritise strategic initiatives for an improved student experience, an expanded set
of guiding principles is proposed. These are that the student experience should:

Student-centric

• reflect a commitment to student-centricity, that is, to interactions with the University that
  are seamless, responsive, of high quality, and tailored to students’ personal needs;
• scaffold the transition from commencing to experienced student and then successful
  graduate through targeted support at key moments of challenge;
• ensure effective access to supporting information, resources and systems;
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• provide timely, effective, personalised assistance to manage barriers to participation or periods of crisis or need and work to ensure opportunity for all students to succeed;

Strategic and outcome-focussed
• support the University’s education strategy by providing curricular, co-curricular and extra-curricular opportunities for students to realise their potential and develop to a high level the University’s identified graduate qualities;
• encourage and support each student to identify, regularly review and work to achieve their aspirations for learning, life and career;
• take full advantage of the educational possibilities of the cultural diversity and breadth and depth of academic and professional expertise at the University and among its partners;
• maximise positive impact for students through efficient resource use;
• reflect the University’s values and mission;

Equitable and evidence-based
• create, for every student, a strong basis for engagement, learning and lifelong networks through a commitment to interactive and collaborative pedagogies and an intellectually rewarding and socially enriching student life;
• recognise and facilitate the role of peers in multiplying the impact of the University’s enrichment efforts;
• contribute to an open, inclusive and resilient University community in which students are active participants in accessible, diverse and interleaved groups and activities;
• recognise and support the role and importance of educators in providing a rich and relevant curricula and effective learning experience for students;
• promote both participation and excellence in student activities by achieving an effective balance between the promotion of high levels of participation and support for aspirations towards excellence and performance at the highest levels; and
• be guided by effective mechanisms for timely monitoring and quality improvement.

Key pain points for the student experience

To develop a plan for realising our aspirations for the student experience, it is important to understand the point from which the effort must spring.

Several recent surveys and projects provide valuable data on the contemporary student experience. These include:
• recent student surveys, principally the national Student Experience Survey (2015-2017);
• recommendations from Improving the International Student Experience, the Report of the 2017 International Student Experience Taskforce, chaired by Prof Greg Whitwell; and
• a week-long online discussion forum among students held in May 2018 on current state and improvement opportunities for four broad aspects of the student experience (student life, classes, administrative processes; and student support).

These data show that the need for improvement in the student experience at the University of Sydney is both substantial and urgent. For many of the quantitative student experience measures, we are in the lower quartile for the university sector. Furthermore, improvement is necessary in almost every aspect of the student experience if we are to reflect the guiding principles for the student experience just outlined and foster student success within a stimulating intellectual and social environment. The necessary improvement include:
• a redesign of the University’s approach to supporting the student experience, to embed student-centricity as a core principle and a feedback system facilitating quality improvement;
• a heightened focus on student learning and intellectually stimulating interactions within units of study and a commitment to facilitating the quality and diversity of student life;
• integrated and responsive support for students at key moments of transition, choice and challenge, including those moments at which students initially connect with the University as prospective students, enter the University community, make life-shaping academic choices, experience substantial hardship, prepare for career and further study options beyond their current degree, and connect actively as alumni;
• improved access to essential supports and an environment designed to optimise the likelihood of success for all students.

The data sources listed above all demonstrate that the current student experience at the University falls well short of the vision for the enriching and seamless student-centric experience set out earlier. The data consistently identify specific key pain points for students. It is important to stress that these data also identify many specific experiences that are outstanding and worthy of high praise, and students often comment on individual academic and professional staff members with whom their engagement has not only been rewarding but transformative. In addition, a variety of initiatives aimed at improving the student experience are already having a positive impact, including projects in Student Administrative Services, 2017 International Student Taskforce initiatives, and ongoing implementation of the 2016-20 Strategic Plan. These initiatives are demonstrably improving students’ experience of administrative interactions with the University, supporting a smoother and more welcoming arrival at the University, expanding opportunities for students to engage more fully in the academic and social life of the University, and promoting more interactive and collaborative approaches to learning. The Library, faculties and University schools have also developed innovative and distinctive programs to support student life in the setting. Examples include: the peer Learning Advisor program in the Library; a focussed academic transition unit (Law School); an extensive orientation program and student grants for activities to promote cross-cultural interaction (Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences); a systematic focus on interactive learning designs and extensive peer assistance and support programs (Business School); support for student-led industry engagement and leadership programs (Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology); curricular and co-curricular support for enhancing communication skills (Faculty of Health Sciences); and programs prioritising personal health and wellbeing (Faculty of Medicine and Health).

Nonetheless, students often refer to both high points and low points when describing the quality of their experience and a number reflect openly on what they see as unacceptable variation in quality. This perceived variation arguably underpins the perception of many students that, while we are able to – and do – deliver some excellent and rewarding experiences, we are not yet committed as an institution to an experience of uniformly high quality.

The specific issues that emerge consistently as key pain points in the student experience are described below and summarised in Table 1. We focus on those here in order to identify the most promising opportunities for improvement.

The key pain points are that:
• Students do not experience their interactions with the University as student-centric.
  o A digital experience of variable quality. Information is hard to find and not adapted to students’ circumstances.
  o Lack of integration and consistency. Students need to repeat their stories as they are passed from one part of the university to another, and receive inconsistent advice.

2 The recruitment/admission and alumni phases of the student experience are not covered in detail here, but it will be important to ensure alignment of governing principles and processes to ensure a seamless and integrated experience.
• The University lack measures and systems to ensure systematic quality improvement
  o Incomplete and lagged monitoring. Measurement of various aspects of the student experience is incomplete and distributed.
  o Ad hoc approaches to quality improvement. There has not been a systematic process for responding to student feedback on the student experience.

• The educational experience does not yet fully realise the aspiration of Strategy 5 (2016-2020 Strategic Plan) to “make more extensive use of the interactive, experiential and collaborative pedagogies that most advance learning and enrich the student experience.”
  o Non-interactive classes. Students continue to seek greater levels of discussion, interaction and practical application in class, and are aware of the learning benefits of interactive pedagogies.
  o Lack of concern for students and student learning. Some teachers continue to be seen as lacking a concern for students and/or for student learning.
  o Variable quality of teaching. Students see the teaching capabilities of lecturers and especially tutors as too variable.
  o Variable quality of assessment. Assessment, too, is seen as variable in quality, and some aspects of assessment are seen as misaligned with learning goals and yielding inconsistent grading and feedback.
  o Greater access to academic support. Students see a need for more academic support, especially for the development of communication skills.

• The University community is not experienced as socially integrated and inclusive, even though some students report an outstanding experience of student life.
  o Social isolation. Many students feel isolated and, even though they seek higher levels of connection to the University community, they find it difficult to connect to others.
  o Peer mentoring is ad hoc. Students value peer mentoring programs and would like to see more systematic availability.
  o Limited student life on campuses other than Camperdown. Students on campuses other than Camperdown seek richer opportunities for student life.
  o Cost of USU Access card. Many students see the need to purchase a USU Access Card in order to join clubs and societies as annoying and unfair.
  o Limited access to social sport. Students seek greater access to social sporting opportunities.
  o Lack of identification with the University and its community. Many students fail to identify with the University or feel a sense of belonging to the University community.

• Students do not feel supported by the University as they commence their studies and make choices that are important to their future.
  o Transition and orientation. Transition and orientation are too rushed and limited in their reach and effectiveness.
  o Lack of access to academic advice. Students are frustrated by the lack of availability of academic advice, especially in an interactive (e.g. face to face) setting.
  o Lack of access to career development opportunities and career advice. Some students are either unaware of career support services or see them as insufficiently tailored to their circumstances.

• Administrative interactions are not experienced as student-centric.
  o Difficulty of enrolment. Enrolment is seen as a very difficult and unwieldy process, one that is not supported with sufficient information about process or options.
Unsatisfactory processes for resolving non-routine administrative issues. Many students dislike email as the channel for resolving non-routine administrative issues and report long delays and inconsistent outcomes. They are frustrated by the lack of a case/relationship management system and by the slow and indirect form of access to expert advice in the faculties. Securing credit in advance for international exchange is a common difficulty. Students would also like to see a clear point of responsibility for resolution of non-routine administrative issues.

- Lack of single sign on. Students are frustrated by the lack of Single Sign On.
- Late finalization of timetable and poor information on subject choices. Students would like to see earlier resolution of their timetable, earlier and more detailed information on course choices and more control over class selection.

- Essential supports are not always seen as available.
  - Lack of health and wellbeing services. Students see room for improvement in accessing some of the supporting services.
  - Lack of support for finding accommodation. Students, especially international students and those from areas other than Sydney, would like support in finding accommodation and too many students are experiencing financial hardship.

Table 1. Key pain points in the student experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Pain point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Design             | Students do not experience their interactions with the University as student-centric.  
  - a digital experience of variable quality  
  - lack of integration and consistency  
  The University lacks measures and systems to ensure systematic quality improvement  
  - incomplete and lagged monitoring  
  - ad hoc approaches to quality improvement                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Relational core    | The educational experience does not yet realise the aspiration of Strategy 5 (2016-2020 Strategic Plan) to ‘make more extensive use of the interactive, experiential and collaborative pedagogies that most advance learning and enrich the student experience’  
  - non-interactive classes  
  - lack of concern for students and student learning  
  - variable quality of teaching  
  - variable quality of assessment and feedback  
  - greater access to academic support  
  The University community is not experienced as socially integrated and inclusive, even though some students report an outstanding social experience  
  - social isolation  
  - peer mentoring is ad hoc  
  - limited student life on campuses other than Camperdown  
  - cost of USU Access card  
  - limited access to social sport  
  - lack of identification with the University and its community                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Transition and navigation | Students do not feel supported by the University as they commence their studies.  
  - transition lacks impact and reach                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |

---

Many of these pain points have also emerged in several specific user experience and design workshops that have been completed to date (for example, an ICT workshop on information access and a SOM project workshop on curriculum timetabling). Despite the focus on a specific type of interaction, many of the broader pain points also emerged. For example:

- A blueegg workshop organized by ICT on students’ engagement with University information identified as key issues: lack of a sense of belonging; lack of single sign on; lack of personalization; lack of consistency of style and information and use of bureaucratic language and tone; fragmented sources of information and the difficulty of finding information, especially for enrolment; and lack of access to timely and integrated timetable information.

- The Customer Experience Company project on students’ experience of curriculum timetabling, as part of the SOM curriculum timetabling project identified as pain points: insufficient information about units and course components to inform enrolment choices; lack of clarity concerning pathways and pre-requisites; a disjointed experience of gaining academic advice; lack of systems support for planning, including connection with course requirements; lack of timely timetable information to inform planning around outside commitments and avoidance of clashes; slow response to requests for advice through student services; inadequate means of taking account of special needs; and insufficient student control over class selection to manage outside commitments.

This analysis points to focussed improvement in the key aspects of the student experience identified in Table 2.

Table 2. Focus areas for the student experience strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Design               | **student-centric systems and processes:** a seamless and student-centric experience supported by personalised and timely access to information, resources and systems, and an integrated relationship management system  
**data-informed quality improvement:** timely and effective feedback and quality improvement processes |
| Relational core      | **relational aspects of learning:** concern for student learning and adoption of more interactive pedagogies in the classroom  
**social connection:** social interaction, inside and outside the classroom |
| Transition and navigation | **transition:** a scaffolded transition into the University community  
**reflection and advice:** opportunities for structured reflection and advice on achieving aspirations for learning, life and career |
| Essential supports   | **student-centric support:** integrated, accessible support to address barriers to student participation and success  
**affording opportunity:** processes that seek to afford opportunity for all students |
At a high level, addressing these eight focus areas should ensure that students have an outstanding student experience, one that is coherent, personalised and successful and in which they and their education are at the centre.

A strategy for the student experience

To address the identified inadequacies in the current experience of students at the University of Sydney and to realise the vision for an outstanding student experience outlined earlier, a strategy for the student experience is proposed below.

The strategy is presented in four parts. Part 1 deals with the design of an integrated approach to the student experience, and hence with organisation, leadership, governance and integration. It therefore also addresses the proposed design focus on student-centric systems and processes and data-informed quality improvement. The remaining three parts deal, in turn, with each of the layers in Figure 1: Part 2 with the relational core (that is, with relational aspects of learning and social connection); Part 3 with transition and navigation (i.e. with transition, reflection, advice and access); and Part 4 with essential supports (i.e. with student centric support and affording opportunity).

Part 1. Design

Contributing to an excellent student experience is the responsibility of almost every member of the University community. Whether improving the amenity of the University campus, working in the Library, supervising higher degree by research students, teaching, leading an academic unit or contributing to the effective administration of the University, almost every individual has a direct or indirect impact on the student experience. Responsibility for the student experience is, as a result, highly distributed. A key step in improving the student experience is therefore to create a conceptual design for the student experience in which:

- core information, resources and services are readily accessible to all members of the University community (e.g. through an intuitive and easy-to-navigate portal);
- operational responsibilities for each aspect of the student experience are understood by all and valued for their contribution to an outstanding education;
- core dependencies among different aspects are understood and supported by effective collaboration mechanisms;
- supporting systems capture relevant interactions, issues and responses, have appropriate access and privacy settings in place, and are integrated so that successive encounters with the University can add value to preceding ones; and
- timely and effective monitoring supports local and system-wide quality improvement.

Some of the current organisational arrangements for the various parts of the University community that support the student experience reflect three important design principles. The first is that there is a core central role for strategy, coordination and systems support, but that many aspects of the student experience, especially those in the relational core, are primarily managed through faculties and student organisations as well as in residential communities. As a result, strong partnerships and a shared vision among central portfolios, PSUs and faculties, on the one hand, and between central units and student organisations including those in residential communities, on the other, are vital. The second is that the weight attached to central or faculty operational responsibility varies across the layers of the student experience: the role of faculties, schools and student organisations is strongest for the relational core, strong but potentially more reliant on central units for the transition and navigation layer, and much less strong for the essential supports layer. Third, there is a need, at least in some situations, for alignment across different aspects of the student experience; for example, academic advice offered in the transition and navigation layer may have consequences for enrolment in the essential supports layer and forms of participation in the relational core. In
some cases, these cross-functional dependencies can be managed through shared leadership within a unit; in other cases, they may be managed in different units, but must be supported through other collaboration mechanisms (e.g. through co-location, or a standing coordination group).

To reflect these various considerations, a more visible ‘hub-and-spoke’ structure is proposed for several aspects of the student experience, especially for transition and academic and career advising, with the concentration of resource in the (central) hub and the (faculty and school) spokes dependent on the distribution of operational responsibility. As noted earlier, many aspects of this proposed arrangement are already in place, but less attention than necessary has arguably been paid in the past to the importance of the partnerships inherent to a hub-and-spoke form: that is, to the partnership between central units and faculties and schools, and to co-dependencies across functional areas among central units and within faculties and schools.

The design and delivery of an outstanding student experience must ensure a superb digital experience, including access to clear, accurate, integrated and comprehensive information resources covering all aspects of joining and belonging to the University community and its systems, resources and support services. It is proposed that the University continue to develop a fully functioning student portal that is sensitive to a student’s circumstances, such as whether they are commencing or returning students, or new to the city and/or country. It is also proposed that shared and/or integrated systems with appropriate management of privacy and access settings support the management of students’ interactions with all of the University’s supporting services. In 2019, it is proposed to continue the ‘quick wins’ program of work being undertaken by ICT with further digital support of onboarding, enrolment, way finding, and geolocation services. The design of these systems and processes will be informed by further detailed work, including user experience and design workshops, to be undertaken in the early part of 2019.

In terms of governance, four primary University Executive (UE) committees play a key strategic and oversight role. These are:

- **UE Student Life Committee**: strategy and oversight for the broader student experience including overall quality of the student experience (but excluding education matters covered directly by UE Education and UE Research Education and administrative matters covered by UE Operations);
- **UE Education Committee**: strategy and oversight for students’ educational experience and outcomes;
- **UE Research Education Committee**: strategy and oversight for Higher Degree by Research (HDR) students’ research education experience and outcomes;
- **UE Operations Committee**: strategy and oversight of all operations overseen in the Operations Portfolio, including student administration.

It is proposed that this continue, though as recommended below, it is important to clarify the role of the UE Student Life Committee and the role of the Associate Deans Student Life and other leadership roles related to student life matters within University and Faculty schools. A specific question that has arisen through consultation on the strategy is how programs supporting coursework student success and academic advising for student success fit into the roles of Associate Deans and the TORs of UE Committees. This arises, in part, because some faculties and University schools have created an “academic affairs” or “student affairs” role to oversee programs supporting student success and/or students’ academic progression within the faculty or University school. To resolve this ambiguity, it is proposed here that the UE Student Life Committee should support student success and pastoral care for student success, whereas UE Education should work, as at present, with the Academic Board to set academic policies and processes governing student progress. The consequence of this division of labour is the desirability of “academic/student affairs” or “student success” roles to be linked (e.g. via a dotted reporting line) to the AD Student Life. In the case of smaller units, responsibility for
"academic/student affairs" (including student success initiatives, pastoral care, progression) could also be included in the role of AD Student Life.

Finally, the design of the student experience must include an effective monitoring approach that informs a systematic and timely quality improvement cycle. This monitoring should support improvement at the system level as well as at the level of individual aspects of the student experience.

Many of the issues of organisation, leadership and oversight will touch on the work of the Sydney Operating Model (SOM) and it is therefore suggested that the following proposition form part of the Student Experience Strategy and also inform the work being undertaken within the SOM program.

Proposition D1. A student-centric design. It is proposed that:

D1.1 Student portal. A single portal should provide ubiquitous student access to well-structured information, resources, services and opportunities. In particular, MyUni (or equivalent) should be developed into a single portal to university information, resources, services and opportunities. To support the currency and adequacy of information resources:

a. The information students seek must be available in a timely way and be as open, clear, accessible and analytics-informed as possible (this includes the information required for enrolment);

b. All student-facing material should be reviewed, updated and streamlined to ensure clarity, consistency, a student focus and timeliness;

c. Consideration should be given to also providing important information to commencing students in relevant languages other than English;

d. The feedback mechanisms proposed under D2.1 below should be used to assess regularly the extent to which students are able to access what they need;

e. Personalisation and analytics-informed interactive capability should be developed where feasible; and

f. The portal should include access to a social engagement/community building platform supportive of connection and learning.

D1.2 Integrated system support. Administrative and student service-related interactions with central and faculty units should be supported by an integrated relationship management system that captures core information (e.g. the issue, advice and services sought and provided, recommended next steps), ensures that further interactions pick up from prior ones and supports effective and timely response. The system would need to be built around agreed responsibilities and business processes, have effective access settings in place and ensure protection of privacy where required.

D1.3 Role of the UE Student Life Committee. The Terms of Reference (TORs) of the UE Student Life Committee should be clarified to include strategic responsibility for the broad student experience and for those individual aspects not covered by the UE Education, UE Research Education and UE Operations Committees.

D1.4 Role of Associate Deans Student Life. The role of the Associate Deans (ADs) Student Life should be clarified to encompass oversight of the broad experience of students who interact with their Faculty (except for those matters overseen by the ADs Education and Research Education). This is understood to be inclusive of: co- and extra-curricular participation in faculty-related activities; transition, advising and career-related interactions at faculty level; student success initiatives, pastoral care and academic advising for progression; and faculty-level support for students, including liaison with University support services. Through their membership of UE Student Life Committee, ADs Student Life should also contribute to University policy and strategy for the student experience, and, in partnership with senior professional staff within their faculty, coordinate co- and extra-curricular activities and transition and academic and career advising in the faculty. To reflect this commitment, key aspects of the student experience (student life participation, transition, academic and career advising
including student success, academic progress, student support, student-related infrastructure) should be standing items on the agenda of the UE Student Life Committee as well as associated Faculty and School committees. ADs Student Life and relevant senior Faculty professional staff should have the resources to exercise their responsibility. Faculties may also wish to appoint Associate Deans or Directors of Academic/Student Affairs (or, preferably perhaps, Student Success) with at least a dotted reporting line to the Associate Dean Student Life. In multi-School Faculties, Schools may also wish to appoint an Associate Head Student Life with dotted reporting line to the AD Student Life to coordinate activities at School level and liaise with their Faculty’s AD Student Life.

D1.5 Organisational Model for Student Life. Through the Sydney Operating Model project, a University wide (likely, hub and spoke) model for transition and academic and career advising should be developed. This model would provide services at both central and faculty level, meeting the needs of students who require discipline-oriented advice as well as students needing holistic guidance and support (with informed referrals to appropriate assistance in a faculty or student administrative services where appropriate). The hub should offer academic and careers advice from appropriately skilled staff, together with support for students transitioning to university life, and be at least co-located with the Student Transition and Retention team. Appropriate branding for this hub should be considered to give clarity to the purpose and student-centric nature of the hub. Within each faculty, an identified individual should have formal responsibility for: managing the provision of local transition, academic advising and careers support; liaising with the central hub; and signalling the value the University places on academic advising. This role may be included in the duties of the AD Student Life or, in some faculties, may be a stand-alone position with a reporting line to the AD Student Life.

D1.6 Coordinating Forums and Communication. To facilitate whole-of-University sharing of ideas and good practice and to support the development of connected and coordinated practice, regular forums should be established by the Education portfolio on key aspects of the student experience (e.g. student life participation, transition, academic and career advising, student support, student infrastructure). In addition, more sustained efforts should be made to use existing channels to share excellent practice and the outcomes of new initiatives, and to celebrate the success of our students and staff.

Proposition D2. Monitoring and data-informed quality improvement system. It is proposed that:

D2.1 Monitoring and continuous improvement process. All aspects of the student experience should be monitored as effectively and efficiently as possible, and have a systematic reporting and response protocol in place.

A high-level design for such a system is under construction and will be available for consideration early in 2019.

Part 2. The relational core

Connection to the University community comes from interactions that are educational in focus or part of students’ participation in student life. Social connection and engagement with the University community are strong predictors of academic success, and there is therefore substantial value in ensuring ongoing attention to opportunities to create and maintain social and academic connection, both inside and outside the classroom.

The University’s aspiration for the educational component of the student experience were the subject of extensive consultation as part of the development of the University’s 2016-2020

---

Strategic Plan. They are summarised in strategies 4 (to transform the undergraduate curriculum) and 5 (to transform the learning experience). Strategy 5, in particular, seeks to:

- Develop interactive and collaborative learning designs that foster excellence and innovation
- Create contemporary environments that enable flexible and interactive learning
- Build a new professional learning and support environment

These initiatives have aimed to make more extensive use of the interactive, experiential and collaborative pedagogies that most advance learning and enrich the student experience, and to provide the physical and virtual teaching and learning spaces to enable them. This includes informal virtual and physical learning spaces to afford richer engagement with the University community. The 2016-20 strategic initiatives have also sought to develop a culture that values teaching and supports, sustains and rewards educational excellence. As part of the initiative, the University committed to a refreshed framework for professional learning, one that is responsive to staff and faculty needs, supportive of strategic innovation and quality improvement, and provides access to effective and appropriate professional learning opportunities, including for sessional and casual teaching staff. In late 2017, the Academic Board also adopted a number of important assessment-related initiatives designed to reduce the burden of assessment while better aligning assessment tasks with intended course-level learning outcomes.

In addition to affirming the value for the student experience of these ongoing initiatives, recent feedback from staff and students has also highlighted the value of:

- initiatives to ensure more extensive professional development for tutors, for example, through additional professional development programs; encouragement to complete the Principles and Practice of University Teaching and Learning short course; and the creation of more ‘senior’ tutor mentoring roles;
- increased attention to teaching excellence in all appointment, confirmation, professional development and promotion processes;
- the value to all students of encouraging early cross-cultural interaction within and outside class;
- group activities and group assessment tasks that are appropriately designed, supported and assessed;
- the need for early feedback on foundational skills (e.g. core communication and conceptual skills) and early learning within units, and the provision of additional skills support and formative feedback opportunities;
- technology to support the development of relationships with students in large classes, for example, the Student Relationship Engagement System (SRES) developed by University of Sydney staff (see [https://www.sres.io/](https://www.sres.io/))
- the University’s commitment to responding to student feedback, for example, through the Closing the Loop process on Unit of Study and other surveys, and transparency of survey results.

Academic and learning support for students is also identified in Figure 1 as part of the learning cluster of interactions and is one of the aspects of the student experience that many students most value. Learning support includes a variety of activities offered at unit, major, stream, course and/or central levels, for example: support for learning embedded in tutorial or practical classes; study group programs, peer mentoring programs, peer-assisted student support (PASS) schemes, and discipline-based drop-in centres; the Indigenous Tutorial Assistance Scheme and the Yana Mura program; and co-curricular skills and experiential programs and services offered by the Library, the Learning Centre, the Mathematics Learning Centre, the Writing Hub and the Sydney Informatics Hub. Many fruitful collaborations have developed among the providers of these programs to offer initiatives targeted at improving the experience of particular cohorts of students, but there would be value in developing a whole-of-University perspective and a model for various forms of academic and learning support that optimises their reach and impact across the University. Attention to the design of
the support systems in place is particularly important given: the increasing number of students at the University; the increasing proportion for whom English is an additional language; and the likely changing support needs in the area of mathematics, given the introduction of a mathematics pre-requisite for a number of undergraduate degrees and the possible impact on access to the University by those who have experienced educational disadvantage. A current Education Portfolio project is undertaking more detailed design work for a preferred model for meeting students’ academic support needs, including the use of peer programs. In addition, Education Support is a 2019 project within the SOM program.

Many activities in which students engage outside the classroom are also co-curricular in form, that is, they are not part of the formal curriculum, but they nonetheless support the curricular imperatives of developing the graduate qualities adopted by the University. Examples include: engagement with clubs and societies; sporting and fitness activities; participation in student representation; and engagement with residential communities. These co-curricular opportunities enrich student life by providing additional challenge and by broadening students’ skills and capabilities. In some cases, social connection is an intended consequence of these opportunities and in others a valuable by-product. Other extra-curricular activities are more explicitly focussed on developing extra-curricular interests and skills and building social community among those with shared interests. Responsibility for the co-curriculum is spread across faculties, central portfolios and student organisations, including those in residential settings.

Responsibility for the extra-curricular aspects of student life at the University of Sydney has traditionally belonged to student organisations and these organisations have had a key role in organising intellectual, social, cultural and sporting activities through their clubs and societies. Clubs and societies bring together students with shared interests and provide an important means of establishing the routinized forms of proximity in which students can encounter and re-encounter one another in identified areas of shared interest.

Not all students participate, however, and among those who do participate, there is wide variation in the extent of participation as well as a tendency for students to participate in ways that reflect their social and cultural backgrounds. An unfortunate consequence of this variability is that the compulsory Student Services and Amenities Fee is paid by all students but yields limited benefit for many. Further, as identified earlier, students resent being required to pay an additional fee (e.g. for an access card) on top of the Student Services and Amenities Fee in order to join clubs and societies.

Indeed, while some students enjoy strong connections to a group of peers in one or more of the clubs and societies, others feel isolated from what they see as clique-like groups to which it is difficult to connect. This seeming paradox of a student community that is rich in strong social connections yet fragmented and characterised by social isolation is well understood in the social science literature and gives rise to the perception among students that student communities at other universities are more connected, ‘family-like’ and inclusive. Students at campuses other than Camperdown and mature age students also report feeling unsupported relative to their Camperdown-based and recent school leaver peers.

Some variability in student participation in student life is inevitable, as is some degree of social and cultural shaping of forms of participation, but one option worth considering is targeted support for societies that emphasise shared course interests (e.g. societies at the level of University and Faculty Schools). The attraction of this focus for at least some of the initial opportunity structures that they afford is that they are inclusive of all students and likely to cut across students’ natural tendencies to rely on pre-existing relationships or seek interactions among those with shared social and cultural backgrounds. Shared course interests also provide a focus for repeated encounters that are course-relevant and can serve as the foundation for a more integrated academic and social induction to the University. Of course, this approach need not distract from existing opportunities for students to discover a broader suite of settings in which they can pursue their shared interests; indeed, they may well encourage broader participation.
It will clearly be important to work with student organisations to promote a less fragmented, more inclusive and accessible student community, and remove, as far as possible, financial, social and cultural barriers to participation. Providing opportunities for social interaction as part of the transition process is one important approach to ensuring an effective social transition to University; so, too, are opportunities to create cross-cutting social connections within the student community by connecting students who have some (but not all) characteristics in common (e.g. age group, residential location). Greater opportunities to participate in sport are also seen as desirable by many stakeholders, including in School-based competitions. So too are activities that promote cross-cultural interaction, such as team-based activities or competitions in which teams must comprise a mix of international and domestic students. Providing students with further opportunities to support University-wide initiatives may also be worth considering, for example, community and voluntary projects, and peer mentoring and support programs.

Proposition R1. Relational aspects of learning. It is proposed that:

R1.1 Ongoing commitment to and support for interactive pedagogies. The University should continue to prioritise professional development opportunities for staff with a focus on interactive pedagogies especially in culturally diverse classes. Resource development and workshop programmes should prioritise tutors, effective group work and inter-cultural interaction given the perceived quality gap in these domains. Educational technology support for engagement in large classes (such as the Student Relationship Engagement System, a software system supporting teachers to personalise engagement with large classes) should be adopted or developed as an enterprise system and supported with appropriate resources and workshops. Educational excellence should be at the centre of all appointment, confirmation, professional development and promotion processes.

Proposition R2. Social connection. It is proposed that:

R2.1 School-based student organisations. The University should ensure the creation and support in all schools of school-connected student societies (e.g. by special arrangement with USU, or through funding made available via Associate Deans Student Life). These societies could be funded to run events that build connections among students in all campus locations, and engage students with contemporary issues and career opportunities in their primary field of study.

R2.2 A re-structured program of co- and extra-curricular activities. The University should work with student organisations to develop a strategy for creating a connected and inclusive student community by developing co-and extra-curricular activities aligned to the Principles for the Student Experience. Consideration should include the following:

a. promote engagement opportunities for all students more continuously through the semester, continuing to emphasise early engagement and tapering off toward the end of semester;

b. remove the cost of the access card as a necessary step to joining clubs and societies;

c. develop a suite of sporting opportunities to which all students can have free access, e.g. participation in an annual inter-school competition in, say, 5 to-be-decided domains, at least 3 of which would be popular sports (as an example, the selected sports or activities could be: basketball, fun run, badminton, debating, Go);

d. supplement the clubs and societies programs with more ‘drop-in’ style events to encourage increased participation and ongoing opportunities for students to mix;

e. provide access to a means for students to find others with shared interests, including connecting those interested in forming informal study groups;

f. work with USU and SUSF to encourage greater diversity in their clubs and societies, e.g. by offering voluntary leadership programs to students running clubs and societies on building inclusive club cultures, or through diversity targets;

See https://www.sres.io/.
g. encourage student organisations to offer activities that meet the needs of all students, irrespective of course or level of study, study location and demographic background.

h. consider support for a student-identified and student-led voluntary initiative as a means of encouraging students to engage with one another in a meaningful community contribution;

i. continue to develop and support initiatives designed to build intercultural connection and develop broader skills for successful engagement and participation in University life (e.g. the Speak and Connect program, water safety, Graduate Edge).

Part 3. Transition and Navigation

The opportunity to provide a smoother and more positive transition to the University is probably one with the greatest potential positive impact on the student experience and, indeed, on positive educational outcomes. As the considerable literature on the student experience and transition to University demonstrates, building connection to the University community is a precursor to effective engagement with learning, and careful attention to the transition experience results in improved experience and outcomes for students.6 An important focus must therefore be the transition phase.

Supporting this focus on transition to the University were the recommendations of the 2017 International Student Experience Taskforce. The taskforce identified pre-arrival and arrival support, and the process of connecting students to the University through academic and social engagement as areas in need of urgent attention. Indeed, most of their recommendations focussed on the process of transition into the University, given the strong support for its emphasis in both the academic literature on the international student experience and students’ own reports of the barriers they had encountered.

Many students, especially those from overseas, have reported feeling lost and unprepared on arrival. They find it hard to identify the information that matters, and they often end up seeking information through unofficial channels. Many experience the University as institution- or service-centric rather than student-centric, and many find it difficult to find information they need or someone who can help them. The common presupposition that high school, recruitment, application and admission processes adequately prepare students for entry to university is also clearly incorrect. Orientation Week (to be renamed Welcome Week from 2019) can seem overwhelming and chaotic to students. Contributing to the mix are often other challenges, such as organising accommodation and finding part time work.

Suggestions for changing this experience have included:

• Pre-departure and onboarding packs that include all of the information that students are likely to need;
• Greeting each student and making them feel welcome, and, where feasible, providing a contact who can speak their language.
• A means of accessing help, including in emergencies.
• Assistance in finding accommodation.
• A student portal as the go-to digital gateway to the University, one which could serve as the agreed primary channel for accessing information and which could include a translation capability.
• A chat capability for the student centre for more immediate, personal and problem-focused response to student queries.

Building more opportunities for connection to key information and enquiry options before and after arrival is crucial, for both domestic and international students. Establishing peer connections is vital as well, especially in the early weeks. A key challenge (and opportunity) is...

---

to ensure that non-transactional interactions furnish students with a sense of connection whenever they occur, from the point of offer (and before) through enrolment and orientation activities and as they transition into the first year of their program and beyond. Ongoing efforts to improve the digital experience by making information access and transactional and administrative interactions as immediate, transparent and mobile as possible are also seen as vital in contributing to a good experience of transition.

It is well known that first year unit coordinators play an important role in the experience of new students. However, the appointment of First Year Unit Coordinators often occurs too late, sometimes as late as Week 1, and sessional staff continue to be appointed to fill these roles even though it is not permitted by policy.

Many students are also concerned about what is required of them on arrival at the University and whether than can perform well in the tertiary environment. This concern can be heightened further by the difficulties some have in self-managing administrative processes such as enrolment or in engaging with University services. There is also significant movement of students between units of study in the first weeks of semester which impacts initial engagement with tertiary study and early learning experiences, and this can also contribute to a sense of disconnection and lack of preparation. An early focus on students’ strengths as well as their opportunities for further skill development would support students’ confidence and planning as well as their capacity to succeed in their studies.

An important means of improving students’ transition to University would be to ensure that every student encounters dedicated and context-appropriate support for academic and social transition in their chosen course of study. In courses with compulsory units in the first semester of study, this academic and social transition support could be embedded in one or more chosen compulsory unit(s) taken by every student in their first semester (irrespective of semester of commencement or recognition of prior learning7). Appropriate resourcing of the unit(s) would be required to ensure that the transition components of the course are effective for all students.

In courses rich in choice, such as in liberal studies degrees, it would be necessary to embed this academic and social transition support in either:

a. a core unit for the degree that is offered to all students in their first semester of study; or
b. a core unit in each major of the degree that is offered to all students in their first semester of study; or
c. sufficient selective units (or all units) in each major of the degree to ensure access for all students in their first semester of study; or
d. a compulsory, possibly selective transition unit, such as a week-long 2 credit point intensive unit that is open to all commencing students, is an attractive, substantive academic offering within the degree, and includes a joint program of social and academic transition8.

Ideally, the same choice would be made across all degrees, given the popularity of combined degrees and shared curriculum components across many degrees, especially the shared pool of majors and the Open Learning Environment. To choose among these options, we need to weigh the effort and difficulty of these efforts to embed transition-aware pedagogies with their likely impact. Options a and d above are more focussed and could be accomplished by relatively targeted efforts; options b and c would require a much broader transformation of the first year. The current difficulty with option a is that some liberal studies degrees do not currently possess the required core units or suitable core units, though this may change in the near future. For this reason, we suggest immediate consideration by the University community of option a and option d. In addition, it may be of value to pilot selective transition units in

---

7 There may need to be some exceptions for students entering with unusual patterns or large amounts of advanced standing.
8 These selective units could be listed in the OLE (indeed, could be versions of existing OLE units) and contribute to completion of the OLE requirement. While they would have a rich set of online resources, they would be delivered primarily in a face-to-face, interactive and collaborative mode.
2020 in Week 0 of each semester. If successful, further implementation could be considered for 2021.

Whatever the final choice among these options, the academic and social transition support offered in the chosen format should include:

• use of appropriate interactive, collaborative and transition pedagogies;
• opportunities for discussion of personal strengths, aspirations and course advice;
• assessment and targeted support for any foundational academic needs;
• education in foundational information literacy and academic honesty; and
• a supplementary social program designed to foster peer interaction and intercultural engagement.

If option d is selected (subject to a successful pilot), the first-year schedule for all liberal studies undergraduate programs could be restructured to offer the selected intensive transition unit in week 1 of semester, and the remaining units in Weeks 2-13. The loss of class time in the units offered in weeks 2-12 would be more than compensated by the preparatory work occurring in the intensive unit.

Students also seek better access to academic and career advice. At present, most academic advice is probably offered through the Student Centre and its referrals to Faculty Services and Faculties, and also informally through discussion with academic and professional staff in faculties. Given the greater level of student choice in the University’s new curriculum, an interim team of advisors was established in late 2017 to respond to academic enquiries from students commencing new degrees in 2018. It is important to incorporate the learnings from this initiative into the future model for academic advising. It will also be important to consider mentoring models and the appropriate role of staff and students in such models. There is clearly also an opportunity to develop buddy or peer mentoring and assistance programs, and to support students to create and join informal study groups.

An important consideration in designing models for academic advising is to ensure that advice is targeted and sensitive to students’ life and career aspirations. This, in turn, suggests the importance of providing opportunities for students to reflect on and begin to articulate their strengths, interests and emerging aspirations. It raises the importance, also, of contemporary, accurate information on career and further study opportunities, employer and labour market trends and entrepreneurship pathways.

As students approach the completion of their course of study, support for career transition needs to change in form, from exploration and sorting of opportunities to preparation for successful transition. This calls for different forms of support. The high level of demand for career programs and support underlines the importance to students of these forms of engagement and it will be important to build on existing work in designing a coherent program for transition, academic advising and career development.

With respect to academic and career advising, the University itself is generally perceived as passive in its approach to engagement with students. While it is important to empower students’ sense of self-direction, equally important is ensuring an awareness that advice and services are available, that there are people available to help and, indeed, that many students seek opportunities to connect with each other. Students consistently report that the lack of human interaction when advice is sought is problematic. There is also a lack of consistency in the provision of academic advising, and access to the advising that remains available within Faculties and Schools is sometimes obscured by local practices and different nomenclature. Furthermore, the lack of continuity with an identifiable person providing advice can lead to conflicting advice, prolonged time to resolution and/or ongoing confusion.

The perceived anonymity of advising staff is also considered a barrier to students engaging with academic advisers through the existing enquiry structures. In addition, the localized nature of advice where it is available within schools and faculties can impede students’
opportunities to engage with the richness of the curriculum, especially in liberal studies and combined degrees. This, together with the perceived disconnection between faculty advice on academic programming (where available), and the provision and integration of advice relevant to students’ career aspirations is a missed opportunity to ground and connect the student from admission through to transition to the workforce. Advice that is obscured, disconnected, depersonalized and untailored to the experience of the individual student contributes to a fragmented student experience.

Personalised support and advice is also often necessary for those students who experience extreme hardship and unexpected misfortune. At present, such students are required to interact with multiple service providers inside and outside the University, and the need to re-explain their circumstances, and self-manage their progress can itself become an additional and unhelpful burden. In such cases, a better model would be access to a single point of contact to provide case management and support liaison with internal and, in some cases, external service providers, as now is in place for students who have experienced sexual assault and sexual harassment.

Poorly organized and inconsistent information on the website is also often identified as an obstacle to an excellent student experience, and this is especially problematic when students are directed to find answers and direction via the web instead of in-person.

The evidence of best practice across the sector reveals that student engagement in any one of these three domains is most effective when support is integrated, when activities and resources are located where students are, when they are available on demand and when they are responsive to the needs of individual students.

There almost certainly needs to be a clearer understanding and more effective triage of those enquiries that can be handled as immediately and transactionally as possible by the Student Centre/Faculty Services, and those that require referral to a more relational and interactive form. Necessarily, of course, and given the size of the student body, an effective model for handling high-volume, repeated transactions is essential to a sustainable approach for more discursive, value-adding interactions for complex and developmental queries.

Proposition N1. Transition to the University. It is proposed that:

N1.1 Pre-arrival and arrival. The University should continue and expand its support for pre-arrival and arrival, including in-country briefings in China, airport pickup for all commencing international students, and a Welcome Event for each commencing cohort.

N1.2 Dedicated, intensive and context-appropriate academic and social transition units (undergraduates). The University should ensure that every student encounters dedicated, and context-appropriate intensive support for academic and social transition to the University in their chosen course of study.

- In courses with compulsory units in the first semester of study, this academic and social transition support could be embedded in a chosen compulsory unit that is taken by every student in their first semester (irrespective of semester of commencement or recognition of prior learning9) and appropriate resourcing would be needed to ensure that the transition components of the course are effective for all students.

- For courses rich in choice, the University should determine by the end of March 2019 whether to require the embedding of academic and social transition support in either:
  - a core unit for the degree, or a core unit in each primary major of the degree that is offered to all students in their first semester of study; or
  - a set of selective, one-week-long, 2 credit point, intensive transition units, offered in Week 1 of each semester that are: open to all commencing first year undergraduate (UG) students; that are: attractive, substantive academic

9 There may need to be some exceptions for students entering with unusual patterns or large amounts of advanced standing.
offering within the degree; and include devoted to a joint program of social and academic transition. The program of academic and social transition should include:

- Compulsory transition unit. Restructure the first-year schedule for all undergraduate programs to enhance academic and social transition by reconfiguring the 4 units offered in each semester to a 1 unit × 3 weeks + 3 units × 10 weeks format. The purpose of this reconfigured schedule would be to support commencing students in the initial three weeks in
  - intensive classes of the order of 120 students that would be offered in a use of appropriate interactive, collaborative and transition pedagogies-aware format;
  - offer opportunities for discussion of personal strengths, aspirations and course advice;
  - include assessment and targeted support for any foundational academic needs;
  - foundational education in information literacy and academic honesty; and
  - a be supplemented by a social program to foster diverse encourage peer interaction. The assessment for this class would be completed as soon as possible after the completion of classes, but certainly by, say, the end of week 5. In programs with core units, the selected class would ideally be one of the core units that could be taught successfully in an intensive format. In courses without core units, several popular units could be selected so as to ensure availability of a course of interest for all students. In the latter case, selected courses may need to run in both the 3-week and 10-week formats to ensure availability to all students.

Selective transition units in week 1 of semester. If the second option is selected, there will need to be consideration of whether this option should apply to the first year of all degrees, or only to Restructure the first-year schedule for all liberal studies undergraduate programs. In this case, the first year could be restructured to offer the selected intensive transition unit in week 1 of semester, and the remaining units in Weeks 2-13. The loss of class time in the units offered in weeks 2-12 would be more than compensated by the preparatory work occurring in the intensive unit. If a single option is not chosen across the University, there would also be a need to consider the situation of students enrolled in combined professional/liberal studies degrees

---

10 These selective units could be listed in the OLE (indeed, could be versions of existing OLE units) and contribute to completion of the OLE requirement. While they would have a rich set of online resources, they would be delivered primarily in a face-to-face, interactive and collaborative mode.

11 Under this option, all other first year units would run from Weeks 2-13, with a full suite of classes from Week 2. This would entail some redesign of first year units, but it would provide an opportunity for these units to be aligned with the transition focus of the Week 1 class.

12 This proposed format for commencing with an intensive unit is currently in place for the Juris Doctor program at the University of Sydney and was proposed by participants of the University Leadership Forum held in August 2018. As for the new block structure for first-year courses at Victoria University in Melbourne (in which units are offered in a sequential intensive format), the advantage of a single initial course is that it allows students to focus on transition and mastery in a single domain, build connection to a peer group and one or more academic staff members, and record an early success. From the perspective of the University, this structure supports a dedicated but efficient focus on social and academic transition for every student.

13 The reconfiguration would keep class contact times approximately the same as at present. For example, a class offering 3 (or 4) hours of class time for each of 13 weeks could be reconfigured to 3 weeks of 1.2 (or 1.7) hours per week if offered in intensive mode, or 10 weeks of 1.2 (or 5) hours per week if offered in the less intensive format. It is recognised that there would be some effort required to redesign each first-year unit in either the intensive or less intensive format, the intensively-taught units would need additional support, and the timetable would need to support a revised schedule. It is also recognised that the intensive format may be more suitable for some units than others, and the choice of units for intensive offer would need to be made carefully, including the timing of their introduction.

14 It is recognised that there will be a cost associated with this recommendation, an estimate will be included in the final report of the CAT Steering Group.
(e.g. combined Engineering and Advanced Computing students to undertake the professional degree transition units, and combined Law students to undertake the liberal studies transition units), by: (a) requiring students to complete one of a selection of intensive transition-focussed Open Learning Environment (OLE) units in the first week of semester; and (b) reconfiguring all other first year units offered in the semester to a 12-week format (while maintaining total class hours in the unit). The selective intensive transition-focussed OLE units would ideally be popular, existing OLE units, redesigned for an intensive format and augmented to have both a social and academic transition focus. They would prioritise interactive pedagogical approaches, include opportunities to identify any academic support needs (and include connection to relevant support programs), academic honesty and would have an associated social program. They could also include opportunities for students to reflect on individual strengths and aspirations and confirm their current course plans. If Option 2 is the preferred option, it is recommended that the selected transition units be piloted on an elective basis in Week 0 of each semester in 2020 and that full uptake in 2021 is subject to demonstrated success of the pilot.

Elective or selective transition units in WelcomeWeek. Offer a number of elective or selective transition focussed OLE units intensively during Welcome Week (Week 0), the week prior to commencement of the semester, with a social and academic transition focus. As for option b, the units would prioritise interactive pedagogical approaches, include opportunities to identify any academic support needs (and include connection to relevant support programs), academic honesty and would have an associated social program. They, too, could include opportunities for students to reflect on individual strengths and aspirations and confirm their current course plans. Under the ‘elective’ option, students could choose to participate in the transition unit or not; under the ‘selective’ option, students would be required to complete one of the units, thereby effectively lengthening the semester to 14 weeks.

Focused transition activities in selected first year units. An alternative is to select a suite of existing units into which a transition can be embedded, and which provide coverage for all commencing first year students.

N1.3 Dedicated, intensive transition units (postgraduate). The University should also consider the development of a dedicated, intensive unit for all commencing students in each postgraduate (PG) course. The unit would be devoted to joint social and academic transition and could run in the period prior to the commencement of semester, well-supported by high quality online preparatory resources. Alternatively, it could be offered through a reconfigured schedule for the first semester as in the options canvassed for the UG level above. As for the UG case also, the purpose of the intensive unit would be to: (a) ensure full transition support for commencing students; (b) immerse students in the methods of inquiry for the field; (c) set expectations for student engagement, standards and experience of the program, including academic honesty; and (d) offer a supplementary peer and course engagement program to encourage peer interaction and connection. These would work constructively with other units to ensure a coherent approach across all the units of study taken by students in each course. The assessment for this intensive class would involve early low-stakes summative assessment and the overall assessment of the unit would be completed as soon as possible after the completion of classes, but certainly within several weeks of the final class.

N1.43 Support for first year coordinators. Faculties should ensure that a “first year coordinator/director” (as distinct from first year unit coordinators) is appointed in every school (or department, where necessary), with a dotted reporting line to the Associate Dean Student Life. The First Year Coordinators Program should be expanded to a university-wide initiative that is required for all first year unit and year coordinators and incorporates guaranteed mentoring from former successful coordinators. The program should be supported with initiatives and resources such as the following:

- Ensure that all first year unit and year-coordinators and directors are identified early and supported to attend the program.
• Expand the first-year experience website as a First Year Experience resource in Canvas, and include additional information/links to Academic Enrichment, Diversity and Inclusion, Mana Yura program, Disability Services, Library etc.

• Develop promotional videos for each unit in first year so that students can hear from the lecturer what the unit is about before committing to enrolment to reduce movement in first weeks of semester.

• Offer a University-wide professional development program for first year tutors to complement the training done in faculties, focusing on teaching performance and pastoral concerns. This could include a means for staff to achieve an internationally recognised Associate Fellowship with Advance Higher Education (formerly, the Higher Education Academy).

• Ensure that Canvas sites are available no later than the Monday before Welcome Week (that is, the week preceding the commencement of semester).

• Develop a best-practice protocol that all first-year units of study include formative or low stakes summative assessment early in semester, with feedback available before the Census date.

• Develop best practice data-informed, communication strategies for all first-year units of study for key points in the semester with diagnostic and engagement activities available online in Welcome Week.

N1.45 A coordinated approach to orientation. The UE Student Life Committee should provide strategic oversight of the University’s transition program, and should develop principles and an approach to coordination and oversight of orientation activities. A key focus should be ensuring that students are supported to make early and informed decisions about unit choices. Possibilities may include:

• Developing a module that categorises orientation events and activities to create greater consistency and coherence and make it easy for any student to understand and prioritise.

• Adopting Transition Workshops in all Faculties to prepare students for the start of their academic program in week 1, covering topics such as how to use Canvas, how to download their calendar on to a mobile device and other advice such as the importance of the unit of study outline, availability of advice etc. These workshops would complement the Orientation Module.

• Ensuring early access for students to unit of study outlines in all units available on Canvas and publicly on the internet.

• Increasing availability of and access to virtual materials and assistance (orientation videos, online chat functionality etc.)

• Developing ‘pop-up’ enquiry services during orientation and possibly the early weeks of semester so that students can access personalised advice from advising and careers staff and trained student ambassadors and PhD students. These ‘pop up’ services would collaborate closely with Faculties, their student societies and the broader student organisations to better merge the informational and social components of welcome programs during orientation.

• Streamlining orientation events and develop a consistent and clearly communicated approach to orientation across all parts of the University community.

Proposition N2. Reflection and academic and career advice. It is proposed that:

N2.1 Technology-enabled transition, academic and career advising support. As for all other student-facing services (see D1.2), academic and career advising services should be supported with integrated system support to capture presenting issues and advice provided. In addition, the University should consider:

• Developing a University-wide academic advising webpage (accessible through the student portal), with sequential links based on the student journey;
• Exploring innovative ICT solutions for proactive engagement with students, including an appointment portal for all face-to-face advising meetings, curriculum links to labour market insights, degree planning functionality etc.

• Ensuring connection of all transition, advising and career support services to an enterprise-wide data-capture system or CRM in order to support continued engagement, reduce conflicting advice and streamline communication with students and provide data to enhance the effectiveness of academic advising and career development activities. In particular it should be the aim to have a longitudinal record of student advice and engagement activity, with appropriate mechanisms to link to administrative records.

• Establishing a case management/student liaison function to sit alongside transition, academic and career advising support, to support students who experience periods of sustained hardship or challenge and who would benefit from support to engage across multiple university and external services. The purpose of this function would be to create a more seamless and effective experience for students by coordinating access across multiple services.

N2.2 Career development and its integration into academic programs. Resources should be developed to support students’ exploration of strengths, interests and aspirations and develop mechanisms for coordinating these with curricular initiatives with connection to workplace settings. In particular, the University should consider initiatives to:

• Develop sequential Online Learning Environment (OLE) Units of Study to take students through career-related activities from the time of acceptance to the end of their degree. Each OLE would provide information relevant to a student’s current stage in the student life cycle.

• Develop a suite of interactive and self-diagnostic tools that encourage students to consider and test options, reflect on activities, and record what they plan to achieve. These tools will also allow the University to assess how career development, advising activities, social and other events have prepared students to achieve their goals.

• The self-diagnostic tools should be integrated and aligned with feedback given to students through assessment of the graduate qualities, using, where appropriate, discipline-specific interpretations of these.

• Embed these tools where relevant within the curriculum, and develop resources to support student choice of curricular and co-curricular career development opportunities.

N2.3 Connection and support for school careers advisors. Develop University and Faculty champions to provide deep links with high school careers advisors and agents and develop complimentary short programs for professional development.

Part 4. Essential student supports

As national survey data indicate, student satisfaction with student support at the University remains at an alarmingly low level and student support is clearly in need of vital attention. Concern for student support led to the establishment of a Working Group on Student Wellbeing in 2014 and, eventually, to the 2014 Student Wellbeing Report and its 65 recommendations. Although the majority of these recommendations have now been implemented, there is limited public evidence to date of an uplift in reported student satisfaction. It is also evident that investment in core student support services – namely, accommodation information services, financial advice and assistance, health, counselling and psychological services – has been relatively static over recent years, despite sustained growth.

16 The considerable efforts in 2018 to implement Student Administration Service and Student centre improvements should lead to improvement in existing student experience outcomes in 2019.
in student numbers, especially international student enrolments. Immediate questions to be asked, therefore, are how to ensure the most effective investment by the University to add value to services available in the community, how to ensure that the University is working to maximise opportunity for success among all of its students, and how to set the right aspiration and level of funding for the various services agreed to be on offer. It is vitally important also to ensure that services take account of best available evidence-based practice in service delivery. It is important to note that direct evaluations of services that students have experienced tend to be much more positive than the broad ratings obtained in the annual Student Experience Survey (SES), suggesting that the SES ratings may often reflect the difficulty of accessing the services rather than the quality of the service once accessed.

Students also consistently give low ratings to their experience of transacting with the University’s administrative processes. Some projects to improve the experience are already underway (e.g. curriculum timetabling, a student project management system and student administrative services (SAS) projects within the Sydney Operating Model (SOM) program, an expanded portal capability, and broader functionality for the Learning Management System and its plug-in technologies). Students describe their digital interactions with university systems and staff as often lacking compassion and they feel the need to sometimes talk to a human being who will case-manage them through complex problems. Staff also feel constrained by the lack of integrated system support.

While all staff and students recognise the value of automating the automatable, many are critical of current arrangements, citing long wait times, too much reliance on email, lack of resolution and lack of a clear point of responsibility for defining and resolving students’ non-routine problems. They also regard timetable and placement schedules as being delivered too late. More generally, students believe that the reputation of student-facing support needs to be lifted and that there needs to be greater transparency in reporting on the quality and time to resolution for key student services. These concerns have already been the target of the 2018 Student Administrative Services (SAS) improvement program, and there are already substantial and documented improvements in key areas.

Student Support Services staff feel, perhaps paradoxically, less visible as a result of the centralisation that occurred as part of SAS. Some also believe that the University needs to rebuild its expertise in international student support issues (e.g. visas, fees, accommodation, mental health) and that a number of specific processes (such as special consideration, evaluation of credit for exchange) still require particular attention for all students. A case or relationship management approach was recommended above in place of the existing transactional model. Some students also report a mismatch in expectations in their engagement with CAPS and the difficulty of accessing careers support is broadly recognised.

In addition to these broad trends, there is a concern that certain cohorts of students experience particular difficulties. To ensure an outstanding experience for all students, we need to monitor the experience of cohorts of students more effectively and ensure that effective strategies are in place to address barriers that students of different backgrounds may encounter. This is especially so for those who have experienced past disadvantage or lack the local social support to address major challenges for themselves.

Several areas of concern to students that are not captured by the Student Experience Survey include accommodation, transport and childcare.

The issue of transport access is an area of ongoing advocacy by the University.

With respect to accommodation, the University has attempted to increase accommodation options for students so as to begin to meet the large and increasing demand for student accommodation at below market rates. The Queen Mary, Abercrombie and Regiment student accommodation projects have and are providing a much needed expansion of accommodation options for students and several colleges have and are increasing capacity, especially for postgraduate students. There has also been some expansion of student accommodation in the
private housing market though private rents are putting some traditional forms of student accommodation out of the reach of students. Also counterbalancing an overall picture of growth among accommodation options is the near end-of-life status of the International House building. In the context of a growing student cohort and an increasing proportion of students without a family base in Sydney, the availability of affordable accommodation remains a key, and indeed growing, concern for students.

In developing the University’s approach for accommodation, it will be important to take account of the University’s strategy for the student experience as well as student preferences. Price is a core and primary consideration for many students; for many, location and community are also key considerations. A choice modelling study to understand in much greater detail the distribution of student needs and preferences for accommodation is being undertaken in coming months to inform the development of the University’s approach to accommodation; this is expected to be finalised in the next 3-4 months. In the meantime, it is very likely that this study will point to:

- Very strong and unmet demand for additional accommodation options in the price range of Queen Mary, Abercrombie and the Regiment;
- Good though more limited demand for mid-range options offering more structured academic and/or social programs;
- The potential value of students being able to select a basic accommodation offer as well as an additional (academic/social/pastoral care) enrichment program;
- The potential value, therefore, of residential and/or non-residential enrichment programs;
- The importance of continuing to offer and to improve a threshold-level enrichment/pastoral care program for all students in University-owned facilities;
- The importance of a University service to assist students to find accommodation, whether in University-owned or affiliated colleges and residences, or in the private market;
- The importance of ensuring that the enrichment opportunities available to all students through the University’s Student Life program are accessible and effective for all students, irrespective of their accommodation arrangements; and
- The value of seeking to increase the number and effectiveness of needs-based bursaries for students.

With respect to childcare, the excellent analysis of childcare needs for staff and students undertaken in 2015 identified the volume of unmet demand for childcare among staff and students. This analysis has recently been updated and has identified ongoing rises in the level of demand, not least because of the rising numbers of staff and students. Student demand for occasional child care remains especially strong and largely unmet. This is a particularly difficult challenge given that most commercial and not-for-profit centres are driven to favour full-care clients because of competitive pressures on price and the resulting small operating margins. Identifying feasible ways in which the University can facilitate childcare access in forms that are useful and affordable for students is therefore a challenge that is both pressing and difficult to solve. Of course, staff needs for additional childcare also raise the question of whether the University should again consider building a child care facility to cater more effectively to the needs of staff and students at campuses with high demand (e.g. Camperdown/Darlington and, perhaps in future, Parramatta/Westmead). It is important to recognise, though, that this is likely to provide only a partial solution. A further question is whether the University could and should contemplate additional needs-based bursary support packages for students with children.

Finally, the enabling character of the environment and their wrap-around services cannot be ignored. The extent and layout of physical student spaces, the affordances of virtual spaces, supporting peer programs (e.g. the Library’s Peer Learning Advisor model), accompanying food and beverage services and the culture of the University and its local communities all play a part in creating an inclusive University community and providing opportunity for valuable interactions among students and between students and staff.
As recent transformational projects have demonstrated (e.g., Charles Perkins Centre, Abercrombie building), students respond very positively to improvements and expanded access to informal environments that allow them to work together. They also embrace technologies that support collaboration and social interaction, and are keen participants in discussions of policy and culture.

The Learning Spaces/Student Experience Advisory Group and a to-be-appointed expert on learning spaces in the Education portfolio are intended to ensure a whole-of-University perspective on the design, refurbishment and development of formal and informal physical and virtual learning spaces. This approach should allow the University to adopt a more student-centred approach to learning and student space planning as well as to wrap-around support services. Their work will also be important in ensuring alignment of the Campus Infrastructure Plan 2 (CIP2) with the curriculum ambitions of Strategy 4 in the 2016-2020 Strategic Plan and the pedagogical intentions of Strategy 5. It will be important also to expand this discussion to encompass all informal learning and student spaces and alignment with the Student Experience Strategy and to include in the discussion all of the relevant professional and academic units, such as CIS, ICT, the Library and faculties, and all student organisations, including USU and SUSF, that manage student spaces.

One particularly important space consideration is the extent to which central student-facing support services should be co-located, for example, in the vicinity of the Jane Foss Russell Building (JFR). While some student-facing services are currently co-located (e.g., Student Centre, University Health Service, Counselling and Psychological Services, Careers Centre, STAR team), not all are visible or clearly accessible to students, and space that could enable a greater level of access currently houses other University units. An important task for the Learning Spaces/Student Experience Advisory Group is therefore to bring a student perspective to space planning within the University and ensure that the location and facility for student services is not only fit for purpose but supportive of the aspiration for an outstanding student experience.

Proposition E1. Student-centric support. It is proposed that:

E1.1 Location and operating model for student support services. Informed by the current project on student support models, the University should ensure a more student-centric approach for students who experience barriers to engagement. For example, students identified as needing more than occasional support should be assigned a case manager who takes primary responsibility for all of their support service needs, and liaises, according to circumstance, with colleagues in other support services including, potentially, in services provided externally that are not available within the University. The University should consider co-locating at a suitable future moment all student-facing central teams and ensuring the availability of mechanisms to support: collaboration within and outside the University; innovation; and a coherent and integrated student support model. This central service point should include the Student Centre and, ideally, all student-facing central teams. This would become a new one-stop shop for students in managing their relationship with the University.

E1.2 Mental Health and Wellbeing Strategy. As recommended by the Higher Education Standards Panel in 2017, the University should also develop in the first half of 2019 a full mental health and wellbeing strategy for the student community. The strategy should take account of the changing needs of the University student community and the growing evidence base on effective practice. Ideally, also, it should take advantage of the University’s expertise in the promotion of youth mental health.

E1.3 Interface between SAS Student Centre/Faculty Services and academic and career advising. The University should ensure a seamless and efficient connection between the administrative service offered by the SAS Student Centre and Faculty Services, and the interactive advisory service proposed for the central academic and career advising function. The University should consider whether there is value in the Student Centre triaging directly to
the academic and career advising centre for case management of non-routine enquiries and problems. Students should also have the option to self-triage to academic and career advising if they know their advising problem is complex, though triage back to the Student Centre/Faculty Services would be expected if a problem proves to be standard.

**E1.4 A new student code of conduct.** The University should review the Student Code of Conduct and ensure that it is aligned with the culture strategy, the Principles for the Student Experience and all other aspects of the student experience strategy.

**Proposition E2. Affording opportunity for all students.** It is proposed that:

**E2.1 Informal learning and social spaces for students.** The Learning Spaces Advisory Group should lead the development of a plan for informal learning and social spaces and hence for wrap-around student support services for students on all of its campuses. The plan should be aligned with the University’s guiding principles for the student experience and guided by data on space utilisation.

**E2.2 Student accommodation.** The University should develop an approach to student accommodation that is aligned to the student experience strategy and informed by the choice modelling survey of student accommodation preferences to be undertaken in coming months. The approach is likely to entail: a proposal for substantial lift in student accommodation in the price range of Queen Mary, Abercrombie and the Regiment; a requirement for a-threshold-level enrichment and pastoral care programs for all students in University-owned facilities; the development of optional, modestly priced, enrichment packages, decoupled from an accommodation offer and comprising a structured program of academic and social activities; consideration of an additional mid-range residential option offering both accommodation and an enrichment program; a University service to assist students to find accommodation, whether in University-owned or affiliated colleges and residences, or in the private market; and an increase in the number and effectiveness of needs-based bursaries for students’ living costs.

**E2.3 Child care.** The University should articulate its approach to the support of students’ access to child care that is aligned to the student experience strategy and informed by revised data on availability and need. The approach is likely to need to clarify: whether the University should again consider building a child care facility to cater more effectively to the needs of staff and students at campuses with high demand (e.g. Camperdown/Darlington and, perhaps in future, Parramatta/Westmead); whether and how it could offer additional needs-based bursaries, in this case to students with children in need of childcare; and how to support student access to occasional childcare, given the scarcity of access in the external environment.

**E2.4 Supporting all student cohorts.** The University should ensure that support services are effective for all student cohorts. In particular, it should:

- Monitor the effectiveness of each form of support for specific student cohorts including, but not limited to, students entering via different pathways and with different demographics;
- Through a review of policy on progression, establish the principle that progression Stage 2 and 3 students are required to meet with an academic adviser and that pastoral progression advice will be provided by an academic advising team;
- Ensure that progression Stage 1 students receive personalised advice and support;
- Support post-graduation in-country networking events for recent graduates;
- Consider commissioning work from time to time to conduct ad hoc research that will inform support initiatives for various student cohorts (e.g. labour market trends); and
- Use analytic approaches to regularly interrogate possible barriers to student success so that steps can be taken to target support services where they are most needed.

**Proposed implementation**

It is proposed that, on adoption by the University Executive, this strategy should be implemented as a project with oversight by a Student Experience Steering Advisory Group.
(SESG) and led by a project team located in the Office of the DVC Education. Proposed Terms of Reference and membership of the SESG are included in Appendix 1.

The proposed responsibilities and timing of each of the strategy’s propositions are outlined in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Draft high-level implementation plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Sub-initiative</th>
<th>Key accountability</th>
<th>With support of</th>
<th>Proposed timing (to be confirmed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 1 Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.1 Student portal</td>
<td>Phase 1 – clear, consistent, timely, personalized, student-centric information (a,b,c,d)</td>
<td>DVC Ed</td>
<td>VP Ops</td>
<td>Phase 1: Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2 – social engagement platform (f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2: Dec 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 3 – further personalization, interactivity (e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 3: TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.2 Integrated system support</td>
<td>Phase 1 – scoping</td>
<td>DVC Ed</td>
<td>VP Ops</td>
<td>Phase 1: Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2 – delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2: Dec 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VP ER</td>
<td>Phase 1: Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VP A&amp;D</td>
<td>Phase 2: Dec 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.3 UE Student Life</td>
<td>Revise TORs</td>
<td>DVC Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td>phase 1: Mar 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.4 AD Student Life</td>
<td>Revise position description</td>
<td>DVC Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.5 Student Life Organisational model</td>
<td>Phase 1 – design</td>
<td>DVC Ed</td>
<td>VP Ops</td>
<td>Phase 1: August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2 – implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2: Mar 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.6 Coordinating forums</td>
<td>TAC forums for central, faculty staff</td>
<td>PVC SL</td>
<td>ADs SL</td>
<td>Apr 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.1 Monitoring and QI process</td>
<td>Phase 1 – design</td>
<td>DVC Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1: Apr 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2 – implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2: Sept 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 2 Relational core</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.1 Interactive pedagogies</td>
<td>Phase 1 – design expanded Principles &amp; Practice program</td>
<td>PVC EI</td>
<td>ADs Ed</td>
<td>Phase 1: Oct 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2 – implement new P&amp;P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2: Feb 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 3 – school-based workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 3: June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.1 School-based student societies</td>
<td>Phase 1 – agree model with USU</td>
<td>DVC Ed</td>
<td>ADs SL</td>
<td>Phase 1: Dec 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2 – implement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pres USU CEO USU</td>
<td>Phase 2: Feb 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.2 Co-, extra-curricular program</td>
<td>Phase 1 – 2019 program</td>
<td>DVC Ed</td>
<td>ADs SL</td>
<td>Phase 1: Feb 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2 – expanded design</td>
<td></td>
<td>Presidents USU, SUSF, SRC, SUPRA CEO USU EXDir SUSF</td>
<td>Phase 2: Sept 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2 – initial implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 3: Feb 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 3 Navigation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1.1 Pre-arrival and arrival</td>
<td>Expanded pre-arrival and arrival program</td>
<td>DVC Ed</td>
<td>ExDir, SXS VP ER VP A&amp;D</td>
<td>Jan 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1.2 Intensive transition UG</td>
<td>Phase 1 – agree model and pilot</td>
<td>DVC Ed</td>
<td>PVC EI PVC SL ADs Ed ADs SL</td>
<td>Phase 1: MarJune 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2 – implement pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2: Feb 2020 (if full unit model) or Feb 2021 (if full unit model)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 3 – determine final model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 3: July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 4 – implement final model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 4: Feb 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1.3 Intensive transition PG</td>
<td>Phase 1 – agree model</td>
<td>DVC Ed</td>
<td>PVC EI PVC SL ADs Ed ADs SL</td>
<td>Phase 1: June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2 – implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2: Feb 2020 (if full unit model) or Feb 2021 (if full unit model)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**N1.4 First year coordinator support**  
| Phase 1 – extended pilot 2019 | Phase 2 – fully implement 2020 | PVC EL | PVC SL | ADs Ed | ADs SL | Phase 1: S2, 2019 | Phase 2: S1, 2020 |

**N1.5 Welcome week**  
| Phase 1 – extended pilot 2019 | Phase 2 – fully implement 2020 | PVC SL | ADs SL | Phase 1: S2, 2019 | Phase 2: S1, 2020 |

**N2.1 Tech-enabled TAC support**  
| Phase 1 – design | Phase 2 – implement | DVC Ed | Phase 1: Dec 2019 | Phase 2: Dec 2020 |

**N2.2 Academic integration of career development**  
| Phase 1 – OLE development | Phase 2 – interactive resources | DVC Ed | Phase 1: Feb 2020 | Phase 2: Dec 2020 |

**N2.3 School career advisors**  
| Phase 1 – extend and deepen links to career advisors | Phase 2 – PD program | PVC SL | Deans | Phase 1: Dec 2019 | Phase 2: Dec 2020 |

**Part 4 Essential student supports**

| E1.1 Operating model | Phase 1 – design | Phase 2 – implement | DVC Ed | VP Ops | CIO | Phase 1: Dec 2019 | Phase 2: S1, 2020 | Phase 3: Dec 2020 | Phase 4: TBD |

| E1.2 Mental Health and wellbeing | Phase 1 – develop strategy | Phase 2 – implement | DVC Ed | Deans | Phase 1: Aug 2019 | Phase 2: Dec 2020 |

| E1.3 SAS/TAC Interface | Phase 1 – design | Phase 2 – implement | DVC Ed | VP Ops | Phase 1: Aug 2019 | Phase 2: Feb 2020 |

| E1.4 Code of conduct | Phase 1 – consult | Phase 2 – adopt & implement | Dir, Ed strategy | ADs SL | Phase 1: Oct 2019 | Phase 2: Jan 2020 |

| E2.1 Informal learning and student spaces | Phase 1 – concept consultation | Phase 2 – adoption of concept | PVC SL | Dir CIS | Deans | Phase 1: Sept 2019 | Phase 2: Mar 2020 | Phase 3: TBD |

| E2.2 Student accommodation | Phase 1 – choice modelling | Phase 2 – strategy design | DVC Ed | VP Strategy | VP Ops | Phase 1: Feb 2019 | Phase 2: Apr 2019 | Phase 3: TBD |

| E2.3 Childcare | Phase 1 – strategy design | Phase 2 – adopt & implement | DVC Ed | VP Strategy | VP Ops | Phase 1: Apr 2019 | Phase 2: TBD |

| E2.4 Identifying barriers to success | Phase 1 – routine monitoring | Phase 2 – advice for progression | Phase 3 – alumni in-country | Phase 4 – analytics on educational and career success | DVC Ed | VP A&D | ADs SL | Phase 1: May 2019 | Phase 2: May 2019 | Phase 3: July 2019 | Phase 4: Dec 2019 |

**Monitoring performance**

In addition to monitoring the implementation of the strategy, the University will assess the performance of the student experience strategy through its existing educational and student experience Key Performance Indicators (based primarily on national surveys, including the Student Experience Survey and the Graduate Outcomes Survey) and through additional indicators to be agreed in the early stages of implementation.
## APPENDIX 1. Proposed Terms of Reference for the Student Experience Steering Advisory Group

### Terms of Reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE</th>
<th>STUDENT EXPERIENCE STEERING ADVISORY GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PURPOSE</td>
<td>The Student Experience Steering Advisory Group provides governance and oversight for the implementation of the University’s student experience strategy. This includes providing overall governance of the implementation of student experience initiatives and responsibility for managing the approach, scope, progress, budget, benefits realisation, risks, issues and timelines of the program of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERMS OF REFERENCE</td>
<td>The Steering Advisory Group will:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Monitor and review the implementation of the student experience strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Provide direction to individual initiative work streams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Ensure coordination of digital initiatives within the overall program of work and with other digital initiatives across the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Manage funding within the agreed envelope, and prioritise and direct the allocation of resources including human, physical and capital resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Understand and monitor key dependencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Ensure an appropriate risk management framework is in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Oversee the communications strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Steering Advisory Group has the authority to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Make decisions on the implementation of the student experience strategy, following the strategic direction agreed to by the University Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Make recommendations, as appropriate to the DVC Education and the University Executive and its relevant committees (UE Student Life, UE Operations, UE Education), on financial allocation to student experience proposals formally supported by the University’s budget process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with University Executive:</td>
<td>The Steering Advisory Group will report to the UE Student Life Committee after each meeting, and provide regular progress reports (at least quarterly) to the University Executive, and the UE Operations and UE Education Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The Steering Advisory Group will refer financial decisions to the University Executive above the DVC (Education) delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAIR</td>
<td>Chair, Professor Pip Pattison, DVC (Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBERSHIP</td>
<td>Professor Adam Bridgeman, PVC (Educational Innovation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Richard Miles, PVC (Education Enterprise and Engagement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Gregory Whitwell, Dean, University of Sydney Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor Tim Wilkinson, Associate Dean Student Life, FEIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jordi Austin, Director, Student Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ainslie Bulmer, Executive Director, Education Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Day, CIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Morgan, Director, Enterprise Systems Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridgette Dang, ICT Associate Director, Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brendon Nelson, Deputy Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angela Watkins, Executive Director Global Student Recruitment and Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leah Hill, FGM Faculty of Arts and Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joanna Lowe, Director, Marketing and Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bronwen Mather, Campus Experience Design Lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Anne Bell, University Librarian, or nominee  
| President SRC  
| President SUPRA  
| EXECUTIVE SUPPORT  
| Ms Iqra Sheik, Senior Project Officer  
| MEETINGS  
| Meetings will occur on the first Thursday of each month at 0800 for one hour  

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR STUDENTS

1. Principles

This Code of Conduct has been formulated to provide a clear statement of the University’s expectations of students in respect of academic matters and personal behaviour.

Study at the University presents opportunities for interacting with other members of the University community. The University recognises and values the diversity of student experiences and expectations, and is committed to treating students, both academically and personally, in a fair and transparent manner. All students, in return, are required to comply with the requirements set down in this Code of Conduct.

The University reaffirms its commitment to:

• high academic standards, intellectual rigour and a high quality education;
• intellectual freedom and social responsibility;
• recognition of the importance of ideas and the pursuit of critical and open inquiry;
• tolerance, honesty and respect as the hallmarks of relationships throughout the University community; and
• high standards of ethical behaviour.

All students are required to be aware of and act consistently with these values.

2. Coverage

This Code of Conduct applies to all students of the University of Sydney, in respect of all actions and activities (including inaction or inactivity) relating to or impacting on the University or its students and employees. It must be read in conjunction with the statutes, rules, and resolutions of the University.

3. Definitions

In this Code of Conduct:

Student means all students of the University of Sydney, including but not limited to fee paying students, HECS students, PELS students, audit students, Centre for Continuing Education students, Centre for English Teaching students, exchange students, Study Abroad students, Summer School students and Winter School students.

Employee means all staff of the University of Sydney, (including full-time, part-time or casual staff).
4. **Personal conduct**

All students must:

- treat all employees, honorary appointees, consultants, contractors, volunteers any other members of the public and other students with respect, dignity, impartiality, courtesy and sensitivity;
- maintain a cooperative and collaborative approach to inter-personal relationships;
- act honestly and ethically in their dealings with University employees, honorary appointees, consultants, contractors, volunteers, any other members of the public and other students;
- respect the privacy of employees, honorary appointees, consultants, contractors, volunteers any other members of the public and other students;
- ensure that they do not act in a manner that unnecessarily or unreasonably impedes the ability of employees, honorary appointees, consultants, contractors, volunteers any other members of the public and other students to carry out their study, research or work at the University, including in the University of Sydney Library, lecture theatres and laboratories;
- ensure that they do not act in a manner that unnecessarily or unreasonably impedes the ability of employees, honorary appointees, consultants, contractors, volunteers any other members of the public or other students to access or use the resources of the University, including the University of Sydney Library resources, lecture theatres and laboratories; and
- ensure that they do not become involved in or encourage discrimination against or harassment or bullying of employees, honorary appointees, consultants, contractors, volunteers any other members of the public or other students.

5. **Academic Conduct**

All students must:

- ensure that their enrolment and progress in their award course is lawful and consistent with the statutes, rule and resolutions of the University of Sydney. Students must not enrol in additional units of study outside the degree resolutions even if the student information system allows it when enrolling online. It is a student’s responsibility to maintain current information in the student information system, and observe key dates and deadlines;
- read all official correspondence from the University, including email;
- act ethically and honestly in the preparation, conduct, submission and publication of academic work, and during all forms of assessment, including formal examinations and informal tests;
- avoid any activity or behaviour that would unfairly advantage or disadvantage another student academically;
- conform to the University’s requirements for working with humans, animals and biohazards;
• behave professionally, ethically and respectfully in all dealings with the University’s learning partners during extramural placements and practicums; and
• use University resources, including information and communication technology resources, in a lawful and ethical manner and for University purposes only, unless express permission has been granted for non-University or private usage.

6. Authority

This Code of Conduct was approved by the Academic Board pursuant to the University of Sydney (Academic Governance) Rule 2003 on 2 February 2005. It was updated on 11 February 2015 with administrative amendments only. It was updated in May 2017 with administrative amendments only.

7. Useful References

Please note that this is not an exhaustive list of the policies applying to students at the University. The full set of University policies is available on the Policy Register at http://sydney.edu.au/policies/.

PERSONAL CONDUCT

Alcohol: Policy and Guidelines on Consumption

University of Sydney (Campus Access) Rule 2009

Equal Opportunity in Education Policy

Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Policy 2015

Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination Resolution Procedures 2015

Policy On the Use of University Information and Communications Technology Resources (ICT Resources)

University of Sydney (Library) Rule 2011

Work Health and Safety Policy 2016

Work Health and Safety Procedures 2016

Children in University Workplaces and Premises Policy

University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016

ACADEMIC CONDUCT

Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015

Australian code for the care and use of animals for scientific purposes 8th edition (2013) (NHMRC)

University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006
Assessment Procedures 2011

Coursework Policy 2014

National Statement of Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007) (NHMRC)

Learning and Teaching Policy 2015

Policy On the Use of University Information and Communications Technology Resources (ICT Resources)

University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014

University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011

Intellectual Property Policy 2016

University of Sydney (Library) Rule 2011

Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013

Research Code of Conduct 2013

University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016

Date determined: 2 February 2005
Date effective: 3 February 2005

Determining Authority: Academic Board

Last amended: 29 February 2012 (Administrative amendments only)
3 December 2013 (Administrative amendments only)
11 February 2015 (Administrative amendments only)
30 October 2015 (Administrative amendments only)
23 February 2016 (Administrative amendments only)
24 August 2016 (Administrative amendments only)
15 May 2017 (Administrative amendments only)
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards & Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board approve the Academic Board Annual Report 2018 and present it to Senate.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD 2018

The University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017 (the ‘Academic Board Rule’) requires that the Academic Board report to Senate on an annual basis on its activities and its assessment of its own performance.

The Academic Board met on the following Tuesdays in 2018 from 2:00pm – 4:00pm:

- 6 March
- 1 May
- 12 June
- 7 August
- 2 October
- 27 November

The Academic Board Rule establishes the functions of the Academic Board as follows:

Principal responsibilities
The Academic Board has principal responsibility for:
(a) assuring the highest standards in teaching, scholarship and research and, in so doing, safeguarding the academic freedom of the University;
(b) overseeing and monitoring the development of academic activities of the University;
(c) communicating with the academic community, particularly through academic organisational units such as faculties, University schools, boards of studies and centres; and
(d) providing a forum for debate and information flow within the University in relation to academic matters.

The establishment in 2018 of the Academic Quality Committee provides a forum for monitoring the quality of the University’s teaching and learning. This committee worked through 2018 to establish a course monitoring process, including analysis of available data, commissioning of custom reports by Institutional Analytics and Planning, and the identification of thresholds to identify courses that might require investigation.

The Board has also received periodic updates from the University's Culture Taskforce, which in part encourages a culture of academic freedom and ‘disagreeing well’.

Undertook an interactive exercise to explore aspects of quality in learning and teaching.

Discussion of the Charter of Academic Freedom

During the year, the Board discussed a number of strategic topics:
- Student Wellbeing (in preparation for the University thematic review of student wellbeing and safety, which was undertaken in 2018)
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- Educational initiatives, in which the Board received an update from the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education - Enterprise & Engagement) on the implementation of Industry and Community Project units of study to ensure that students have experience in multi-disciplinary group work outside the University environment
- The preparation of the University’s TEQSA re-accreditation submission
- Trends in Academic Integrity, led by Dr Ann Rogerson (Director of Academic Integrity and Assessment - Faculty of Business, University of Wollongong), who has published widely in the field and presents at national Higher Education conferences
- A draft MoU for discussion with the Ramsay Centre for Western Civilisation to sponsor delivery of a program of study to be developed by the University, including a detailed discussion of non-negotiable terms for inclusion in the draft
- Improving Education Performance, a discussion led by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) and Deputy Dean of the Business School, arising from Unit of Study Satisfaction (USS) survey data by faculty, focussing on opportunities to improve student satisfaction with the educational experience
- The Report of the Assessment Working Group 2018 presented by the Director, Educational Strategy and the development of draft assessment rubrics
- An overview of the continued implementation of the Student Experience Strategy presented by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)

The Board has continued to provide advice via its website and direct communication with faculties and other units on specific Academic Board decisions. The Board continues to liaise with faculties and portfolio units to consult on major policy reviews and developments.

The Board also provides an opportunity at each meeting for members of the academic and professional staff and student community to raise questions for the Vice-Chancellor and the Chair of Academic Board.

Specific roles and powers

(1) Subject to any inconsistent provision in the Act, By-Law or any Rule, the Academic Board will determine standards and, after consultation with the University Executive, determine policy in relation to:

(a) admission requirements;
The Board approved the introduction of Admissions Prerequisites Standards – Mathematics, requiring a specified standard of HSC Mathematics for admission to a number of undergraduate award courses.

The Admissions Sub-Committee endorsed changes to the admission requirements for a number of undergraduate and postgraduate coursework award courses, as reported under (2) below.

(b) programs of study, including requirements for the award of any qualification;
The Board approved the amendment of the course proposal template to make it easier to complete. Changes to individual award courses – including the requirements for award – were approved as reported under (2) below.

(c) progression requirements;
The Board discussed and agreed to amend the progression requirements for Higher Degree by Research students. Coursework progression requirements were considered and amended through consideration of proposals to amend individual award courses as reported under (2) below.

(d) examinations and assessment;
The Academic Board received and noted the 2017 and 2018 reports of the Assessment Working Group and agreed on a number of measures to improve monitoring and management of assessment plans and learning outcomes for each degree, stream, specialisation, program and major in the undergraduate curriculum.

The Board also provided comments and advice on a series of papers and questions presented by the Director, Graduate Research addressing excessive examination times for HDR theses.
(e) **student recognition awards, including scholarships, subsidies or prizes; and**

The Board approved the Student Recognition Awards Policy 2016 (retitled the Scholarships and Student Recognition Awards Policy 2016). The Graduate Studies Committee also received regular reports from the HDR Scholarships Sub-Committee, which is responsible for the allocation of HDR scholarships and prizes to domestic and international students. This group also discussed scholarship allocation guidelines and provided recommendations on management of the University’s HDR scholarship processes.

(f) **such other matters as Senate may delegate to it.**

- **Determine English language requirements:**
The Academic Board approved the amendment of the Coursework Policy 2014 and approve the introduction of Admissions Standards – English Language Proficiency to clarify language requirements and ensure consistency between undergraduate and postgraduate language requirements.

- **Determine whether or not a Higher Doctorate be awarded.**
The Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee approved the awarding of one Doctor of Laws in the Sydney Law School, one Doctor of Engineering in the Faculty of Engineering & Information Technologies and one Doctor of Medical Science in the Faculty of Medicine & Health.

- **Determine whether or not a PhD be awarded.**
Regular reports on the award of doctoral degrees are provided to the Academic Quality Committee by the Higher Degree by Research Examinations Sub-Committee, including quarterly trend reporting.

- **Determine periods of instruction and commencement and conclusion dates of the academic year.**
The Academic Board approved faculty-specific semester and vacation dates for 2019 for the Faculties of Arts & Social Sciences, Health Sciences, Medicine & Health (Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing and Pharmacy) and of Science.

- **Restrict the public availability of a thesis.**
Ten applications to restrict, for specified periods, the public availability of a thesis were approved in 2018.

- **Permit a candidate to submit a thesis prior to the normal earliest date for submission of a PhD thesis**
The Chair of the Academic Board received no applications for the early submission of a PhD thesis in 2018.

(2) **The Academic Board will consider and, if appropriate, approve new academic award courses and amendments to existing courses, provided that the approved new or amended course:**

(a) **is tabled and considered at the next appropriate Senate meeting; and**

(b) **may not commence until after it has been endorsed by Senate.**

As reported to Senate after each meeting, during 2018 the Academic Board approved the introduction of the following new award courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW COURSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Bachelor of Education (School and Community Education) / Bachelor of Arts
- Master of Professional Engineering (Accelerated)
- Master of Medicine and Master of Science in Medicine (Trauma-Informed Psychotherapy)
- Bachelor of Science / Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Taronga Wildlife Conservation)

As reported to Senate after each meeting, during 2018 the Academic Board approved the amendment of the following award courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMENDED COURSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Bachelor of Economics |
- Bachelor of Economics / Bachelor of Advanced Studies |
- Bachelor of Arts / Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Media and Communications) |
- Bachelor of Arts / Bachelor of Social Work |
- Bachelor of Economics |
- Bachelor of Economics / Bachelor of Advanced Studies |
- Bachelor of Education (Secondary: Humanities and Social Sciences) and Bachelor of Arts |
- Bachelor of Education (Secondary: Mathematics) and Bachelor of Science |
- Bachelor of Social Work |
- Bachelor of Visual Arts |
- Bachelor of Visual Arts / Bachelor of Advanced Studies |
- Diploma of Arts |
- Diploma of Languages |
- Diploma of Social Sciences |
- Graduate Certificate of Art Curating |
- Graduate Certificate in Digital Communication and Culture |
- Graduate Certificate in Human and Community Services |
- Master of Contemporary Art |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Sydney Business School</th>
<th>Faculty of Engineering &amp; Information Technologies</th>
<th>Faculty of Health Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Bachelor of Commerce</td>
<td>• Bachelor of Advanced Computing</td>
<td>• Bachelor of Applied Science (Diagnostic Radiography)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>• Bachelor of Advanced Computing and Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>• Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise and Sport Science)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Master of Business Administration (Leadership &amp; Enterprise)</td>
<td>• Bachelor of Engineering (Honours) and Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>• Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise Physiology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Master of Commerce</td>
<td>• Bachelor of Engineering (Honours) and Bachelor of Commerce</td>
<td>• Bachelor of Applied Science (Occupational Therapy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Master of Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations</td>
<td>• Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>• Bachelor of Applied Science (Physiotherapy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Master of Logistics and Supply Chain Management</td>
<td>• Bachelor of Project Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submission To</strong></td>
<td>Academic Standards &amp; Policy Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>19 March 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item No</strong></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Bachelor of Applied Science (Speech Pathology) |
| Bachelor of Applied Science / Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Exercise and Sport Science) |
| Master of Speech Language Pathology |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sydney Law School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Commercial Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juris Doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Administrative Law and Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Business Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Criminology (Coursework)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Environmental Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of International Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Laws</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Medicine &amp; Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Nursing (Post-Registration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Oral Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Pharmacy (Honours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Pharmacy Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Pharmacy Management (Honours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Clinical Dentistry (Oral Rehabilitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Evidence-Based Complementary Medicines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Brain and Mind Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Clinical Trials Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Health Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Medicine / Master of Science in Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Medicine / Master of Science in Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Medicine / Master of Science in Medicine (General Practice and Primary Health Care)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Medicine / Master of Science in Medicine (Infection and Immunity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Clinical Dentistry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Animal and Veterinary Bioscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Animal and Veterinary Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Environmental Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Food and Agribusiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Liberal Arts and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science / Bachelor of Advanced Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science / Doctor of Dental Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science / Doctor of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science / Master of Mathematical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science / Master of Nutrition and Dietetics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The introduction, amendment or rescission of course resolutions and (where required) Faculty resolutions to enable the above changes were also approved by the Academic Board.

The Academic Board also approved the learning outcomes for undergraduate courses and course components for courses offered by the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, University of Sydney Business School, Faculty of Health Sciences, Sydney Law School, Faculty of Medicine and Health, Faculty of Science and the Sydney Conservatorium of Music.

(3) The Academic Board will provide advice to Senate, the Vice-Chancellor and the University Executive about academic matters, including but not limited to:

(a) teaching, research and educational programs;
(b) academic priorities;
(c) academic aspects of current and proposed University strategic plans;
(d) academic aspects of policies and procedures, including but not limited to those relating to the appointment, promotion and conditions of employment of academic staff;

The Academic Board:
- endorsed the recommendations in a proposal for increasing engagement opportunities for HDR students, prepared by the Director, Graduate Research;
- discussed a proposed Higher Degree by Research Coursework Implementation Model, also prepared by the Director, Graduate Research;
- received a presentation and provided feedback on a discussion paper outlining academic themes for Western Sydney;
- noted reports on the promotion of academic staff to Level B, C, D and E in 2018;
- noted the membership of the 2018 Central Promotions Committee membership in compliance with the Academic Promotions Policy 2015; and
- received and provided feedback on the Academic Promotions Normative Criteria.

New policies and procedures approved in 2018:
- Continuing and Extra-Curricular Education Procedures 2018
- Educational Integrity Decision-Making and Penalty Guidelines 2018
- Higher Degree by Research Internships Procedures 2018
- Outbound Student Mobility Policy 2018, which provides a framework for student mobility experiences
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Existing policies amended in 2018:

- Assessment Procedures 2011, to enable implementation of a common system of late penalties and a common submission time for some forms of assessment
- Coursework Policy 2014
- Learning and Teaching Policy 2015
- Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015
- Student Placement and Project Policy 2015
- Student Recognition Awards Policy 2016 (reitled the Scholarships and Student Recognition Awards Policy 2016)

Policies deleted in 2018:

- None

The Academic Board also:

- endorsed the amendment by Senate of the University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017 to accommodate the implementation of the Faculty of Medicine and Health;
- endorsed the amendment by Senate of the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014 to permit the Academic Board to determine qualifications outside the Australian Qualifications Framework, clarify delegations relating to admission standards, and clarify time limits for embedded courses;
- endorsed the amendment by Senate of the University of Sydney (Governance of Faculties and University Schools) Rule 2016 to accommodate the implementation of the Faculty of Medicine and Health and simplify the process of approving award course changes at the faculty level;
- endorsed the amendment by Senate of the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016 to accommodate the implementation of the Faculty of Medicine and Health and make other minor adjustments;
- endorsed the amendment by Senate of the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 to require students to complete their candidature in a shorter time, as well as clarifying English language requirements for HDR students;
- endorsed the rescission by Senate of the Semester and Vacation Dates – Senate Resolutions, which have been made redundant by the clause 9.2.1 of the Delegations of Authority (Academic Functions) Rule 2016 and by the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015; and
- Noted the Academic Promotions Procedures 2015 to introduce the Academic Promotions Normative Criteria to include impact and engagement standards.

(e) establishing and maintaining academic standards;

The Board asked faculties to review course learning outcomes and develop assessment plans and graduate qualities to establish and maintain academic standards across the University’s undergraduate award courses.

(f) any academic matter it considers to be of strategic importance.

(4) Jointly with the University Executive, the Academic Board will initiate and oversee a formal program of reviews of the academic activities of the University and its academic organisational units.

The Board:

- received and noted the Phase 4 Faculty Review for the Sydney Law School and the Sydney Conservatorium of Music; and
- approved the terms of reference, membership and processes for the review of student wellbeing and safety, as the first theme in the Phase 5 Academic Board / University Executive reviews.

(5) The Academic Board may receive, and may direct provision of, reports from faculties and other organisational units in relation to academic matters.

The following reports were received and noted:

- The Student Administration Services Program Post-Implementation Review;
- Implementation of Anonymous Marking;

Respect is a core value of the Academic Board
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- Educational Integrity Annual Report 2017 and Trend Report, Semester 1 2018;
- Appeals Reporting 2017;
- The Annual Report of Student Misconduct 2017;
- The Annual Report of Student Appeals Body 2017;
- A summary of Student Experience Survey (SES): 2017 Results;
- Regular updates on the implementation of the 2016-2020 Strategic Plan from the Vice-Chancellor, Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) and other key participants in the implementation process;
- Regular updates were also received on the Implementation of Strategic Initiatives Relating to Assessment, provided by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) and the Director, Educational Strategy.

In addition to the above, the Academic Board noted the appointment of members to the Student Appeals Panel and the Academic Panel 2018-2020, as required under the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended).

Structure of the Academic Board
In terms of the Board’s structure and membership, the following actions were taken:
- 4 academic staff were co-opted to the Academic Board (the four Heads of School and Deans of the former Faculties of Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing and Pharmacy).

The Board also:
- approved the amendment of the terms of reference for the Academic Standards and Policy Committee, the Graduate Studies Committee, the Undergraduate Studies Committee and the HDR Examinations Subcommittee and approved the terms of reference for the Academic Quality Committee and the Admissions Sub-Committee, in response to the recommendations of the external review of the Academic Board conducted by Jill Baker (Baker & Baptist) and Professor Paul Wormell (WSU) in 2016 and 2017;
- approved the appointment of Professor Jane Hanrahan as Deputy Chair and approved the appointment of the Committee Chairs;
- approved the appointment or co-option of academic staff and student members to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee, Academic Quality Committee, Graduate Studies Committee and Undergraduate Studies Committee to fill a number of casual vacancies.

With respect to the 2018-2019 Academic Board membership, the Board also:
- noted the results of elections held for student membership of the Academic Board for the term 1 January 2019 to 31 December 2019; and
- appointed the academic staff and student members nominated by their deans to fill casual vacancies for the term 1 January 2019 to 31 December 2019.

Associate Professor Tony Masters
Chair, Academic Board
Non-Confidential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Michael Yell, Lead Business Analyst, Curriculum Timetabling Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer/Approver</td>
<td>Provost Steering Committee, Sydney Operating Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper title</td>
<td>Curriculum Timetabling Policy 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Provide the draft Curriculum Timetabling Policy 2019 for noting by the Academic Standards and Policy Committee (ASPC).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION**

*That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the draft Curriculum Timetabling Policy 2019 from the Provost Steering Committee of the Sydney Operating Model Program.*

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The University of Sydney does not currently have a curriculum timetabling policy. As a result, there is a lack of guiding principles for timetabling in the University, resulting in varied practice, and significant impacts on the quality of the student experience of timetabling.

The scope of the Curriculum Timetabling Project, under the Sydney Operating Model program, includes managing the delivery of a timetabling policy and procedures. The current draft of the policy has been created by a Policy Working Group. It has been circulated for review and feedback to a Policy Reference Group and other key stakeholders, with broad representation of University academic and professional roles. The Policy Working Group revised the draft Policy to incorporate feedback, then recommended the draft to the Provost Steering Committee.

The Provost Steering Committee have endorsed the draft for noting by the Academic Standards Policy Committee, and by several other committees.

*Curriculum Timetabling Procedures* are currently under development and will be separately submitted to the Committee.
ADDITIONAL CONTENT FOR REPORT

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

The Curriculum Timetabling Policy has not been previously submitted to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee. The stakeholders consulted to date are listed under Consultation, below.

CONSULTATION

The Curriculum Timetabling Policy has been subject to consultation and review by:

- Policy Working Group, Curriculum Timetabling Project
- Policy Reference Group, Curriculum Timetabling Project
- Disability Services
- Health and Wellbeing
- The software vendor of the timetabling product Syllabus Plus, which the University will procure
- Provost Steering Committee, Sydney Operating Model
- Education Committee (UE), for noting

BENEFITS

The benefits of the University implementing a Curriculum Timetabling Project are that it can

- Standardise the timetabling and student allocation processes with the University;
- Provide a stronger alignment of timetabling with strategic objectives of the University;
- Improve the student experience of timetabling within the University;
- Improve the staff experience of timetabling within the University;
- Improve the utilisation of teaching space through the span of the University’s teaching week.

IMPLEMENTATION

The Policy will also be noted and/or tabled to the following committees in 2019:

- Joint Consultative Committee (EA)
- University Executive
- Academic Board

In June, it will be submitted for the Vice-Chancellor’s approval, and registered with the Office of General Counsel (OGC).

COMMUNICATION

A communication and engagement plan has been developed to socialise the Policy and Procedures to the University community, along with changes to the technology solution and operating framework for timetabling.

ATTACHMENTS

Curriculum Timetabling Policy 2019
CURRICULUM TIMETABLING POLICY
2019

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

Dated:

Last amended:

Signature: DRAFT ONLY – NOT FOR SIGNATURE

Name: Dr Michael Spence
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PART 1 – PRELIMINARY

1 Name of policy
This is the Curriculum Timetabling Policy 2019.

2 Commencement
This policy commences on [date].

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

4 Statement of intent
This policy:
(a) provides clear principles and a framework for the planning and scheduling of the University’s learning and teaching activities;
(b) requires a University timetable that supports the student learning experience and enables best teaching practice; and
(c) establishes reporting requirements for quality assurance of the timetabling process.

5 Application
(1) This policy applies to:
(a) all students undertaking coursework;
(b) all participants in non-award courses; and
(c) all staff involved in;
   (i) planning;
   (ii) scheduling;
   (iii) maintaining;
   (iv) monitoring; and
   (v) teaching;
the University’s educational offerings.
(2) This includes, but is not limited to:
(a) all scheduled learning and teaching activities relating to units of study;
(b) coursework undertaken by higher degree research students;
(c) scheduled learning and teaching activities relating to non-award courses.

6 Definitions

**academic staff** has the meaning given in the *University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016*, which at the date of this policy is:

academic staff of the University, including teaching and research academic staff, research only and teaching focused academic staff.

**allocation** means, as appropriate, allocating any of:

- teaching time;
- teaching spaces; or
- students to classes in a unit of study.

**annual timetable production schedule** means the schedule of activities involved in the planning and creation of the curriculum timetable and the allocation of students to the timetable, specifying deadlines for the work necessary to complete the timetable.

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

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

**clash** means an overlap in scheduled time for two or more separate learning activities in a student's personal timetable.

**class** means an individual scheduled activity for delivery of a unit of study, such as a lecture, laboratory session or tutorial.

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

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

**Dean** means, as appropriate, the Dean or Executive Dean of a faculty, or the Head of School and Dean of a University school.

**enrolment** means completing, to the satisfaction of the University, all requirements for enrolment or re-enrolment in an award course.

**Enterprise Agreement** means the *University of Sydney Enterprise Agreement 2018 - 2021*, and any successor to that agreement.
faculty means, as appropriate, a faculty, University school or Board of Studies.

Head of School means:

- for schools within a faculty, the Head of School;
- for faculties which do not have a school structure, the Dean;
- for clinical schools within the Faculty of Medicine and Health, the Head of Clinical School; and
- for University schools, the Head of School and Dean.

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

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

non-award means studies undertaken that do not lead to an award from the University. Non-award courses include professional development programs.

non-teaching space means a room or location on campus that can be booked for an activity, but which has not been designed for teaching.

precinct means the area within a campus that is dedicated to the teaching and research activities of a specific cluster of disciplines.

procedures means the Curriculum Timetabling Procedures 2019.

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

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

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

timetable means the schedule of lectures, tutorials, laboratories and other academic activities that a student is expected to attend.

teaching space means a room or location designed for teaching.

timetabling team means the functional area with the University responsible for managing unit of study timetables, student personal timetables and associated information and systems.
unit of study has the meaning given in the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015, which at the date of this policy is:
the smallest stand-alone component of an award course that is recordable on a student’s transcript. Units of study have an integer credit point value, normally six credit points except where approved by the Academic Board.

unit of study coordinator has the meaning given in the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015, which at the date of this policy is:
the academic staff member with overall responsibility for the planning and delivery of a unit of study.

PART 2 – PRINCIPLES

7 Timetabling principles

(1) The University should produce an equitable and efficient timetable for its students and staff.

(2) The timetable should foster educational excellence by:
(a) matching learning spaces to teaching delivery requirements;
(b) aiming to schedule the mix of learning and teaching activities to facilitate excellent learning outcomes and experiences.

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

(3) The timetabling process should optimise use of teaching facilities and resources by:
(a) minimising scheduled timetable clashes for students, subject to:
(i) agreed and documented availability of staff for teaching;
(ii) agreed and documented availability of essential specialised teaching space; and
(iii) availability of security and other necessary services;
(b) optimising:
(i) the match of teaching spaces to scheduled class requirements (such as size of class, type of class, teaching facilities needed);
(ii) proximity of teaching spaces to staff-preferred precincts; and
(iii) proximity of teaching spaces to precincts relevant to the students’ courses.

(4) The University aims to minimise travel time between learning and teaching activities for students and staff.

(5) For the purposes of venue allocation and scheduling, the University will prioritise events in the following order:
(a) all scheduled teaching, learning and assessment activities that comprise units of study;
(b) approved non-award teaching activities;
(c) non-teaching activities that are part of the University's core activities, such as research-related workshops, conferences and symposia.

(6) There will be a Timetabling Committee, with responsibility for:
(a) overseeing the University timetable; and
(b) approving the annual Timetable production schedule.

(7) The Timetabling Committee will have the membership and terms of reference specified in Schedule 1. The University will publish the timetable based on the annual timetable production schedule approved by the Timetabling Committee.

PART 3 – TIMETABLE PLANNING

8 Timetable planning and development

(1) The timetabling team within the central student administration unit is responsible for producing the annual timetable production schedule, specifying deadlines for the work necessary to complete the timetable in accordance with this policy.

(2) All academic and professional staff involved in producing the University timetable must:
(a) provide current and accurate information for timetabling purposes; and
(b) undertake this work according to the timetable production schedule.

9 Teaching time allocation

(1) Core teaching hours for timetabling purposes are from 8.00 am to 9.00 pm, Monday to Friday.
(a) Units of study offered in daytime mode of delivery will normally have classes scheduled between 8.00 am to 6.00 pm; and
(b) Units of study offered in evening mode of delivery will normally have classes scheduled between 5.00 pm to 9.00 pm.

(2) Staff allocation to teaching must be consistent with:
(a) the faculty's academic workload allocation policy, established under the Enterprise Agreement; and
(b) the workload provisions of the Enterprise Agreement.

(3) The Head of School will determine and approve teaching hours outside of core teaching hours, in consultation with academic staff and consistent with the Enterprise Agreement.
10 Teaching space allocation

(1) The University will allocate classes to appropriately equipped spaces according to function and need.

(2) If classes cannot be scheduled due to competing requirements, the DVC (Education) will decide the schedule.

(3) The University will ensure that all teaching spaces are:
   (a) recorded in the timetabling system;
   (b) as from 1 July 2020, categorised as one of:
      (i) general teaching space, to which any teaching and learning activity can be allocated (e.g. seminar rooms);
      (ii) prioritised space (e.g. computer laboratories with specialised software), to which priority will be given for their principal use, but can also be timetabled for other use depending on need and availability; or
      (iii) specialised space, which is unsuitable for general use (e.g. purpose-built wet laboratories); and
   (c) allocated accordingly.

11 Timetable draft

(1) The timetable will normally be provided to academic staff before publication to students, as provided by the annual timetable production schedule.

(2) Staff should be given a period during which they can request changes to the timetable before publication.

(3) Staff may request changes if:
   (a) they advise why the draft does not meet the class requirements; and
   (b) the requirements are consistent with the procedures.

PART 4 – TIMETABLE PUBLICATION

12 Timetable publication

(1) The timetable will be published and released to students:
   (a) after the staff revision period; and
   (b) as provided in the timetable production schedule.

(2) The timetable will be published online and provided to relevant University systems.

13 Timetable changes after final publication

(1) Changes to the published timetable can only be made in the circumstances specified in the procedures.
(2) Students will be notified of changes to their personal timetable as soon as practical after the changes have been approved.

PART 5 – STUDENT TIMETABLE ALLOCATION

14 Student allocation to classes
(1) All classes that students are expected to attend as part of their units of study should appear on their personal timetable.
(2) A student should be allocated a clash-free timetable where unit of study timetables and venue capacity permit.
(3) If a student’s personal timetable contains unresolvable clashes, the student must choose whether to:
   (a) proceed with their timetable, and ensure that they can complete the requirements of the units of study; or
   (b) change their selected units of study to enable a clash-free timetable.
(4) Students may apply to change classes in the manner specified in the procedures.

15 Staff permissions and accountabilities
(1) Timetabling staff may manage class lists where appropriate, including adding and removing students.
(2) Teaching staff may request students present at, but not allocated to, a particular class to leave.
(3) Where the number of students present constitutes a health and safety risk teaching staff must require that those students not allocated to the class leave.

PART 6 – QUALITY ASSURANCE

16 Reporting and diagnostics
The timetabling team will report annually to the University Executive Education Committee about efficiency of timetabling processes.
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**SCHEDULE 1**

**Timetabling Committee – Terms of Reference**

**Purpose and role**

(1) The Timetabling Committee is responsible for delivering a University timetable:

(a) to a high standard;
(b) with continuous performance improvement;
(c) in alignment aligned with the University’s strategic goals;
(d) consistently with the Curriculum Timetabling Policy 2019.

(2) The Committee will:

(a) approve the annual timetable production schedule;
(b) in exceptional circumstances, authorise overriding the annual timetable production schedule.
   (i) Exceptional circumstances may include a building becoming unavailable at short notice for health and safety reasons, requiring the replanning of the timetable;
(c) approve updates to the list of teaching space properties that meet teaching delivery requirements;
(d) provide guidance to the timetabling team in implementing the strategic direction set by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education);
(e) review the annual performance reporting from the timetabling team;
(f) assist in implementing continuous improvement initiatives within the University community to benefit timetabling; and
(g) assist in resolving root cause issues within the University community to benefit timetabling.

(3) The Committee is not required to resolve operational issues arising in the standard timetabling process.

**Membership**

(1) Members will be appointed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).

(2) The committee will consist of:

(a) the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), or nominee, acting as chair;
(b) the Vice-Principal of Operations, or nominee, acting as deputy chair;
(c) the Director of Student Operations, Student Administrative Services;
(d) three Associate Deans (Education) from faculties and University schools, with rotation every two years;
(e) one Faculty General Manager or School General Manager of a University school, with rotation every two years;
(f) the [role tbc], Campus Infrastructure Services, or nominee.

(g) the [role tbc], Information and Communications Technology, or nominee.

Meetings

(1) The group will meet at least once every three months.

(2) Meetings will be convened by the chair, who may convene additional meetings if required.