ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY COMMITTEE – 13 AUGUST 2019

Chair: Professor Jane Hanrahan
Secretariat: Cory Thomas
Committee Officer

NOTICE OF MEETING

Meeting 05/2019 of the of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee will be held on Tuesday 13 August 2019 at 2.00pm in the F23 Administration Building, Level 5 Function Room. The Agenda for the meeting is attached.

☆ This symbol indicates items that have been starred for discussion at the meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>2.00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

☆ 1.1 Welcome and Apologies
☆ 1.2 Declarations of Interest
☆ 1.3 Minutes of Meeting (25 June 2019)
☆ 1.4 Minutes of Supplementary Meeting (16 July 2019)
☆ 1.5 Actions Arising
☆ 1.6 Starring of Items

2 STANDING ITEMS

☆ 2.1 Report of the Chair

2.2 Report of the Academic Board

☆ 2.3 Report of the Admissions Subcommittee and supplementary Academic Standards and Policy Committee meeting

3 ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

☆ 3.1 Report on Changes to Assessment Procedures 2011
☆ 3.2 Draft Student Charter
AGENDA

3.3 Academic Risk Evaluation
Chair, Academic Board

3.4 Implementing policy-mandated education in sexual consent
Peter McCallum Attached

3.5 Curriculum Timetabling Procedure
Attached

3.6 Admission Pre-requisite Standards – Mathematics. Adjustments
Peter McCallum Attached

4 ITEMS FOR NOTING

4.1 Cybersecurity Policy Update
ICT Cyber Security
Business Change
Lead, ICT Attached

3.6 2017 Go8 Quality Verification System Review
Academic Director,
Education Quality and Policy, and Registrar Attached

MEETING CLOSE

4.00 pm

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING DATES FOR 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda deadline</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 1 October 2019</td>
<td>Tuesday 15 October 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
Non-Confidential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>1.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Author**
Cory Thomas, Committee Officer

**Reviewer/Approver**
Chair, Academic Standards and Policy Committee

**Paper title**
Minutes from the meeting of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee

**Purpose**
To provide the Academic Standards and Policy Committee with the Minutes from the Meeting held on 25 June 2019

**RECOMMENDATION**

*That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the Minutes from the Meeting held on 25 June 2019.*
ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY COMMITTEE

2:00PM – 4:00PM, TUESDAY 25 JUNE 2019

Function Room, Level 5, F23 Administration Building

Members Present: Professor Jane Hanrahan (Chair), Associate Professor Tony Masters (Chair, Academic Board), Professor Pip Pattison (Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)), Associate Professor Helen Agus (Faculty of Science), Dr Vasiliki Bethavas (The University of Sydney Susan Wakil School of Nursing and Midwifery), Dr Bret Church (The University of Sydney School of Pharmacy), Professor Manuel Graeber (The University of Sydney School of Medicine), Mr Jacky He (President, SRC), Ms Kerrie Henderson (University Policy Manager, Office of General Counsel), Ms Patty Kamvounias (Academic Board representative), Ms Kaylyn Ke (SUPRA (Nominee), Dr Adrienne Keane (The University of Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning), Associate Professor Alex Lefebvre (Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences), Professor Greg Murray (The University of Sydney School of Dentistry), Associate Professor Maurice Peat (The University of Sydney Business School), Professor Rita Shackel (The University of Sydney Law School), Associate Professor Tim Wilkinson (Chair, Admissions Sub-Committee), Narelle Yeo (representing Associate Professor Jennifer Rowley, Sydney Conservatorium of Music).

Attendees: Professor Ross Coleman (Director, Graduate Research; for item 4.1), Associate Professor Wendy Davis (Chair, Academic Quality Committee), Arlino Djunaidi (Examinations Office); Ms Rebecca Halligan (Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration, for item 2.2.1); Lynn Ko (Risk Manager, Risk Management, for item 3.2.2), Associate Professor Peter McCallum (Acting Registrar and Academic Director, Education Policy and Quality), Hugh O’Dwyer (Education Strategy); Alan Wright (Examinations Office); Dr Glenys Eddy (Acting Committee Officer, Secretariat)

Apologies: Professor Peter Bryant (The University of Sydney Business School), Professor Alan Fekete (Academic Board representative), Dr Peter Knight (The University of Sydney School of Medicine), Ms Yeon Jae Kim (Postgraduate Student), Associate Professor Jennifer Rowley (Sydney Conservatorium of Music).

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

1 WELCOME & APOLOGIES
The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and read out the apologies received.

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/4-1
The AB Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolved to note the apologies received as detailed above.

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

2.1 Minutes of Previous Meeting (7 May 2019)
The Chair noted that subsequent to the meeting, Item 4.2 was modified, and then withdrawn before it was due for submission to Academic Board.

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/4-2
The AB Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolved to approve the Minutes of Previous Meeting (7 May 2019).

2.2 Minutes of Meeting by Circulation (14 May 2019)

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/4-3
The AB Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolved to approve the Minutes of the Meeting held by Circulation (14 May 2019).

2.2.1 2019 Research Code of Conduct Feedback
Resolution AB ASPC 2019/4-4
The AB Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolved to note the feedback provided on the 2019 Research Code of Conduct.

2.2.2 New powers of the Research Integrity Office designated officer: in need of oversight by the committee?

The Chair observed that with respect to a matter arising from the minutes of the previous meeting (held by circulation) concerning the revised Research Code of Conduct, which was considered by the Academic Board at its meeting on 4 June, the related matter raised by Professor Graeber needs resolution by 1 July. Professor Graeber outlined his concerns that 1), complaints of breach of the Code of Conduct can be dismissed by a single designated officer if shown to be made in bad faith, and 2), that this has the capacity to silence a complaint that could be important and should be heard. He also raised concerns about the potential breaches of privacy and the potential risk to the reputations of individuals and the University related to these matters.

Kerrie Henderson drew the meeting’s attention to two legal points related to the matter:
1. It is not accurate to say that there is any legal waiver of privacy just because there is an allegation of impropriety. If anything, the right to privacy really does come into play when someone is accused of doing the wrong thing.
2. With respect to the body of Law relating to bad faith and vexatiousness, cases of this nature are rare due to the high standards applied to them.

During discussion the following points were clarified:
- It is not within the capacity of the University’s Research and Integrity Office to label a complainant as vexatious.
- The ability to dismiss a complaint is new to this Code of Conduct; the University will treat a complaint as confidential unless there is the potential for harm to someone.
- For a complaint to be dismissed a reason must be given and there is a requirement for reporting of these matters; complaints cannot be dismissed arbitrarily, and in addition the reason for dismissal of a complaint is given to the complainant in writing.

Professor Graeber emphasized the need for the Committee to be informed of dismissal of complaints. Associate Professor Masters observed that before such a report is submitted to the Academic Quality Committee after being reported to the Research Committee, the data must be de-identified in a way taking cognizance that the AQC’s proceedings are public.

Professor Graeber expressed his agreement with the Chair’s suggestion that the next version of the Research Code of Conduct contain a reporting requirement.

Kerrie Henderson can have a look at where and how, to de-identify. Kerrie Henderson and Rebecca Halligan agreed to meet to discuss the nature of the reporting of such cases, and how far such reporting can be taken before there is risk of breach of privacy.

Associate Professor Masters recommended that the Committee receive an outline of the nature of the reporting process.

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/4-5
The AB Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolved to endorse the decision that the Academic Quality Committee have oversight of and receive reports on complaints relating to research integrity.

2.3 Action Schedule

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/4-6
The AB Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolved to note that no discussion took place under this item.

3 STANDING ITEMS
3.1 Report of the Chair

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/4-7
The AB Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolved to note that the Chair had nothing to report.

3.2 Report of Academic Board

With reference to an item concerning the Hult Prize, noted under ‘Other matters’ in the written report, Associate Professor Masters (Chair, Academic Board) noted that ‘the University's entry for the Hult Prize’ should read ‘the entry of the University of Sydney students’.

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/4-8
The AB Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolved to note the Report of Academic Board for its meeting held on 4 June 2019.

3.2.1 Academic Board Standing Orders

Associate Professor Masters (Chair, Academic Board) presented the draft Academic Board Standing Orders to the Committee, noting that the University has had a long-standing set of Academic Board processes, in need of documentation for transmission of knowledge of the work of the Academic Board to new Board members. He began consultation with the Academic Board committee chairs last year, but progress was delayed by the TEQSA re-registration review and the French review. The draft Standing Orders are intended as a record of how and why the work of the Board is conducted, and as such are not intended to be a guide rather than stringently applied. Feedback has been provided by Professor Twomey from Law and Professor Baird from Business.

An ‘opt-in’ provision has been made that if the Standing Orders are approved by the Academic Board, its committees can decide whether to operate under these orders, to continue as is, or decide to adopt them ‘with waivers’.

During discussion the following points were raised:

• The Chair read out feedback from Professor Fekete who expressed support for the principle that the Academic Board should have the right to adjust its Standing Orders.

• In light of the point above, Section 9, Changes to Standing Orders, needs some rephrasing to enable the Board to change its own Standing Orders.

• Kerrie Henderson, observing that under Law the Chair can put procedural motions only, and not substantive ones, to the meeting, suggested that the Committee consider recommending the addition of this to the Standing Orders. The Chair, Academic Board, agreed, provided additions to the draft Standing Orders were in agreement with current practice.

• Although these Standing Orders will not be formally be presented to faculty boards as guidelines for the conduct of their own business, they will be at liberty to adopt them if they choose to.

The draft Academic Board Standing Orders were endorsed for submission to Academic Board.

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/4-9
The AB Academic Standards and Policy Committee:
1. discussed and provided feedback on the proposed draft Academic Board Standing Orders, as presented to the meeting; and
2. resolved to endorse the proposed Standing Orders for submission to Academic Board for approval.

3.2.2 Academic Board Emerging Risk Discussion
Lyn Ko made a presentation to the Committee on the trends in emerging risks associated with the work of the Academic Board. Defining risk as anything that might affect the achievement of an organisation’s outcomes, and specifically the possibility of an adverse outcome, she drew attention to the need to understand how and why risk might emerge in relation to the responsibilities of the Academic Board. The Committee agreed that such risk should be monitored.

The Committee was asked to rate each of the six emerging risk trends in the Emerging Risk Trend Table on p. 42 of the agenda pack, using a rating scale of green (diminishing risk), amber (stationary/stable) and red (increasing risk).

**Risk 1: Third-party Teaching Agreements, and Failure to Provide Services Expected by an External Provider**

There was considered to be a general lack of awareness of third-party agreements and their inherent risks. Although 20 or 30 years ago, contract teaching did not exist, this is seen as an increasing risk with the increase in the amount of contract teaching, effectively third-party teaching. Lack of awareness of the process of, failure to obtain right advice concerning engaging third-party teachers, and failure to notify the Academic Board of new arrangements were seen as sources of increasing risk. Kerrie Henderson and Lyn Ko outlined the University’s controls for such risk, including its policies and documentation in the University’s risk register. Risk was seen as high for non-award teaching, but mitigating steps have been put in place. Risk will be reduced by putting controls in place via the work of the Sydney Operating Model (SOM) and a curriculum management system.

Risk trend rating: Green.

**Risk 2: Inability to Realise Expected Learning and Graduate Outcomes**

Sources of risk were held to be drift in expected Learning and Graduate outcomes with changes to units in a course without appropriate monitoring of the changes, and similarly changes to assessment regimes.

Risk trend rating: Amber.

**Risk 3: Inconsistent Application of Assessment Standards by Academic Units**

Professor Pattison considered the work currently being undertaken on assessment rubrics and the work conducted by the Academic Board on grade distribution to be effective mitigating strategies for this risk. Interdisciplinary project work and Table O were suggested as areas needing more oversight. These areas can be taught by staff from more than one faculty, and as the mean WAM can vary considerably between faculties, more verification of standards was recommended. Lyn Ko suggested an amber rating because more can be done to mitigate the risk.

Risk trend rating: Amber.

**Risk 4: Inability to Comply with the Academic Board Rule 2017**

The risk of noncompliance with the Academic Board Rule has arisen because of the large number of areas of Academic Board responsibility and the need for adequate resourcing to ensure compliance. Kerrie Henderson saw the transition period at Westmead as a critical source of risk for the Board and suggested adding more inductions and controls for new Board members, and the monitoring of both Board activities and production of Board minutes.

Risk 4 was viewed as a constantly changing risk and also as an improving trend because with the changing environment, the Board’s decision-making function was increasing.

Risk trend rating: Green.

Risks 5 and 6:
Unacceptable Number of Unaddressed Cheating Cases and Number of Contract Cheating Cases Exceeds Our Ability to Address Them

These two risk trends were treated as interrelated. It was noted that the number of cases of academic dishonesty has risen dramatically recently. It was suggested that the increase could be affected by the increase in student population, although better detection processes were being used. Associate Professor McCallum, noting that the number of units reporting breaches is small, considered that more reporting activity was needed.

Risk trends 5 and 6 were considered high and increasing, and in need of more effective mitigation strategies. Students can pay for essays/assignments online; impersonation in examinations is also a problem. Associate Professor McCallum reported that work is being conducted on developing mitigation strategies, some of which are ongoing and active, and not captured in this discussion.

Risk trend rating: Red.

The Chair, ASPC and the Chair, Academic Board, thanked Lynn Ko for her presentation and for the background work she had undertaken.

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/4-10
The AB Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolved to provide input into the mitigation status and trends in emerging risks to the work of the Academic Board.

3.3 Report of the Admissions Subcommittee

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/4-11
The AB Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolved to note the Report of the Admissions Subcommittee.

3.3.1 Changes to English Language Proficiency Requirements

Associate Professor McCallum presented the proposal to the Committee, outlining the two types of proposed change to the English Language Proficiency Standards: those pertaining to tertiary studies which further specify requirements based on the location of study, and those relating to faculty-specific requirements. With respect to the first, there are subtleties around duration and location. For where instruction is in English in a non-English speaking country, the aim is to standardize across all areas.

The Chair conveyed feedback from Professor Fekete, who suggested 1), that the use of the Pearson test for English was problematic in that it promoted gaming for learning the test rather than learning English, and 2), that instead of the Centre for English teaching conducting both the teaching and the testing, that it conduct the teaching and another means of testing is employed, for instance IELTS. Professor Pattison confirmed that the Centre for English Teaching has undergone a careful benchmarking study. When compared with IELTS the Centre for English Teaching was seen to do a good job.

During discussion the following suggestions were made:

Even though an International student might have studied for a year in an English-speaking country, the University might still wish to test their English proficiency. However, the University could simply test these students rather than have the requirement of study in an English-speaking institution.

The University is implementing some good support practices such as the Student Transition Policy which will run units in Semester 1 and provide a good momentum at the beginning of the degree. The University needs to find ways of extending this throughout the degree.

Several committee members suggested that existing data be re-analysed and that new data be generated concerning methods of English-proficiency testing.
Resolution AB ASPC 2019/4-12

The AB ASPC resolved to endorse the proposed amendments to the Admissions Standards – English Language Proficiency, for submission to Academic Board.

4 ITEMS FOR ACTION

4.1 Improving HDR Supervision at the University of Sydney

Professor Ross Coleman (Director, Graduate Research) presented the paper to the Committee, which had arisen from a long-standing consideration of the University’s practices and the requirements of the Policy Review Rule. The review of the Policy was undertaken with the view to articulating desired outcomes and integrating best practice into the outcomes of the SOM HDR support model.

Arising from previous discussion was the view that best practice would be to have a supervisory team, which is contrary to current practice. Professor Coleman suggested that a supervisory panel structure include a role for a staff member to look after the student’s interest such as a mentor, and that this be someone not embedded in research activities. Professor Peat’s observation that although PhD supervision is an educational activity, it is not acknowledged as such in the wider community, elicited the suggestion that a cultural shift in investing in the research and the student would be beneficial.

Associate Professor Coleman, observing that the School of Psychology have instituted a supervision contract, signed by the supervisor and the student, noted that students are not aware of the expectations of them when they begin their higher research degree. He expressed his agreement for the document to be shared among colleagues, and for any feedback to be sent to him directly.

Associate Professor Wilkinson noted the similarity of the open comments between those of PhD students and regular coursework students, namely that lack of empathy from supervisors seems to be a main concern. The training needs to be more general, and to facilitate improvement in several areas, such as managing people, and interacting with students more effectively and respectfully in general. Associate Professor Coleman reported that SOM is concerned with better management of candidature.

During discussion, the following feedback was offered:

- The variability between supervisors in terms of engagement of supervisor with student was noted.
- Some students and staff have a tendency to see The Annual Progress Review (APR) as a box-ticking exercise only.
- Academics’ perception of their not being recognized for their efforts might be a contributing factor to the lack of engagement with supervisory duties; perhaps University recognition of academic effort in this area would be beneficial.
- Ongoing training in HDR supervision might be beneficial. Many Universities require a three-year re-accreditation mechanism, and it was suggested that the University consider implementing something comparable.

The subject of ‘other’ training for PhD students to prepare them for non-academic employment was raised, and OLE was suggested as a means of providing this.

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/4-13

The AB Academic Standards and Policy Committee discussed the paper “Improving HDR Supervision at the University of Sydney”, and endorsed the proposal of the DVC Education Portfolio to review the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013.

4.2 Report on Changes to Assessment Procedures 2011

Associate Professor Masters (Chair, Academic Board) had requested a review of the Assessment Procedures following the Examinations Process audit. A number of matters needing action were identified, for instance, procedures for managing interrupted examinations and emergencies. Associate Professor Masters considered that immediate action was required with respect to those problems identified and consulted with the committee chairs and student representatives. All were in
agreement about the need to act. The purpose of this report is to inform stakeholders about the executive action taken.

Kerrie Henderson informed the Committee that the Procedures need some redrafting and to be registered, since policies are not binding until registered. The re-draft will be re-submitted to the Committee. Members were encouraged to provide feedback.

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/4-14
The AB Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the action of the Chair of the Academic Board in approving amendments to the Assessment Procedures at the request of the Executive Director of Student Administration and consider the revised Assessment Procedures.

4.3 Report of the Dual and Joint Degrees Working Group
Professor Pattison (Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)) presented the report to the Committee, noting that the paper proposes a new framework for the University's dual and joint degrees, and proposes some safeguards for their management. The report also proposes a joint PhD model rather than a Cotutelle or dual model.

Professor Pattison also noted that the University's partners in this regard will depend on tiered collaboration. Without any detriment to strong existing relationships, a third tier would serve ad-hoc arrangements. The University will also use existing approval structures for these degrees, although additional resourcing might be needed. A new policy will need to be developed for the administration of these degrees and the Cotutelle Policy will need to be rescinded.

The Committee endorsed the recommendations of the Report.

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/4-15
The AB Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolved to review and endorse the recommendations of the report of the Dual and Joint Degrees Working Party.

5 ITEMS FOR NOTING

5.1 Proposed legislation for prohibiting the provision and advertisement of commercial cheating services

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/4-16
The AB Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the University's draft submission on the proposed legislation for prohibiting the provision and advertisement of commercial cheating services.

5.2 Addendum to 2018 Student Misconduct Annual Report

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/4-17
The AB Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the addendum to the report for submission to Academic Board and the University Senate as fulfilment of the reporting requirement of clause 8.4 of the University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016.

6 OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 Any Other Business

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/4-18
The AB Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolved to note there was no other business.

With there being no other business, the Meeting closed at 4.02 pm.
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**RECOMMENDATION**

_That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the Minutes from the Special Meeting held on 19 July 2019._
ADMISSIONS SUB-COMMITTEE (04/2019) AND ACADEMIC STANDARDS & POLICY COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING

2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 16 July 2019
Level 5 Function Room, F23 Administration Building

Members Present
Admissions Sub-Committee

Associate Professor Tim Wilkinson (Chair); Wencong Chai (Head of Admissions); Kubra Chambers (Director, Institutional Analytics & Planning); Shane Griffin (Executive Director, External Relations); Jacky He (President, SRC); Associate Professor Melissa Hardie (Chair, Undergraduate Studies Committee); Katy Head (representing Mary Teague, Head, Widening Participation); Associate Professor Tony Masters (Chair, Academic Board); Joshua Preece (AB Postgraduate member).

Academic Standards and Policy Committee

Professor Jane Hanrahan (Chair); Associate Professor Tony Masters (Chair, Academic Board); Professor Pip Pattison (Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)); Associate Professor Helen Agus (Faculty of Science); Dr Bret Church (The University of Sydney School of Pharmacy); Professor Peter Bryant (Business); Associate Professor Vincent Gomes (Engineering); Professor Manuel Graeber (The University of Sydney School of Medicine); Mr Jacky He (President, SRC); Ms Kerrie Henderson (University Policy Manager, Office of General Counsel); Ms Patty Kamvounias (Academic Board representative); Dr Adrienne Keane (The University of Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning); Dr Peter Knight (Medicine); Professor Greg Murray (The University of Sydney School of Dentistry); Associate Professor Maurice Peat (The University of Sydney Business School); Associate Professor Alison Purcell (Health Sciences); Associate Professor Tim Wilkinson (Chair, Admissions Sub-Committee).

Attendees:
Linda Carmichael (Information Management Officer); Dr Glenys Eddy (Committee Officer); Dr Jennifer Green (Nursing); Associate Professor McCallum (Director, Education Strategy); Hugh O’Dwyer (Education Strategy); Cory Thomas (Committee Officer, Secretariat); Scott Ward (Admissions Manager, SAS); Alyssa White (Manager of Governance, Academic Board and Senate).

Apologies
Admissions Sub-Committee

Tim Field (Acting Director, Global Student Recruitment and Mobility); Associate Professor Michael Kertesz (Chair, Graduate Studies Committee); Rengen Parlane (AB Undergraduate student member); Professor Pip Pattison (Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Education); Professor Anna Reid (Dean and Head of School, Conservatorium of Music); Mary Teague (Head, Widening Participation); Professor Greg Whitwell (Dean, Business School).

Academic Standards and Policy Committee

Dr Vasiliki Betihavas (The University of Sydney Susan Wakil School of Nursing and Midwifery), Professor Adam Bridgeman (Director, Educational Innovation); Professor Alan Fekete (Academic Board representative); Professor Manuel Graeber (Medicine, co-opted member); Ms Kaylyn Ke (SUPRA Nominee); Associate Professor Alex Lefebvre (Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences); Associate Professor Jennifer Rowley (Sydney Conservatorium of Music); Professor Rita Shackel (The University of Sydney Law School).
1 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

1.1 Welcome and Apologies, and Report of the Chair

Professor Jane Hanrahan, Chair, Academic Standards and Policy Committee, welcomed everyone to the meeting. She extended a thank-you to members of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee for attending this special joint meeting, and to the Admissions Sub-Committee for accommodating the arrangements for this special meeting for the purpose of considering items 3.1 and 3.2, which needed Academic Board approval in time for Open Day.

Due to the structure of the meeting, the Procedural Matters, items 1.2 to 1.5, were deferred until after the consideration of Items 3.1 and 3.2 (for consideration by both committees).

Resolution ASC 2019/4-1
That the Admissions Sub-Committee resolved to accept the apologies received as recorded above.

1.2 Declarations of Interest

No discussion of this item took place.

1.3 Minutes of the Previous Meeting, 28 May 2019

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 28 May 2019, were approved as a true record of that meeting.

Resolution ASC 2019/4-2
That the Admissions Sub-Committee approved the minutes of its meeting held on 28 May 2019 as a true record of the outcomes of that meeting.

1.4 Actions Arising

No discussion of Actions Arising took place.

1.5 Starring of Items

The Chair noted that all items for this agenda had been starred beforehand.

Resolution ASC 2019/4-3
That the Admissions Sub-Committee resolved to note the starring of items for the meeting.

2 STRATEGIC ITEMS

No strategic items were submitted for this agenda.

3 ITEMS FOR ENDORSEMENT (ASC and ASPC)

3.1 Admissions: Broadway Scheme – Review of Concession Points

Professor Pattison presented the proposal to amend the Broadway Scheme to increase the concession to a maximum of 10 points for eligible Broadway Scheme applicants. It was thought that the previous scheme had disadvantaged some students.

Associate Professor Agus reported that Science, whilst willing to accept disadvantaged students, is concerned that accepting those with a low ATAR (for instance of around 60) is setting them up for failure. In response, Shane Griffin noted both that a very small number of students will receive the 10 points, and that without the disadvantage, which occurred at some finite point in time, the student would have performed better, suggesting that the decision to award extra points was based on the view that the student was capable.

The question was raised concerning the potential for creating a cultural divide by admitting students with a lower ATAR. It was noted both that the student's disadvantage is most likely not long-term, and that under the Broadway scheme, the number of students admitted can be changed. Professor Pattison also considered it possible to offer these lower ATAR students extra support, reporting that
the STAR team are contacting students with suggestions of means of support. It was noted that Broadway Scheme applicants who obtain an ATAR close to the cut-off usually do well, and that work on improving the Student Experience is revealing many cultural divides which are not due to low SES alone.

Professor Pattison also stated that the University is keen to enhance the student experience and to provide support for the acquisition of essential learning such as language skills and mathematics. With respect to tracking progress, it was observed that given that monitoring student progress is retrospective, the University could consider ways of providing support to these students on commencement of their studies. Faculties are not always given a detailed admissions list, but Pathway students are invited to particular events during Orientation and placed on the 'Track and Connect' list, although individual lecturers have no visibility of disadvantage unless the student self-identifies as disadvantaged.

Professor Pattison also considered that sufficient evidence of this does not yet exist to determine whether disadvantaged students do not apply to Sydney because it awards only 5 points under this scheme. The Admissions Sub-Committee does not see information about unsuccessful applicants. That other schemes have similar levels of concession in place and are successful, suggests that the University will be successful.

Professor Pattison also stated that more tailored approaches were needed for supporting disadvantaged students, and that work to be undertaken by the Vice Principal (External Relations) and the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Indigenous Strategy and Services) will see all of the University’s programs offering places that will reflect the diversity of its students.

Both the Admissions Sub-Committee and the Academic Standards and Policy Committee endorsed the proposal for submission to Academic Board.

Resolution ASC 2019/4-4
That the AB Admissions Sub-Committee recommend that the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board:
1. approve an increase in concessions for eligible Broadway Scheme applicants to a maximum of 10 points;
2. approve an in-principle amendment to Part 7, 27 (2) of the Coursework Policy 2014, to reflect approved changes; and

3.2 Admissions: ATAR Adjustment Factors (confidential)

Professor Pattison presented the proposal to introduce some new ATAR adjustment factors into the Admissions process, seen as a next logical step after the introduction of the Mathematics prerequisites, with both Mathematics and English seen as important HSC subject choices. The University has also been asked to consider other HSC subjects for this scheme. Admissions is requesting in-principle approval to make adjustments to the ATAR of a maximum of 5 points, with the details of the adjustments to be determined later. This adjustment scheme is intended to replace the now dormant Flexible Entry scheme. Associate Professor McCallum noted that in the updated submission, tabled at the meeting, Appendix 4 had been deleted and replaced with Appendix 3.

In response to the expression of concern over the need to maintain academic standards when introducing other subjects into the scheme, Professor Pattison stated that the University is committed to taking an evidence-based approach to making changes.

Associate Professor Hardie, noting the potential effect of the proposed change on Widening Participation, observed that students from middle-class English-speaking backgrounds perform well in English, demonstrating the advantage of socioeconomic status, and suggested that this scheme could decrease the widening if bonus points were allotted to English. Professor Pattison, noting that adjustments will be based on the likelihood of success, suggested that other strategies be devised for managing Widening Participation and for supporting students from schools that do not teach
advanced English. She noted that the precise details of the scheme will be available by the end of July, in time for Open Day in August.

The Chair, Admissions Sub-Committee, observed that experience over the previous couple of years has demonstrated that the transparency of the admissions process has re-assured students of the way in which the process and its schemes will work, and recommended clarity and accuracy in answers to potential applicants about such matters.

Professor Pattison reported that, with the exception of Law (not included in this scheme), the Deans have indicated their endorsement of this proposal.

The Admissions Sub-Committee and the Academic Standards and Policy Committee endorsed the proposal for submission to Academic Board.

The Chair, Academic Standards and Policy Committee, thanked members of that committee for their attendance.

**Resolution ASC 2019/4-5**
That the AB Admissions Sub-Committee recommend that the Academic Standards and Policy Committee recommend that the Academic Board:

1. approve the proposed application of ATAR Adjustment Factors for applicants with eligible subjects and band performance;
2. approve the Subject Excellence Adjustment Scheme as a basis for ATAR adjustment factors based on individual subject performance to replace the existing (dormant) Flexible Entry Scheme adjustments for admission in 2020;
3. request a report for noting at its next meeting on the design rationale for a transparent adjustment scheme to be developed by the end of July 2019 for deployment by UAC in the 2020 admission rounds; and
4. request by February 2020 the design for a new subject-based ATAR adjustment scheme to be deployed from 2021 and made explicit in the Coursework Policy 2014.

3 **ITEMS FOR ENDORSEMENT (ASC only)**

3.3 **Education Strategy: Mathematics Admissions Standards**

The Chair, Admissions Sub-committee, invited the members of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee to stay for the Admissions Sub-Committee only part of the meeting if they wished to.

Scott Ward tabled an updated version of the Mathematics Admission Standards proposal, incorporating changes recommended by OGC, and confirmed that no substantive change had been made to the original submission to this meeting. Associate Professor McCallum presented the proposal to the Sub-Committee, noting its previous approval in 2018. Amendments made this year allowed for clearer definition of some aspects of the proposal.

During discussion, the following was clarified concerning mature-age applicants:

- the entry requirements for mature age students is outlined in Section 5 of the Standard;
- To the Chair’s question of whether applications from those students who have not reached ‘mature age’ before they apply will be filtered out by the faculty, Scott Ward responded that all applications which have satisfied the requirements (the requirements having been approved by the School of Mathematics) will be considered.

The Admissions Sub-Committee endorsed the proposal for submission to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee.
Resolution ASC 2019/4-6
That the Admissions Sub-Committee recommend that the Academic Standards and Policy Committee endorse for submission to Academic Board:

(1) the proposal from Education Policy and Quality to amend the Admission Pre-requisite Standards – Mathematics; and

(2) the amendment of the Admission Pre-requisite Standards – Mathematics arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020.

4 ITEMS FOR NOTING

No items for noting had been submitted for this meeting.

5 OTHER BUSINESS

5.1 Comment Concerning Media Reporting of Mathematics Pre-requisites

The Chair of the Admissions Sub-Committee reported that during the week the campus morning mail contained a story referring to comments from the Chief Scientist concerning the lack of Mathematics prerequisites at universities in general, with the quote “Our universities need to indicate clearly to students what subjects are required to do well in a given course and reinstate the expectation of study at intermediate or advanced levels, particularly for entry into mathematics-based courses such as physics, engineering and all of the general-science courses, as well as other disciplines that depend on mathematics …”

5.2 Meeting Close

There being no other business, the meeting ended at 3.04 pm.

The Chair of the Admissions Sub-Committee thanked all in attendance for their accommodations in terms of endorsing the two papers for submission to Academic Board.
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RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 23 July 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 Tuesday 18 June 2019 and:

- noted that the Committee endorsed completed award course reviews from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences for the Master of Human Rights, Master of International Relations, Master of International Security, Master of International Studies, Master of Public Policy and Master of Peace and Conflict Studies; and
- noted that the Committee endorsed a completed award course review from the University of Sydney Business School for the Master of Management.

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 Tuesday 25 June 2019 and:

- approved the proposal to introduce the Academic Board Standing Orders, for adoption by the Academic Board;
- approved the proposal from Admissions to amend the Admissions Standards – English Language Proficiency;
- approved the recommendations of the report of the Dual and Joint Degrees Working Party;
- approved an increase in concessions for eligible Broadway Scheme applicants to a maximum of 10 points, approved the amendment of Part 7, 27 (2) of the Coursework Policy 2014, to reflect approved changes, and agreed to request a review of impact on numbers in early 2020 and analysis of success rates of the 2020 Broadway commencing cohort in early 2021; and
- endorsed the Subject Excellence Adjustment Scheme (Appendix 3) as a basis for ATAR adjustment factors based on individual subject performance to replace the existing (dormant) Flexible Entry Scheme adjustments for admission in 2020 and agreed to request by February 2020 the design for a new subject-based ATAR adjustment scheme to be deployed from 2021 and made explicit in the Coursework Policy 2014.

Items related to the Graduate Studies Committee
The Academic Board noted the report from meeting of the Graduate Studies Committee held on 18 June 2019 and:

- endorsed the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to delete the Doctor of Health Science, Master of Health Informatics, Master of Health Sciences (Medical Radiation Sciences), Master of Molecular Imaging, Master of Nuclear Medicine, Master of Orthoptics, Master of Radiation Therapy, Graduate Diploma of Health Sciences (Medical Radiation Sciences) and Graduate Certificate of Health Sciences (Medical Radiation Sciences) from the Resolutions of Senate for the Faculty of Health Sciences, and
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agreed to recommend that Senate approve the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate for the Faculty of Health Sciences, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Economic Analysis and embedded award courses and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from January 1, 2020;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences to amend the Master of Education and embedded award courses and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from Sydney Law School to amend the Juris Doctor and approve the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine & Health to amend the Master of Medicine and Master of Science in Medicine and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine & Health (Sydney Nursing School) to amend the Master of Nursing (Nurse Practitioner) and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine & Health and Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Master of Pharmacy, Graduate Certificate in Pharmacy Practice, Graduate Certificate in Evidence-Based Complementary Medicines, Master of Nursing (Nurse Practitioner), Master of Advanced Nursing Practice, Master of Emergency Nursing, Master of Intensive Care Nursing, Master of Mental Health Nursing, Master of Nursing, Master of Primary Health Care Nursing, Master of Advanced Surgery, Master of Surgery, Master of Medicine / Master of Science in Medicine (including new and variation units of study), Master of Clinical Trials Research, Doctor of Dental Medicine, Doctor of Clinical Dentistry, Master of Diagnostic Radiography, Master of Exercise Physiology, Master of Medical Imaging Science, Master of Occupational Therapy, Master of Physiotherapy, Master of Rehabilitation Counselling, Master of Speech Language Pathology and Master of Applied Science, approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, and approved the consequent amendment of the Resolutions of Faculty for the Faculty of Medicine and Health, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine & Health to amend the Master of Global Health / Master of Philosophy and Master of Public Health / Master of Philosophy combined award courses, and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine & Health to amend the Master of Health Policy / Master of Philosophy combined award course, and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- endorsed the creation of new HDR degree codes for all faculties and University schools, ensuring that these degree codes are linked to Table R; once the new degree codes have been created, agreed to permit the Director, Student Operations, to close existing degree codes for applications for admission to research degrees from 2021; and noted that the Director, Graduate Research, will lead a communications campaign to ensure current and prospective applicants are fully informed of the coursework programme;

- approved the guidelines for determining the inclusion of HDR coursework units of study in Table R and provided in-principle approval for the inclusion of the recommended units of study, as presented, with effect from 1 January 2021; and

- discussed the paper Improving HDR Supervision at the University of Sydney and noted the proposal from the DVC Education Portfolio to review the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013.

Items related to the Undergraduate Studies Committee
The Academic Board noted the report from the meeting of the Undergraduate Studies Committee held on 25 June 2019, and:

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering to amend the Bachelor of Advanced Computing and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering to amend the Bachelor of Engineering (Honours) Aeronautical, Biomedical, Mechanical and Mechatronic streams and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;
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- approved the proposal from Sydney Law School to amend the Bachelor of Laws and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine & Health and the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Pharmacy, Bachelor of Pharmacy (Honours), Bachelor of Pharmacy & Management, Bachelor of Pharmacy & Management (Honours), Bachelor of Arts / Master of Nursing, Bachelor of Nursing (Advanced Studies), Bachelor of Nursing (Honours), Bachelor of Science (Health) / Master of Nursing, Bachelor of Science / Master of Nursing, Bachelor of Oral Health, Bachelor of Applied Science (Diagnostic Radiography), Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise & Sport Science), Bachelor of Applied Science / Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Exercise & Sport Science), Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise Physiology), Bachelor of Applied Science (Occupational Therapy), Bachelor of Applied Science (Physiotherapy) and Bachelor of Applied Science (Speech Pathology), approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, and approved the consequent amendment of the Resolutions of Faculty for the Faculty of Medicine and Health, with effect from 1 January 2020; and
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Advanced Studies and approved amendment of the unit of study tables for the Table A majors Computer Science, Information Systems, and Software Development arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020.

Other matters
The Academic Board also:
- provided input into the mitigation status and trends in emerging risks to the work of the Academic Board;
- noted a presentation from the Director, Graduate Research, on the 2021 implementation of mandatory coursework for HDR candidates;
- received and noted the Reports of the Chair and of the Acting Vice-Chancellor;
- received and noted reports from the student members;
- approved 2020 meeting dates for the Academic Board, its committees and sub-committees;
- agreed to recommend that Senate approve the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate for the Faculties of Engineering and Medicine & Health;
- approved administrative changes to the course resolutions for all award courses delivered by Faculty of Medicine & Health to reflect the new organisational structure of the Faculty from 2020 and approved the introduction of Resolutions of the Faculty of Medicine & Health for Coursework Awards;
- approved the 2020 Academic Calendars for Sydney Dental School and Sydney Nursing School in the Faculty of Medicine & Health, with effect from 1 January 2020; and
- acknowledged the work of the Culture Taskforce and the new governance measures, as presented

The agenda pack for this meeting, excluding confidential items, is available from:

Associate Professor Tony Masters
Chair, Academic Board
Non-Confidential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Dr Glenys Eddy (Committee Officer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer/Approver</td>
<td>Associate Professor Tim Wilkinson (Chair, Admissions Sub-Committee), and Professor Jane Hanrahan (Chair, Academic Standards and Policy Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper title</td>
<td>Report of the Admissions Sub-Committee and supplementary Academic Standards and Policy Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To advise the Academic Standards and Policy Committee of the outcomes of the joint Admissions Sub-Committee and Academic Standards and Policy Committee’s supplementary meeting held on 16 July 2019.</td>
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**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Academic Standards & Policy Committee note the report of the joint Admissions Sub-Committee and Academic Standards and Policy Committee (supplementary) meeting held on 16 July 2019 and recommend that Academic Board:

1. approve an increase in concessions for eligible Broadway Scheme applicants to a maximum of 10 points, approve an in-principle amendment to Part 7, 27 (2) of the Coursework Policy 2014, to reflect approved changes, and approve a review of impact on numbers in early 2020 and analysis of success rates of the 2020 Broadway commencing cohort in early 2021;
2. approve the proposed application of ATAR Adjustment Factors for applicants with eligible subjects and band performance, approve the Subject Excellence Adjustment Scheme as a basis for ATAR adjustment factors based on individual subject performance to replace the existing (dormant) Flexible Entry Scheme adjustments for admission in 2020, request a report for noting at its next meeting on the design rationale for a transparent adjustment scheme to be developed by the end of July 2019 for deployment by UAC in the 2020 admission rounds, and request by February 2020 the design for a new subject-based ATAR adjustment scheme to be deployed from 2021 and made explicit in the Coursework Policy 2014.

That the Academic Standards & Policy Committee note the report of the Admissions Sub-Committee held on 16 July 2019 and:

1. endorse both the proposal from Education Policy and Quality to amend the Admission Pre-requisite Standards – Mathematics, and the amendment of the Admission Pre-requisite Standards – Mathematics arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020.

**ITEMS FOR DECISION**

7.1 **Admissions: Broadway Scheme – Review of Concession Points**

This item was considered in the joint meeting of the Admissions Sub-Committee and the Academic Standards and Policy Committee, and has been reported to the Academic Board for it meeting on 23 July 2019, in the ASPC report to the Academic Board for 16 July 2019 (Supplementary meeting).

The Admissions Sub-Committee and the Academic Standards and Policy Committee endorsed the proposal to amend the Broadway Scheme by amending the current maximum of 5 ATAR adjustment factor points to a maximum of 10. The adjustment factor points will be applied as sliding scale from 5 to 10 points based on assessment of the severity ranking, rather than the than the current process where all students who meet a severity ranking of 3 points receive 5 ATAR adjustment points. The Broadway Scheme’s current maximum of 5 is now below that of partner schemes offered by the University and lower than the maximum reduction offered by comparative EAS Schemes at
7.2 Admissions: ATAR Adjustment Factors (confidential)

This item was considered in the joint meeting of the Admissions Sub-Committee and the Academic Standards and Policy Committee, and has been reported to the Academic Board for it meeting on 23 July 2019, in the ASPC report to the Academic Board for 16 July 2019 (Supplementary meeting).

The Admissions Sub-Committee and the Academic Standards and Policy Committee endorsed the proposal to implement ATAR Adjustment Factors for applicants with eligible subjects and band performance. The Subject Excellence Adjustment Scheme would be a basis for ATAR adjustment factors and will replace the existing (dormant) Flexible Entry Scheme adjustments for admission in 2020. The Subject Excellence Adjustment Scheme will permit ATAR adjustments (where applicable) to students who have excelled in key disciplines at High School, namely, in High School Mathematics or Advanced English, or have undertaken more challenging HSC Mathematics and may have marginally missed the required selection rank as a result.

7.3 Education Strategy: Mathematics Admissions Standards

This item was discussed in the Admissions Sub-Committee only portion of the meeting, and is recommended to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee for endorsement.

The Admissions Sub-Committee endorsed the proposal to amend the Admission Pre-requisite Standards - Mathematics for a 2020 implementation. The proposed changes involve adding 'international applicants applying on the basis of Australian secondary study' to the coverage of section 3, permitting students entering on the basis of secondary studies to demonstrate mathematics standards by a pass or better in an approved mathematics prerequisite course, modifying Section 6 to apply to University of Sydney Preparation Program students for 2020 and to other approved preparation programs from 2021, and specifying that for entry on the basis of mathematics study within a preparation program, the standard must be equivalent to either a required NSW mathematics result or an approved mathematics prerequisite course.

Agenda papers for this meeting are available from the Manager of Governance (Academic Board and Senate), Alyssa White, at: alyssa.white@sydney.edu.au.
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the action of the Chair of the Academic Board in approving amendments to the Assessment Procedures at the request of the Executive Director of Student Administration and consider the revised Assessment Procedures.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Student Administrative Services 2017 Internal Audit included recommendations to amend the Assessment Procedures 2011. The proposed amendments relate to examinations and include simplifying clause 10 Evacuation procedures during examinations and modernising clause 11 Use of hand held devices during exams.

The proposed emergency evacuation procedure clearly identifies the decision makers, defines and differentiates between simple and complex evacuation scenarios and introduces a time-based rule for resuming and abandoning examinations. Existing references to the Registrar are updated to the Deputy-Vice Chancellor (Education). These changes improve consistency in student experience, improve the operational efficiency of the evacuation procedure, minimise the involvement of academics in “real time” operational decisions and minimise the impact of an evacuation on students and the exam event.

The procedure for the use of hand held devices during examinations is modernised to include computers; electronic communication and recording devices; items with internet connectivity; and or items with smart technology capability. This brings the procedure in line with current technologies and devices prohibited in examinations.

Following consideration by the University’s Audit committee of these audit recommendations, the Executive Director of Student Administration requested that the Academic Board urgently approve the proposed amendments to the Assessment Procedures and a proposed Procedure for amendments to student results.

The Chairs of the Academic Board Committees and student representatives from the SRC and SUPRA were of the unanimous view that we should have the draft in place if the audit has identified issues.

At the meeting of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee of 25 June 2019, a draft of the Assessment Procedures was tabled. It was recommended a further re-draft of the Procedures be prepared and submitted to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee for approval prior to submission to the Office of General Counsel for recording on the Policy Register.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Assessment Procedures 2011 Examinations Office Proposed Amendments
1 Purpose and application

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

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

2 Commencement

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

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

3 Interpretation

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

   Note: See clause 5 of the policy.

(2) In these procedures:

   academic unit means a faculty, University school, board of studies, school, of the University.
   assessment rubrics means marking guides that state the criteria against which an assessment will be marked.
Dean means:
- In relation to a faculty, the Dean of the relevant faculty;
- In relation to a University school, the Head of School and Dean of the relevant University school

due date means the later of:
- the date originally specified for submission of a piece of assigned work or any amended date;
- the date specified for submission of a piece of assigned work after grant of a simple extension under clause 14A; or
- the date specified for submission of a piece of assigned work after a grant of special consideration, special arrangements or reasonable adjustments

examination means the final examination of a unit of study, which is held during the formal examination period

Examinations Office means the University administrative unit responsible for the management of all examinations held during the formal examination period

Faculty means a faculty or a University school.

formal examination period means weeks 15 and 16 of each semester

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

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

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

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

Note: See also the University Recordkeeping Manual

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

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

Note: See clause 7
Student Identification Number means the unique identification number assigned to each student upon their first enrolment at the University.

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

4 Application of implementation statements to assessment principles

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

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

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

(1) Standards or levels of expected performance should be described for assessment tasks in sufficient detail that students can improve the quality of their work.

(2) Standards should typically be defined in the context of the discipline, course or level of the unit.

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

Note: See also the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(11) Where possible, assessments should be designed to enable students to apply feedback provided for an earlier task to a later task. This is particularly relevant to first year units.
(12) Feedback on student work, either individually or in a group, should be sufficiently
detailed to be a useful identification of strengths and areas for improvement, yet
not so detailed as to discourage self-reliance in learning and assessment.

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

6 Informing students – Principles 1 and 2

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

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

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

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

(c) an assessment table, with:

(i) the weighting of items and of tasks or papers;
(ii) the due date for submission or testing;
(iii) the conditions under which examinations will be sat;

(d) the conditions for extensions of time (if any); and

(e) the penalties for lateness or violation of assessment specifications (e.g.
length).

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note: See clause 11A of these procedures, and clause 66A of the Coursework Policy
2014.
7 Marking and determination of grades – Principles 2 and 3

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

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

Note: See Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

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

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

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

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

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

(b) If samples involve examples of real students’ work, then a copy of the signed permission of the student author must be kept for as long as the example is used for this purpose.

(c) When it is not possible to provide samples of work, a suitable description of the task and expected standards associated with different levels of achievement should be provided.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(10) Due account must be taken of any special consideration granted under clause 67, and reasonable adjustment under clause 68, of the policy.
7A Late penalties

(1) Subject to any contrary provision in any applicable faculty or course resolution, if penalties are applied for work submitted after the due date they must be consistent with this clause.

(2) For any assessment task:
   (a) late penalties may be applied, consistently with this clause; or
   (b) late submission may be prohibited, with consequences as specified in the unit of study outline; or
   (c) late penalties may be excluded from applying;

   provided that these conditions must be expressly stated in the unit of study outline.

(3) Written work submitted electronically after 11.59 pm on the due date will be considered to have been submitted late.

(4) For every calendar day up to and including ten calendar days after the due date, a penalty of 5% of the maximum awardable marks will be applied to late work.
   (a) The penalty will be calculated by first marking the work, and then subtracting 5% of the maximum awardable mark for each calendar day after the due date.

(5) For work submitted more than ten calendar days after the due date a mark of zero will be awarded. The marker may elect to, but is not required to, provide feedback on such work.

(6) Copies of late work, including work which is not marked, must be retained consistently with the requirements of the Recordkeeping Policy 2017 and the Recordkeeping Manual.

Note: See also University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2016

8 Conduct of examinations - Principles 1 to 4

(1) The principal examiner is responsible for:
   (a) complying with and completing all administrative requirements for the examination by the specified deadline;
   (b) providing the examination paper to the Examinations Office by the specified deadline;
   (c) securing working papers developed in preparation for examinations; and
   (d) accounting for all secure papers.

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

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

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

(5) All examinations other than those which include non-written elements must be administered by the Examinations Office.
(6) In relation to all examinations, the Examinations Office is responsible for:
   (a) managing examination venue bookings;
   (b) security protocol and printing examination papers;
   (c) retaining final examination papers in the University archives;
   (d) scheduling examinations generally;
   (e) scheduling examinations in postgraduate coursework units of study, as far as practicable, at times consistent with class times; and
   (f) recruiting and training examination invigilators; and
   (f)(g) preventing students from leaving the examination venue with examination materials.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(17) In relation to written examinations administered other than by the Examinations Office, the principal examiner is responsible for:

(a) providing the Examinations Office with all necessary information to schedule the examination, within the timeframes specified by the Examinations Office;
(b) arranging the Examinations Office to book an appropriate examination venue;
(c) arranging secure printing and storage of examination papers;
(d) providing a copy of the final examination paper to the Examinations office for retention in the University archives; and
(e) arranging for invigilation of the examination by University trained invigilators.

9 Security of examination papers - Principles 1 to 4

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

10 Emergency evacuations during examinations - Principles 1 to 4

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

(a) invigilators must:
(i) should make a note of the time at which the examination is stopped; and
(ii) should adhere to the instructions of precinct officers or security staff; Campus Security staff and emergency services;

(b) the relevant precinct officer must, if time permits, should attempt to contact the Examinations Office to inform them of the evacuation.

(2) Precinct officers and or security staff will direct students and invigilators to an appropriate area, where they must await further information. Unless otherwise instructed by precinct officers or security staff, students must remain in the immediate vicinity.

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

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

(a) as brief as possible; and
(b) under the direction and supervision of an examination invigilator.

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

(a) the principal examiner
(b) the relevant dean;
(c) the director of the Student Centre; and
(d) the Registrar.

(6) The relevant delegate will determine whether the examination is to be resumed at the earliest opportunity, or whether it must be re-sat by the affected students.

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

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

(9) the relevant delegate referred to in subclause 10(6) of these procedures is not available; or

(4) If an emergency evacuation affects one or more examination venues, the Examinations Office will:

(a) determine to resume the examination if:

(i) 30 minutes or less has elapsed since the time of evacuation; and
(ii) Campus Security or emergency services have confirmed that it is safe to do so;

or

(b) determine to abandon the examination if:

(i) more than 30 minutes has elapsed since the time of evacuation;
(ii) Campus Security or emergency services advise that the venue is not safe for the examination to resume; or, the emergency or evacuation has compromised the examination room itself.

(iii) 

(4) Immediately after a decision to resume or When a decision is taken to abandon an examination, the Examinations Office will notify the following by email:

(a) the principal examiner;
(b) all relevant Associate Deans (Education);
(c) the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education); and
(d) all relevant precinct officers.

(5) Invigilators will:

(a) inform students of the decision to resume or abandon the examination; and
(b) if the examination is abandoned, advise students that:

(i) the Examinations Office will contact them through their University email account about arrangements for a replacement examination; and
(ii) they must remain close to campus until they receive confirmation from the Examinations Office, because they may be required to re-sit the examination on the same day and not depart before 6pm on that day unless otherwise advised.

(6) If an examination is resumed, invigilators will allow students the full time lost to the emergency evacuation plus an additional five minutes, to compensate for the disruption.

(7) When an examination is abandoned:

(a) students’ work (such as answer booklets or computer answer sheets) is deemed null and void for the purposes of marking;

(b) the principal examiner will arrange for the faculty to retain the examination work until the end of the next semester after the examination; and

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

(8) If the original examination paper has been compromised the principal examiner must either:

(a) instruct the Examinations Office to use the replacement examination paper; or
(b) provide the Examinations Office with a new examination paper (or select to use the replacement exam paper) if the original examination paper was compromised by an emergency evacuation.

(10) If the replacement examination paper is used, the principal examiner must provide the Examinations Office with a third paper by COB close of business Monday week 18, for use in the will be required for any exams in the replacement examination period. The primary examiner must provide the Examinations Office with a new examination paper if the original examination paper was compromised by an emergency evacuation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

11 Use of handheld computing devices in examinations - Principle 3

(1) Personal computers, electronic communication devices, recording devices, items with internet connectivity, Bluetooth connectivity or smart technology capability, handheld computing devices, including computers, calculators and internet-capable devices, are not normally permitted in examinations. This includes, but is not limited to:

(a) laptop computers;
(b) mobile phones;
(c) tablet computers;
(d) smart watches; and
(a) headphones, earphones or earbuds.

(2) Students who bring such devices must switch them off and leave them in their bags or under their desk in the examination venue.

(3) Invigilators must report any use or attempted use of an unauthorised device in an examination.

(4) Faculties may develop examinations and assessments in which such devices are permitted but in doing so must consider the equity, supervisory and logistical implications of their use.
(5) The University adopts the approved calculator list for 2 Unit Mathematics issued by the NSW Board of Studies from time to time as its list of non-programmable calculators acceptable for use in examinations at the University.

(a) A copy of this list is available on the University website: [https://sydney.edu.au/students/exams/](https://sydney.edu.au/students/exams/)

(15) Students must have non-programmable calculators approved by the Student Centre before they can be used in an examination.

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

(17) A copy of this list must be provided to students available on the university website. [Insert link].

(6) Students sitting examinations which permit use of non-programmable calculators; principal examiners who specify that non-programmable calculators may be used by candidates for their papers; and examination invigilators.

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

(a) Students must take any who own a non-programmable calculator which they wish to use in an appropriate examination may take the unit to the Examinations Office/Student Centre for approval before the examination, where the unit will be marked indelibly if it is approved for use.

12 Accessible examination and assessment arrangements - Principle 3

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

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

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

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

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

(6) Adjustments applicable to the formal examination period also apply to, and must be provided in, the replacement examination period.
(7) In-faculty-coordinated examinations, tests, take home tests, within-semester assessments, practical and oral assessments are managed by the faculty. Faculty responsibilities include:

(a) notifying students in a timely manner of
   (i) the confirmed adjustments or arrangements; and
   (ii) the time and location of any adjusted examination;
(b) providing notified adjustments and accommodations, including supervision, scribes or equipment;
   Note: Disability Services provides assistance with specialist equipment, ergonomic furniture and access to assistive technology, and can also provide a list of trained scribes and invigilators.
(c) providing adjustments or arrangements to the original examination or assessment for any replacement assessment, unless the form of assessment has changed, in which case Disability Services must be notified.

(8) The provision of reasonable adjustments or accessible arrangements does not preclude a student from claiming special consideration due to illness or misadventure.
   Note: See also clause 14 of these procedures and clause 67 of the policy.

(a) All requests for special consideration and special arrangements are managed by the Student Administration Services (SAS) Professional Services Unit (PSU).
   Note: See schedule 3 of these procedures

13 Special arrangements for assessment or examinations - Principle 3

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

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

(3) A student seeking special arrangements for assessment or examination should make a request:
   (a) in the case of religious commitments that might have an impact on the types of assessment or examination they can undertake, at the date of commencement of semester; and
   (b) in the case of other types of commitment, as soon as the student becomes aware of a requirement to be absent from the University.

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

(5) Late requests for special arrangements for assessment or examination will be considered only where the student provides a reasonable explanation for the delay.
(6) Requests for special arrangements for examinations must be lodged, with all necessary forms and supporting documentation, no later than the close of business 14 days after the publication of the examination timetable.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(8) Students requesting special arrangements must provide contact details for those individuals or organisations providing supporting documentation, so that further information or advice may be obtained.

14 Special consideration due to illness, injury or misadventure - Principle 3

(1) All requests for special consideration will be considered in the same manner across the University, although the response may vary according to the circumstances.

(a) Schedule 3 to these procedures prescribes the standard responses to the most common circumstances.

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

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

(4) Requests for special consideration should be lodged no later than three working days after the assessment.

(a) Where circumstances preclude this, a student may still request special consideration but must provide a reasonable explanation for the delay.

(b) The University will not decline a request on the grounds of late lodgement where a reasonable explanation is provided.

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

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

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

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

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

(9) A student may withdraw a request for special consideration made prior to, during or immediately after an assessment (usually an examination) at any time prior to the earlier of:
   (a) release of results for that assessment; or
   (b) completion of a replacement assessment.

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

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

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

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

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

(a) Replacement assessment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(vii) If the student is unable to attempt the second replacement assessment due to injury, illness or misadventure, previously approved exchange or study abroad commitments, or compulsory experiential placement, the relevant delegate will award the student a DC grade (i.e. discontinue not to count as failure).

(viii) If the faculty is unable to arrange any form of appropriate or appropriately timed second replacement assessment, the relevant delegate will award the student a DC grade (i.e. discontinue not to count as failure).

(b) Extension.

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

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

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

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

(c) **Reweighting or averaging.**

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

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

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

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

(a) **Consideration must be given to the interests of:**

(i) the member(s) suffering the illness, injury or misadventure; and

(ii) the remaining group members whose ability to complete the task as originally assigned may be impacted, and may therefore also be considered to have suffered a form of misadventure. Ideally special consideration requests should be submitted by all affected parties.

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

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

(d) If the relevant delegate considers that the group can no longer function, the assessment task will be redefined for the remaining active members, based on the contributions they were to make.

(i) Assessment will then be based on the redefined task.

(ii) The lecturer or teacher may also allow an extension of time.

(iii) The group member(s) who suffered the illness, injury or misadventure will, if their request is accepted, be given an alternative assessment.

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

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

14A Simple extensions - Principle 3

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

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

15 Processing and release of results - Principles 1 to 4

(1) The Registrar will determine in advance, and publish, dates for release of results to students. The Registrar may also determine, and publish the determination, that results for a specific unit of study be released on an earlier date than the originally determined date, if requested to do so by the relevant dean or associate dean.

(2) Principal examiners must:
   (a) assemble all marks and records of assessment for the unit of study;
   (b) ensure security of marks;
   (c) arrange the collation of marks;
   (d) verify the returned result from evidence such as mark sheets, annotated examination scripts, and minutes of meetings in case an appeal process requires such evidence;
   (e) submit the results to the relevant head of academic unit by the required date; and
   (f) keep appropriate records to justify the final mark.

   Note: See Recordkeeping Manual.

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

(4) Late results must be:
   (a) approved by the head of the relevant academic unit;
   (b) entered into the student management system as soon as they become available; and
   (c) released as soon as possible after the release date determined by the Registrar.
(5) Changes to marks or grades after entry into the student management system must be:
   (a) approved by the relevant delegate after consideration of an explanation for the change;
   (b) submitted and entered in the manner specified by the Registrar; and
   (c) released as soon as possible after the release date determined by the Registrar.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

16 Appeals - Principles 1 to 4

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

(2) If an appeal is made:
   (a) all documentation relevant to that student’s assessment must be placed on the student’s appeal file;
   (b) all other annotated scripts must be retained together for each examination for the appeal period;
   (c) mark sheets must be retained for 12 months; and
   (d) minutes of meetings must be centrally filed.
17 Professional development - Principles 2 and 4

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

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

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

18 Effectiveness of assessment policies - Principle 4

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

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

(b) through information available from Academic Board faculty reviews; and

(c) through feedback from students on assessment (directly and via unit of study evaluations and related feedback tools).
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 3(2)</td>
<td>Definitions added for examination, Examinations Office, formal examination period, replacement examination period, Student Identification Number and test Definitions amended for academic unit, peer assessment, self assessment, standards-based assessment and test</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
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<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 6(1)</td>
<td>Additional details added including updated references to other relevant documents and details regarding assessment tables</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
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<tr>
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<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
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<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses 7(3) (4), 8(4) (15) (16) (17), 14(13)(a)</td>
<td>Amendments to clarify requirements regarding replacement examinations and to reflect changes in terminology</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 2</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 11A</td>
<td>Former clause 11A deleted and relocated to become clause 14A</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 14A</td>
<td>Former clause 11A becomes clause 14A</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 7(4)(b)</td>
<td>Clause deleted</td>
<td>6 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 7(4)(c)</td>
<td>Former clause 7(4)(c) deleted and relocated to become clause 7(4)(a)</td>
<td>6 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses 14(2) and 14(2)(a)</td>
<td>Amendments including addition of new clause for schedule 3</td>
<td>6 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 13(c)(iii)</td>
<td>Amendment to clarify weighting of regular assessment components</td>
<td>6 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 17(3)</td>
<td>Reference to Institute for Teaching and Learning changed to Educational Innovation</td>
<td>6 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 2</td>
<td>‘Closing date’ column added</td>
<td>6 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 3</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>6 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 3; notes</td>
<td>Administrative amendments only</td>
<td>20 April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Reference to By-law changed to University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016</td>
<td>20 April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 3</td>
<td>Administrative amendments only</td>
<td>4 May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 3</td>
<td>Administrative amendments only to footnote 2 and 4</td>
<td>23 May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10(6); 14(13)(a)(iv)-(v)</td>
<td>Consequential amendments arising from University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016</td>
<td>10 October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14(1)</td>
<td>Rescinded</td>
<td>10 October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3; 7(5); 9(4); 10(12); 10(15)(b); 11(2); 12(4); 15(8); 15(2)(d); 16(2)(d); Schedule 3</td>
<td>Consequential amendments arising from organisational design changes</td>
<td>10 October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 12</td>
<td>Amendments including addition of new clauses covering conduct of examinations and role of Disability Services</td>
<td>10 October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 13 (a)(i) and 9v</td>
<td>Amended to clarify possibility of replacement assessment</td>
<td>10 October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Commencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 3</td>
<td>Administrative amendments only</td>
<td>10 October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 3(2)</td>
<td>Definition added for due date</td>
<td>1 January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 7A</td>
<td>Added to stipulate a common system of late penalties</td>
<td>1 January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO BE COMPLETED</td>
<td>Added responsibility to prevent students leaving an exam with exam materials</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 8(6)</td>
<td>New subclause 8(6)(g) added</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 10 (1) to (10)</td>
<td>Full re-write of the emergency evacuations during examinations procedure</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substituted</td>
<td>Clause deleted and replaced.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 11 (1); (3); (5)(a)</td>
<td>Updates to types of electronic devices permitted in examinations, Added procedures for personal devices in examinations, how to have calculators approved and the link to the approved calculator list. Subclause 11(1) deleted. New subclauses 11(1) – (3) added. New subclause 11(5)(a) added. Clause 11 renumbered accordingly.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SCHEDULE 1 – IMPLEMENTATION TABLE**

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

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

4. Assessment practices must be continuously improved and updated

(1) Assessment tasks and outcomes are moderated through academic peer review and used to inform subsequent practice.

(2) Assessment is regularly updated to ensure alignment with program learning outcomes or graduate attributes.

(3) Professional development opportunities that are related to design, implementation and moderation of assessment are provided to staff.
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**SCHEDULE 2 – STANDARD ASSESSMENT TABLE FOR ALL NEW UNITS OF STUDY COMMENCING SEMESTER 1, 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment title</th>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Example of Assessment type</th>
<th>Description of Assessment type</th>
<th>Exam / Quiz type</th>
<th>Individual or Group</th>
<th>Length / duration</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Due date and time</th>
<th>Closing date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free format text to name each assessment</td>
<td>Exam</td>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td>Written exam, written exam with non-written elements, or non-written exam, however administered. Worth 30% or greater.</td>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Due date may be expressed as a time period when exact date not known e.g. final exam period, week 7. Time to be included where assessment must be submitted by a cut-off time e.g. 23:59 EST.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of assessment task</td>
<td></td>
<td>In-semester exam</td>
<td>Written exam, written exam with non-written elements, or non-written exam, however administered. Worth 30% or greater.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Valid values for individual assessments (see note over page)**

- **Exam**
  - Final exam
  - In-semester exam

- **Skills-based assessment**
  - Placements
  - Skills base evaluation
  - Creative assessments / demonstrations

**Academic Standards and Policy Committee**
13 August 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment title</th>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Example of Assessment type</th>
<th>Description of Assessment type</th>
<th>Exam / Quiz type</th>
<th>Individual or Group</th>
<th>Length / duration</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Due date and time¹</th>
<th>Closing date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of assessment task</td>
<td>Submitted work</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Essay, report, case study, proposal, literature review, portfolio, or design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of assessment task</td>
<td>In-class assessments</td>
<td>Tutorial quiz, small test or online task</td>
<td>Worth less than 30%.</td>
<td>Tutorial quiz, small test or online task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small continuous assessment</td>
<td>Worth less than 30%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Oral presentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional assignment or small test</td>
<td>Includes formative assessments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Optional small test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of assessment task</td>
<td>Group work</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Written, non-written elements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

A special consideration report listing all assessments and the form of consideration granted is available to UOS Coordinators.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</th>
<th>Assessment description</th>
<th>Form of consideration</th>
<th>Conditions for standard decision</th>
<th>SAS</th>
<th>Faculty, University school, or school</th>
<th>UOS Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td>Written exam</td>
<td>Replacement exam</td>
<td>Final exam scheduled and managed centrally</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Where the student is unable to attempt the replacement exam and a valid form of replacement assessment or alternative means of assessment is not possible, award a grade of DC (discontinue not to count as failure) if appropriate</td>
<td>Provide replacement exam paper by specified deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule and manage replacement exam</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manage and implement Disability Services adjustments</td>
<td>Construct a valid form of replacement assessment or an alternative means of assessment where the student is unable to attempt the replacement exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category</td>
<td>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, or school</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td>Written exam with non-written elements or non-written exam</td>
<td>Replacement exam</td>
<td>Final and replacement exams may be managed by faculty, University, school, or school</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>For final and replacement exams managed by faculty, University school, or school the relevant area will schedule and manage the exam including managing and implementing Disability Services adjustments and informing the student of the schedule</td>
<td>Provide final and replacement exam paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For exams managed centrally, SAS will: Schedule and manage final and replacement exam; Manage and implement Disability Services adjustments; and Inform student of the schedule</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where the student is unable to attempt the replacement exam and a valid form of replacement assessment or alternative means of assessment is not possible, award a grade of DC (discontinue not to count as failure) if appropriate</td>
<td>Construct a valid form of replacement assessment or an alternative means of assessment where the student is unable to attempt the replacement exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category</td>
<td>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, or school</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>In-semester exam</td>
<td>Written exam, worth 30% or greater (refer to section 14.13(c)(iii) above)</td>
<td>Replacement exam for in-semester exam</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, or school</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exam type could be any of the following: written exam, written exam with non-written elements, or non-written exam, however administered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule and manage replacement exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide replacement exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inform student of replacement exam schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manage and implement Disability Services adjustments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills based assessment</td>
<td>Placements</td>
<td>Professional experience placement, internship, or site visit</td>
<td>New or varied placement</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, or school</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills based evaluation</td>
<td>Clinical skills assessment or lab skills assessment</td>
<td>New or varied evaluation</td>
<td>Not on “non-repeatable” list</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills based evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule and inform student of new or varied placement details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills based evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Academic Standards and Policy Committee 13 August 2019*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</th>
<th>Assessment description</th>
<th>Form of consideration</th>
<th>Conditions for standard decision</th>
<th>SAS</th>
<th>Faculty, University school, or school</th>
<th>UOS Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills based assessment</td>
<td>Skills based evaluation based assessment</td>
<td>Clinical skills assessment or lab skills assessment</td>
<td>Alternative assessment</td>
<td>On “non-repeatable” list (e.g. evaluations with specialised resource requirements)</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Determine appropriate alternative assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative assessments/ demonstrations</td>
<td>Performance, recital or jury-assessment performance, or exhibition</td>
<td>New or varied evaluation</td>
<td>Not on “non-repeatable” list</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Schedule and inform student of alternative assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative assessments/ demonstrations</td>
<td>Performance, recital, jury-assessment performance, or exhibition</td>
<td>Alternative evaluation</td>
<td>On “non-repeatable” list, (e.g. assessments/ demonstrations with specialised resource requirements)</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Determine appropriate alternative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative assessments/ demonstrations</td>
<td>Performance, recital, jury-assessment performance, or exhibition</td>
<td>Alternative evaluation</td>
<td>On “non-repeatable” list, (e.g. assessments/ demonstrations with specialised resource requirements)</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Schedule and inform student of alternative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category</td>
<td>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, or school</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted work</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Essay, report case study, proposal, literature review, portfolio or design</td>
<td>Extension of time (refer to section 14.13(b) above)</td>
<td>1. Impacted period is 20 or fewer working days (refer to section 14.13(b)(iii) above) and 2. The new due date is prior to the return date.</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report Apply extension of time to due date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honours Thesis</td>
<td>Non-HDR thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 New due date is the revised submission date for the assessment.
3 Return date refers to the date when an assignment or the answers are returned to the cohort and is usually within 10 working days (14 calendar days) from the original due date of the assessment, unless otherwise specified by the faculty or University school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</th>
<th>Assessment description</th>
<th>Form of consideration</th>
<th>Conditions for standard decision</th>
<th>SAS</th>
<th>Faculty, University school, or school</th>
<th>UOS Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Essay, report, case study, proposal, literature review, portfolio or design</td>
<td>Determined by faculty or University school</td>
<td>1. Impacted period is more than 20 working days (refer to section 14.13(b)(iv) above) or 2. The new due date is the revised submission date for the assessment.</td>
<td>Refer to UOS Coordinator for form of consideration</td>
<td>Where the student is unable to attempt the replacement assessment or alternative means of assessment is not possible, award a grade of DC (discontinue not to count as failure) if appropriate</td>
<td>Determine appropriate form of consideration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Thesis</td>
<td>Non-HDR thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where the student is unable to attempt the replacement assessment or alternative means of assessment is not possible, award a grade of DC (discontinue not to count as failure) if appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class assessments</td>
<td>Tutorial quiz, small test or online task</td>
<td>Worth less than 30% Students will be encouraged</td>
<td>Mark adjustment (refer to section Not on “no mark adjustment allowed” list</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 New due date is the revised submission date for the assessment.
5 Return date refers to the date when an assignment or the answers are returned to the cohort and is usually within 10 working days (14 calendar days) from the original due date of the assessment, unless otherwise specified by the faculty or University school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</th>
<th>Assessment description</th>
<th>Form of consideration</th>
<th>Conditions for standard decision</th>
<th>SAS</th>
<th>Faculty, University school, or school</th>
<th>UOS Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small continuous assessment</td>
<td>to check with their unit of study coordinator if any repeat sessions will be available before submitting a special consideration application.</td>
<td>14.13(c) above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make mark adjustment (re-weight, average etc.) Provide an alternative assessment where a student has missed more than one third of the regular assessment components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial quiz, small quiz, small test or online task</td>
<td>Worth less than 30% (refer to section)</td>
<td>New or varied assessment</td>
<td>On &quot;no mark adjustment allowed&quot; list</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category</td>
<td>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, or school</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small continuous assessment</td>
<td>14.13(c)(iii) above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
<td>New or varied</td>
<td>Select standard form of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consideration from</td>
<td>consideration from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-class assessments</td>
<td>Optional assignment</td>
<td>Includes formative</td>
<td>Download special consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or small test</td>
<td>assessments</td>
<td>report</td>
<td></td>
<td>report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td>Schedule and inform student of new or varied presentation details</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule and inform student of new or varied presentation details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide alternative assessment if new or varied presentation is unable to be provided</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide alternative assessment if new or varied presentation is unable to be provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment type (refer to section 14 above)</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, or school</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group work</td>
<td>Group work</td>
<td>Group work</td>
<td>Group work</td>
<td>Group work</td>
<td>Group work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee:
- note this update about the policy amendment process; and,
- discuss and endorse the draft Student Charter.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The enclosed Student Charter has been drafted as an outcome of a process to review the existing Code of Conduct for Students 2005 (the Code) (Attachment 1). A review of the Code was led during the first half of 2019 by the interim Pro Vice-Chancellor (Student Life) under the auspices of the University Executive Student Life Committee. Drafting of a Student Charter is now being undertaken as part of the Student Experience Program of work, in accordance with strategic initiative E1.4 of the Student Experience Strategy.

The Student Experience Program aims to ensure student-centricity is embedded as a core principle across the University, creating an environment designed to optimise the likelihood of success for all students. This design principle is core to the proposed Student Charter (Attachment 2). Drafting of this document has been guided by input and feedback received from both staff and students.

The scope for a revised policy was developed with input from student representative organisations during February and March 2019 and agreed by the Student Life committee and other standing committees of the University Executive, including the Education, College Consultative, Student Consultative and Student Life committees. Themes that emerged from that consultation process were further explored during a student-led discussion at the Academic Board during April (Attachment 3) and a moderated online University-wide C-sight forum with the student body during May, which was conducted by Pax Republic in order to allow participating students to remain anonymous.

BACKGROUND

Part 4 of the Student Experience Strategy (E1.4) commits the University to developing a new, more student-centric 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 review of the Code of Conduct for Students 2005 (the Code) (Attachment 1) was led by the interim Pro Vice-Chancellor (Student Life) under the auspices of the University Executive Student Life Committee.

Proposed changes to the current Code of Conduct for Students (2005) were brought forward to the standing committees of the University Executive for feedback during March; including the Education, College Consultative, Student Consultative and Student Life committees. Scope was also agreed with student representatives and case workers from the Student Representative Council (SRC), Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association (SUPRA) and the University Student Union (USU).

Dialogue at the University committees about the Code during March and April identified a number of themes which were further explored via consultation with staff and students. To achieve this, a student representative-led forum was held at the Academic Board on 16 April and feedback from the membership was received via Mentimeter (Attachment 3). Additionally, an anonymous online ‘C-sight’ forum was run by Pax Republic from 8 – 15 May. 10,000 invitations were sent to current students inviting them to participate and approximately 200 students opted to participate.
Non-Confidential

Four topics were explored in the C-sight forum:

- The Code: what's in, what's out – to get feedback on the code as it stands now
- Culture of Integrity – seeking students’ views on what acting with integrity means
- Freedom of Speech – discussing whether or not there should be constraints on the freedom of speech
- What kind of University community do you want to be part of?” – talking about views of what makes a positive, learning culture.

ISSUES

Design principles
The Student Experience Program aims to ensure student-centricity is embedded as a core principle across the University, creating an environment designed to optimise the likelihood of success for all students. This design principle has been core to both the review of the Code of Conduct for Students 2005 and subsequent drafting of the new Student Charter (Attachment 2). Drafting of the attached draft Student Charter has been guided by feedback from staff and students as follows.

Accessibility
Early in 2019, the UE Student Life and other UE committees endorsed a proposal that the Code would be recast to be more accessible and collegiate in tone. They agreed statements such as “students must” and “the University expects students to” will, where possible, be removed with the aim of reflecting staff and students’ agency and that more accessible language will be used. Supporting that approach, the following advice was received via student presentations at the Academic Board during April:

- There is a desire for the current Code to become shorter, more concise and consist of plainer, more simplified language.
- There is a request from students for interpretive materials and case studies illustrating the University’s standards as set out in the policy, which is supported by staff so long as the original intent is not subverted.
- There is an imperative for the new policy to be distributed to students via email upon enrolment; and then reiterated periodically.

Comments made during the C-sight forum similarly indicate students’ desire for a policy which has increased prominence and visibility. For instance:

“Maybe it’s because I’m an international student or maybe because our campus is isolated from main, but it’s wasn’t aware that this existed. Of course, I know there ought to be a student handbook and of sorts but shouldn’t something like a brief on this be done on first day of classes? Something like “Consent Matters”.

Purpose and function
During the first part of 2019, the Student Life committee and other standing committees of the University Executive agreed that the Code should be revised with the aim of reaching a concise expression of principles and values. They endorsed the approach that a revised policy point to, rather than replicate, other University statutes, policies and procedures; and that procedural responsibilities which are set out in guidelines elsewhere should be removed. Supporting that advice, the following feedback was received from students and staff at the Academic Board in April:

- There is support for an aspirational tone and for the document to be structured around building shared values as a basis for partnership between the University and its students.
- The basis for student discipline also needs to be considered and the new policy needs to be carefully structured to balance this function with the above.
- Regulation of University standards and procedures can be covered in linked policy and procedure instruments, which the new policy will point to but not duplicate. There was support for removal of procedural details such as an obligation for students to monitor communications from the University, so long as students understand they remain responsible for meeting those requirements.
- University obligations that are included in the document need to be viable where there are resource implications, this includes provision of student support services.
The Pax C-sight forum that was held during May canvassed the role of University policy in setting out standards of student behaviour, in the context of freedom of speech:

"[on campus] There have been examples of people being abused for sharing and standing up for their (unpopular) point of view…. It is not OK to treat people disrespectfully if you disagree with their point of view. By all means share your point of view, but respect other people’s right to have a different point of view. This is what creates a truly rich, diverse community."

### Joint responsibilities

During early 2019, the Student Life and other UE committees endorsed that a revised Code of Conduct for Students will set out a partnership between the University and its students and define our mutual obligations in building a culture of freedom, respect and the pursuit of knowledge. They endorsed that University values, as set out in the University’s 2016-20 Strategic Plan, form the basis for that partnership. Additionally, the following feedback was received from staff and student representatives at the Academic Board in April:

- Rather than a revised Code of Conduct for Students, a new Student Charter is supported by the student body. Student representatives feel this is a more collegiate title for a document that sets out terms of a partnership between the University and its students.
- There is support for, and a desire to, structure the document around the University values.
- Students and staff have joint-responsibility and obligations in upholding the values and standards of the community, which are central to the University’s reputation.
- Staff and students contribute equally to creating a supportive learning environment and in upholding academic standards.
- There was discussion about rights versus the term ‘responsibilities’. The latter gives students more agency than the term ‘rights’, which is more binding and legalistic in tone.
- Acting lawfully doesn’t need to be reiterated in policy and is seen by students as too low a baseline for expected standards of behaviour. Instead there is a desire for the policy to emphasise broader shared educational, social and ethical responsibilities within the University community.

During the C-sight forum in May there were comments from students that were strongly supportive of a Student Charter that constructs a partnership between the University and its students:

"Almost every other university possesses a student charter instead of a code of conduct. A Code of Conduct that sets expectations on students without similarly detailing what students may expect of the university is simply unfair. The present expectations in the code of conduct are so wide ranging as to allow almost anything to be defined as a breach of the code of conduct should it be deemed so. This needs to be a proper "social contract" between the university and the students, not a set of laws set by the university upon students."

There was demand from students for the policy to demonstrate commitment to a set of institutional values:

"Also....if the uni can’t come and take some pretty basic human rights stances...like 'women and men are equal'.....'we stand on aboriginal land'....which the uni already does....one has to ask whether they're more concerned with profit or 'not rocking the boat' than they are having some kind of set of principles they're willing to stick to."

Thirdly, in exploring joint responsibilities between the University and the student body, students participating in the C-sight conversation also drew strong comparison between student agency and academic and personal integrity:

“For me academic integrity means investing as much as possible effort and passion into conscientious learning and development, making the uni experience as deep and engaging, as possible both from students and from the academic staff.”

“I commend the University for cracking down on unethical academic practices like contract cheating. Academic integrity and personal integrity are the same. If you hold yourself to a high moral standard you will produce work that reflects this.”

### Freedom of expression

Earlier this year, the Student Life and other UE committees endorsed a revised Code which would place emphasis on acting ethically and disagreeing well in all contexts and mediums in a way that respects the
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rights of all regardless of gender, religion, race, sexuality or disability; in accordance with the University values of respect and integrity; openness and engagement and diversity and inclusion. Supporting feedback was received from the Academic Board during April:

- The right to protest is a positive inclusion, so long as it is balanced with allowing others to express their points of view without interruption.
- Freedom of expression should be characterised that it is not taken as permission for students to force their views on others.

Respect and empathy, particularly during disagreement, were likewise strong themes of the C-sight student forum in May:

“So, there’s candour and there’s respect for people and the hurt that our words can have on them. Like all freedoms, responsibility comes with the freedom to speak, and that responsibility is not to hurt people with spiteful stereotypes. I think what you’re saying is an abuse of the privilege of freedom to speak, and I the code to deal needs to explicitly articulate limitations on free-for-all nastiness.”

Other insights from students

Some other key themes emerged from the C-sight discussion during May, which have been included in the scope of the Student Charter. These include:

- There is a strong call for student conduct, when participating in group work and other collaborative learning experiences, to be incorporated into this policy.
- There is a strong sentiment that behaviour in shared spaces and use of University resources should be covered.

CONSULTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee/Stakeholders</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UE Student Life Committee</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 Colleges 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>Culture Taskforce</td>
<td>12 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Board – student presentations and student-led discussions</td>
<td>16 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-sight forum for University students</td>
<td>8 – 15 May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE Student Life – draft policy</td>
<td>27 June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USU President and Vice President</td>
<td>5 July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE Education Committee</td>
<td>12 August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Board Academic Standards and Policy Committee (ASPC)</td>
<td>13 August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Executive</td>
<td>TBA - August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Board</td>
<td>3 September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate People and Culture Committee</td>
<td>2 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>23 October 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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 on-line. 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 

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)
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CONTENTS

1 Name of policy ........................................................................................................... 1
2 Commencement ........................................................................................................ 1
3 Policy is binding ...................................................................................................... 1
4 Statement of intent .................................................................................................. 1
5 Application ............................................................................................................... 2
6 Definitions .................................................................................................................. 2
7 Student expectations of the University .................................................................... 3
8 University expectations of students ....................................................................... 4
Notes .......................................................................................................................... 5
Amendment history ..................................................................................................... 6

1 Name of policy

This is the Student Charter 2020.

2 Commencement

This policy commences on [1 January 2020].

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 charter:

(1) sets out the principles that are core to the reciprocal partnership between the University and its students;
(2) explains the mutual expectations of students and the University to create a productive and safe environment for learning;

(3) reflects the University's values of:
   (a) respect and integrity;
   (b) diversity and inclusion;
   (c) openness and engagement; and
   (d) courage and creativity.

Note: See the University's Strategic Plan 2016-2020.

5 Application

(1) This policy applies to:
   (a) the University, students, staff, and affiliates and participants in continuing educational activities and education in the Centre for English Teaching, and
   (b) any University-related conduct or activities.

(2) This policy must be read in conjunction with University Rules, policies, procedures, faculty resolutions and course resolutions.

6 Definitions

affiliate has the meaning given in the Code of Conduct – Staff and Affiliates. As at the date of this policy this is:

   a clinical title holder, an adjunct, conjoint and honorary appointee, a consultant or contractor to the University, an office holder in a University entity, a member of any University Committee and any other person appointed or engaged by the University to perform duties or functions on its behalf.

continuing education participant means a person who is enrolled in any form of continuing education or extra-curricular education at the University.

exchange student means a person who is:

   • not admitted to an award course at the University;
   • admitted to a formally approved program of study at an overseas institution with which the University has an exchange arrangement; and
   • enrolled in one or more units of study at the University under the terms of that exchange arrangement.
non-award participant means a person who is not admitted to an award course and is not an exchange student or study abroad student, but is enrolled in a unit of study at the University.

staff or staff member means an employee of the University, including a casual employee.

student means a person who is:

- currently admitted to candidature in an award course at the University;
- a non-award student, exchange student or study abroad student.

7 Student expectations of the University

The full extent of the University’s obligations towards students are enshrined in University Rules, policies, procedures, faculty resolutions and course resolutions. Students can expect the University to:

(a) put the safety of all students and staff as its highest priority;

Note: See the Work Health and Safety Policy 2016

(b) create a supportive learning environment that enables students to realise their full potential;

(c) foster educational excellence and engaged inquiry through supportive learning environments and a culture of continuous improvement;

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

(d) welcome student participation in academic governance and create opportunities for students to share feedback;

Note: See clause 11 of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015

(e) treat students fairly, honestly, transparently and with courtesy, regardless of gender, religion, race, sexuality or disability;

Note: See the Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Policy 2015 and the Student Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Policy 2018

(f) protect academic freedom and safeguard the presentation of ideas through robust, informed and respectful debate that is free from discrimination and harassment in line with University policy;

Note: See the Charter of Academic Freedom

(g) maintain high academic standards; and

(h) protect personal or health information that is held by the University.

Note: See the Privacy Policy 2017

(i) respond to complaints and work collaboratively to resolve them fairly

Note: See the Students Complaints Procedures 2015 and
(j) comply with University Rules, policies, procedures, local provisions and faculty and course resolutions.

8 University expectations of students

(1) The University expects the following personal conduct from students:

(a) treat others with respect regardless of gender, religion, race, sexuality or disability;
(b) act honestly and ethically in all dealings with the University and members of its community;
(c) avoid engaging in bullying, harassment or discriminatory behaviour, including on social media;

Note: See the [Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Policy 2015; Student Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Policy 2018; University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016; Acceptable use of IT Policy 2019](#).

(d) maintain a cooperative, collaborative and empathetic approach to interpersonal relationships;
(e) use University resources equitably, responsibly and with sensitivity to the needs of others, and without impeding access or use by others;

Note: See the [University of Sydney (Campus Access) Rule 2009; Acceptable Use of IT Policy 2019; University of Sydney (Library) Rule 2011](#).

(f) Support academic freedom and freedom of speech for themselves and for others.

(2) The University expects the following academic conduct from students:

(a) comply with applicable policies and procedures, faculty resolutions, award course resolutions and unit of study outlines;

Note: See the [University of Sydney (Higher Degrees by Research) Rule 2011; Coursework Policy 2014 and Learning and Teaching Policy 2015; University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016](#).

(b) contribute to learning and the advancement of knowledge through honest, open and respectful discussion and debate of ideas;

(c) promote high academic standards;
(d) act honestly and ethically in all academic matters;
(e) commit to a culture of academic integrity;

Note: See the [Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015; Academic Honesty Procedures 2016; Research Code of Conduct 2019; Advertising on Campus Policy](#).

(f) work collaboratively and contribute equitably to group work, projects and other learning experiences; and

(g) create professional, ethical and respectful relationships with the University’s learning partners during mobility experiences, extramural placements, projects and practicums.
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Students Complains Procedures 2015;

University of Sydney (Campus Access) Rule 2009;

University of Sydney (Library) Rule 2011

University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016

Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015;

Acceptable Use of ICT Policy 2019

Advertising on Campus Policy

Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Policy 2015

Charter of Academic Freedom

Code of Conduct – Staff and Affiliates

Continuing and Extra-Curricular Education Policy 2017

Coursework Policy 2014

Cyber Security Policy 2019

Learning and Teaching Policy 2015

Privacy Policy 2017

Research Code of Conduct 2019
Student Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Policy 2018
Student Placement and Projects Policy 2015
Work Health and Safety Policy 2016
University’s Strategic Plan 2016-2020.
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<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To provide the Academic Board with the feedback provided at the previous meeting relating to the Student Code of Conduct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION**

*That the Academic Board note the feedback provided at the meeting of 16 April 2019 relating to the discussion of the Student Code of Conduct.*

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

At the meeting of 16 April 2019, the Academic Board received a strategic presentation on propose changes to the current Student Code of Conduct (as Item 3.1). Feedback during this discussion was provided via an online tool (Mentimeter) as well as through small-group discussion, which was recorded by each group. This feedback is now provided for the information of members, and has also been circulated directly to the Interim Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Student Life) and her team to inform further discussion.
Student code of conduct

Nice work, how many students participated in the consultation?

the presentation is intuitively appealing and simply represented

Great presentation, very clear.

Do students have any responsibilities in relation to maintaining and enhancing the reputation of the University?

Charter is a great idea and a more approachable label, rights and responsibilities being balanced is an important concept.

There are several purposes we need to fill: one is a basis for deciding disciplinary actions when they are requested. The Charter doesn't seem to serve that role.

Right to protest does not mean right to interrupt others who have different views.

Clear, too the point.

translation an interesting idea, need to be sure things aren't lost
Student code of conduct

Perhaps if the charter would be able to be condensed, it could be sent to the students via email upon enrolment.

Ten mins. not long enough....

The idea of a charter does align with the approach to empowering students to be actively engaged with their responsibilities.

Great presentation. Rights require really clear duty holders - are we sure all the student rights claimed are actually ones that can be discharged?

The student representatives gave a really well thought out presentation. Well done!

Would like to see a sense that all members of the University community have a responsibility toward community building.

There is a little disparity between wanting the university to be bound to student "rights" (ie things it must do or deliver) but not wanting to be similarly subject to obligations (ie things that students must do)

Is the law and/or legal issues the best way to frame student responsibilities? If the law is the only reference point, we already have the law. We don't need an additional charter. What other considerations might be relevant?

Focus on encouraging positive behaviour aspirationally, rather than a legalistic list of things thou shalt not do.
Student code of conduct

I like the proposal to rename it the Student Charter

Student services are currently understaffed to appropriately support students in distress particularly which needs addressing

It was good to hear that the students see their responsibility is not to disturb other students in their learning. This should include not disturbing academics in their teaching.

Under the the three areas of responsibility, where would the sense of academic integrity sit?

How do we balance student rights and responsibilities with those of individual staff, particularly when many issues are not in the control of individual staff but are structural in nature

The student code of conduct articulate the required conduct, however it does not provide guidance on how it can be implemented.

Maybe define protest in the charter and the responsibility undertaken

Positive rights (such as a 'right' to counseling) have resource implications. The substance of the right is given shape by minimum guaranteed provision. But the proposal is aspirational (world class etc). Can those two be reconciled?

All students need to be made aware of the Student Charter or whatever is the agreed name at enrolment and it needs to be reiterated throughout their study journey.
Student code of conduct

We need to make sure that the code can still serve a purpose as a tool to discipline those who abuse the code of conduct.

Freedom of expression is very broad. Some people may take that as permission to force their opinion on others.

I think an initial values or principles exercise would be useful, if that hasn’t already been done. What is a Student Charter for? What is it good for?

Very illuminating presentation - If students have the right to read whichever communications they feel appropriate then are they responsible for meeting requirements of a communication they haven’t read?

Do students not have a ‘duty’ to read their communications from the University, the failure to perform which might attract sanction? ie: I can’t say that I didn’t know I had to do X because I chose not to read my email.

Students also need to be aware of staff (academic and professional) and expectations regarding interactions with them and their rights.

Great presentation - you are asking us to treat students like the adults they are. I like that.

...a formal statement of the rights of a country’s people, or of an organization or a particular social group, that is agreed by or demanded from a ruler or government. Education is one of the basic human rights. Thank you Google.

Really happy with the inclusion of the freedom to protest (campaign etc.).
Student code of conduct

University rules state that academics contact students only via their university email accounts (including CANVAS announcements) and so students do need to read their emails. Changing must to should is just semantics.

As a student representative on the academic board, I feel that presentation really hit the nail on the head. The student code of conduct needs to be shorter, more concise and consist of plainer and more simplified language.

In addition to an expression of student values, the document should refer back to the University values, in particular the part about disagreeing well.

Very good presentation. Thanks. I wonder whether the responsibility framed with the law might be adapted (for reasons someone else has raised here) to reflect broader responsibilities (educational, social and ethical) to the university community.

Terrific. I agree with the right to protest but how do we define the boundaries of acceptable and unacceptable forms of protest?

There appears to be an imbalance in the level of severity/seriousness between the words 'rights' and 'responsibilities'. Rights take a more legal tone to the issue where as responsibility is more voluntary. More focus on academic conduct is needed.

Let's share the Culture Taskforce's Valuing disagreement paper with the student groups

Isn't the complement of a 'right' a 'duty'?

What responsibility do students have to each other?
Student code of conduct

interesting discussion at our table on the language of rights. could make things worse if narrowed.

We all have to read our emails..... this is the way we connect.... telegrams are out. Posted letters are out. Emails..... we have to sort it so people know what's important and what is not.

One suggestion I would make is to email the student charter out to students when they begin their degree, in order to help make the charter as accessible as possible.

The current Code of Conduct makes many references to other documents, how will these be adapted in the new Charter? How will these numerous 'other documents' be simplified?

I like the inclusion of the piece regarding safe spaces.

Great presentation. Clear and succinct and great potential for more discussion.

Add a responsibility about maintaining academic standards?

The staff code of conduct is also being reviewed.

I support the idea of an accessible plain language summary of rights and responsibilities
Student code of conduct

It's been ten minutes ... knew it was not long enough...

We need to distinguish between a document that helps build shared values, and one that is the basis for student discipline. Both are needed, and should be structured differently.

Could "what is lawful" may be too low a standard for USYD students to hold themselves to?

The "right" to quality feedback etc is not always possible for staff to achieve (eg if markers are too busy etc)

Is there a student responsibility to participate actively in their own education, and make responsible use of the resources provided to them by the community?

What would be the future relationship between the Student Charter and the University's extant Code of Conduct? The latter is frequently used to govern staff behaviour and has material consequences if repeatedly flouted.

When students break the codes of conduct, there is nothing in current codes that enables the values to be reinforced.

Agree with the direction of the charter but all systems require communication to be reciprocal.

I recommend using the University values as the foundation for the charter.
Student code of conduct

Neither existing code nor proposed charter resolve the clash between rights or between responsibilities eg a speaker with a view that many dislike, and those trying to drown out that speaker.

Build on top of current code of conduct

Going back to the question of first principles or values, is the Charter a way to capture aspirations of students and staff for the student experience of our University? It is not a regulatory piece (like the current Code) but an aspirational one.

Nice framework but perhaps somewhat light on the ‘duty’ side of the students. Additionally, there is no process in place to implement if rules are not being followed. For example plagiarism is widespread and no efficient process in place.

Nice remark at this table that maybe it should be phrased as university responsibilities rather than student rights (the latter risking getting into legal dispute)

things claimed as rights can narrow things. we need to be sure that the rights can be discharged. there is the danger one makes things worse if they narrow the focus to a scarce resource

need an elaboration of the university responsibilities

In terms of the rights of disabled students, particularly related to action plans etc., I think it is pivotal that the implementation is carefully monitored– for example, the production of Braille translations and the time taken to produce them.

To what extent should the charter be designed around non academic issues. Without taking sides, abortion has created conflict on campus. This is not really an issue that is academic. It just so happens that two clubs have conflicting views.
Student code of conduct

There is no statement about responsibility of being a student, e.g. studying

Perhaps rather than rights of students we could say responsibility of the university

Where did research or academic integrity figure in the student discussion and consultations about a charter?

Right to prompt feedback, we all admit they are sometimes late. That is is ideal and we should improve it but to express it as a right would divert resources to that, possibly at the expense of other equally important things.

How do we engage more students with the charter when there is a decline in interest in student societies and organisations?

The presentation emphasised the desire by students to embrace shared values and understanding

Very good idea – as a student representative, I support this. I believe that the plain English writing is very important! Many students are probably not aware of this code of conduct, much less feel bound by it. I think this change will be welcome.

We should look at the university’s values too—

inclusion, respect, integrity, openness, engagement, creativity, courage, diversity
Rights + Responsibility

- Things claimed as rights need to be sure they can be acknowledged.
- Could make things worse if they narrow the focus to a scarce
- Perhaps Expectation.
- Feedback. Regularly they are late.
- Right to process. Right to safe space – Difficult to reconcile.
- Might be able to achieve without language of rights.
- Perhaps University Responsible rather than Students Right.
- Should value and understanding
- Desire that this be.

- It should be put on students’ shoulders to maintain order on the campus.
- Students have the right the protest, nor the responsibility of policies.

Charter

- Rights need enforceability: where is that stated
- Academic vs. personal conduct
- Should not infringe on legal system
- Charter will be valuable in that it will [provide a] written basis for action
- Charter should be self-contained; no reference to long list of policies
- Charter is timely

Charter

- Charter sounds less punitive
- What will Union say?
- What happens to events out of the control of staff students?
- Anger of students to staff how is that dealt with?
- Who will determine if the Charter/Rules [are] broken – how will it be enforced? What mechanism?
- Will it be used in a disciplinary way?
- Beyond “what the law requires” - why is the law brought in + how will it be managed
- Is based on what rights? NSW Bill of Rights
• Be aware of making it about “consumer rights” – should not be about a “fee paying” relationship.
• Room for valid emotions anger, frustration etc.
• Be wary of the language used – who is the University? Management? Or all of us – how separate are students.

Do you think that learning is one of the student’s responsibilities? And that receiving the best teaching available is one of their fundamental rights.

**Code of Conduct**

• Is law – ‘legal boundaries’ the place to identify boundaries and expectations? Legality not a good start.
• A lack of nuance
• Is what is sought best aspirations rather than ‘conduct’

**What is the Purpose of the Charter?**

• Is it still disciplinary, where will we use the disciplinary action if we change this to a Charter?
• Rights of students to feedback vs. rights of staff
• Two documents:
  1. One that draws students
  2. Another one that is binding that acts as a contract between students
• Need a new document as opposed to changing.

• Staff code of conduct needs to be married to the student code of conduct, inconsistent with the charter change.
• Resource changes needed for this given institution is very big this doesn’t impact all
  - How it might unintentionally impact resourcing and other areas.
  - Resourcing needs to be thought through.
• Need both sides, get timely feedback but also students have a responsivity to action that feedback.
• Whatever is chosen needs a strong commitment from University
  - University should sort out problems where it is their fault.

1. An issue is around what happens if there is a transgression, e.g. if a student feels their right to ‘quality’ education has been denied? Also, it is difficult to take cultural issues / interpretations into account?
2. Some support for developing a 1 pg. Exec Summary that students will be able to access.
3. In general, where can this sit that students will both find and use it?
4. Support for cross-cultural recognition of the need for respect. Translation is good but might also create ambiguities/ things that can be argued as an interpretation issue.
5. Idea of quality as a right is problematic- Have to take into account extenuating circumstances, e.g. family crises. Most staff members have good intentions. Also, quality of experience often depends on effort that a student puts in i.e. the responsibility aspect.
6. Maybe need 2 documents: plain-English version that is a high-level principles doc + legal-type document with detail.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Chair, Academic Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer/Approver</td>
<td>Chair, Academic Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper title</td>
<td>Academic risk evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To seek advice from the Academic Standards and Policy Committee as to whether additional academic risks can be identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee consider whether additional academic risks should be added to list of academic risks it considered at its last meeting.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Further to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee meeting on 25 June 2019 where by the first list of emerging academic risks was presented to the Committee members by the University’s Risk Manager, the Committee members are asked to answer the following two key questions to commence a bottom-up risk assessment of academic risks:

- Is there any additional risk that needs to be added to the current list?
- How can we achieve effective risk management given the governance model of the Academic Board and its subcommittees?

**BACKGROUND / CONTEXT**

The University’s approach is to embrace well-managed risk taking to ensure the success of our mission and strategic objectives. Critical to this approach is minimising our exposure to any potential damage to the culture of excellence evident in our world-class research and education, long-term detrimental brand and reputation damage, and safety, compliance and financial solvency related risks (refer to Attachment 1).

Strategic and institutional risks the University have been captured in the Enterprise Risk Register, which comprises of 11 Enterprise Thematic Risks and 11 Watching Brief Risks (refer to Attachment 2), and is centrally administered by the Risk Management team since August 2017.

Since August 2018, a series of risk discussions between the Chair of the Academic Board, the Chairs of the Academic Quality Committee and Academic Standards and Policy Committee, the Academic Director, Education Policy and Quality and the Risk Management team have been held to commence the top-down risk assessment to identify academic risks of the University.

The main purpose of these top-down risk discussions was to identify, assess and analyse academic risks that may have an impact on the Academic Board’s ability to achieve its objective, considering not only core operations and external factors but also emerging trends and business changes. As a result, 6 potential risks have been identified to be academic risks of the University (refer to Attachment 3), which were presented to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee in June 2019 as part of an emerging risk discussion.

Academic risks will be centrally administered in the format of a risk register and reported to the University Executive and the Senate. The Academic Quality Committee has been established, in part, to have a single body through which we could demonstrate our academic quality assurance. Whilst the Academic Quality Committee does have the responsibility of periodically reviewing risks and risk indicators and checking that controls are adequate and working effectively, details around the accountability and responsibility for managing academic risks within the governance model of the Academic Board are still to be developed.
CONSULTATION

At its meeting of 25 June 2019, the Academic Standards and Policy Committee provided feedback on academic risks to the University’s Risk Manager. The list of potential risks have been shared with the Academic Board, with feedback being primarily focused on the risk identification approach taken.

The Chair of the Academic Board will continue to work with the Risk Management team to identify an agreed list of academic risks to the University, and develop an appropriate approach to assessing and managing these risks effectively.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Risk Appetite and Tolerance Statement
Attachment 2: Revised Enterprise Risk Register
Attachment 3: List of potential Academic Risks
The University Risk Appetite and Tolerance Statement

Last revision date: November 2018
Next revision due: November 2020

The University’s approach is to embrace well-managed risk taking to ensure the success of our mission and strategic objectives. Critical to this approach is minimising our exposure to any potential damage to the culture of excellence evident in our world-class research and education, long-term detrimental brand and reputation damage, and safety, compliance and financial solvency related risks.

The table on the following pages details the specific tolerance and appetite levels to which the University holds itself across ten categories. The statement is reflective of the high standards of quality in research, education, and student experience to which the University aspires.

This version (November 2018) of the statement is the first such statement with reference to specific tolerances that depict the University’s high standards. Therefore, there are likely to be instances in which the University does not yet meet the stipulated tolerance levels. In such cases, the University will explicitly acknowledge those exceptions and ensure an appropriate remediation plan is in place or developed so that the University meets the tolerance levels within a reasonable timeframe.

How to use this document:
- Note the key below. Where a category shows more than one colour in its ‘overall risk appetite’ column, there are a range of statements in that category of differing levels of appetite.
- The column highlighted in yellow on the right-hand side titled ‘Risk tolerance indicators’ lists the specific parameters for which the University has no tolerance. Where you think a breach is noted, please report it to your leadership team and the Risk Management Office.
- If upon review it is determined that the risk tolerance indicators have been breached, the University will review and implement appropriate remediation plans.
- Refer to the Risk Appetite and Tolerance Statements and specifically the ‘What this means’ and ‘Risk Tolerance Indicators’ statements when reviewing information in leadership and team meetings to ensure decisions are made that are compliant with this statement.
- Importantly, when referring to the ‘Risk tolerance indicators’ and supporting metrics, these should not be considered as target metrics. For instance, in considering research excellence, the tolerance metric of an ERA rating of 3 indicates a minimum level of excellence, not a target.

**Key**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Red" /></td>
<td>The University seeks to avoid any risk and uncertainty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Orange" /></td>
<td>The University is prepared to accept a low amount of risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Yellow" /></td>
<td>The University is prepared to accept a moderate amount of risk providing that risks are appropriately controlled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green" /></td>
<td>The University is prepared to accept a high degree of risk in exchange for high potential benefits, which are aligned to its objectives and strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="https://example.com" alt="Green" /></td>
<td>The University seeks to be innovative and adopt change despite greater inherent risk to achieve its strategic objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The University of Sydney Risk Appetite and Tolerance Statement

Category | Overall risk appetite | Description | No to low appetite | Moderate appetite | High appetite | What this means | Risk tolerance indicators
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
Integrity | The University has no appetite for compromises of integrity. | No appetite for: | • Deliberate or serious misconduct or fraud. | • Breaches of the University Code of Conduct. | • Breaches of the University’s academic integrity policies and research standards. | • We will encourage reporting of breaches, misconduct or fraud. | • No instances of identified activities outside of this tolerance for which remediation actions have not been taken as per relevant policy.
 | The University has a low appetite for potential compromises of excellence and no appetite for sustained compromises of excellence. | No appetite for University activities that consistently fail to contribute to excellent research, education, administration, and student experience. | • No appetite for physical and technological assets that are not fit-for-purpose and do not deliver the intended business outcomes within the agreed budget and timeframe and may result in preventable disruptions to operations. | • We are prepared to discontinue pursuing innovation in areas that consistently fail to contribute to excellence, and reallocate our resources to those areas that do contribute to achieving global standards of excellence. | • We will develop strategies and practices that complement and support the University’s strategic objectives. | • No tolerance for any case of verified bullying, harassment, or incivil behaviours.
 | Safety, health and wellbeing | The University acknowledges that the diversity of education and research activities conducted means that a level of safety risk is inherent. We strive to manage the risk presented by our activities and maintain a safe work environment. We do not actively seek out safety risks but tolerate some risks to meet our objectives. | No appetite for uncontrolled safety risks. | • No appetite for bullying, harassment, in civil behaviours and unreasonable management practices that impact negatively on the wellbeing of our people. | • Minor injuries resulting from reasonable work practices, research activities and practical learning experiences. | • We will encourage reporting of hazards and breaches at all levels. | • No tolerance for uncontrolled safety risks with the potential to cause serious injury or death, i.e. causing of such activities until appropriate mitigating strategies are applied.
 | Finance and resource allocation | The University has a high appetite to fund projects and initiatives that directly support our strategic objectives. However, the University will not fund more than it can source and service and has a low appetite for favourably distributing resources. | No appetite for committing ourselves to fund more than we can source and service. | • No appetite to allocate resources to activities that do not align with the University’s strategic objectives. | • We are willing to divest from areas that are not significantly supporting the University’s strategic objectives. | • Funding the delivery of the 2016 – 2020 Strategic Plan appropriately. | • Limited tolerance for debt principles, annual spend rule, liquidity floor, and Senate approved cap on international students (IS) proportion breaches. Where breaches occur, the University will reassess the terms of the cap agreement and cost savings & plans in place. By Jan 30 of the year, and remedial actions/revised proportions of IS will be considered.

Overall risk appetite: The University has a high appetite to allocate funds to initiatives that directly support our strategic objectives.

Risk tolerance indicators:

- No instances of identified activities outside of this tolerance for which remediation actions have not been taken as per relevant policy.
- Limited tolerance for debt principles, annual spend rule, liquidity floor, and Senate approved cap on international students (IS) proportion breaches. Where breaches occur, the University will reassess the terms of the cap agreement and cost savings & plans in place. By Jan 30 of the year, and remedial actions/revised proportions of IS will be considered.
- No tolerance for capital expenditure more than budget inclusive of corporate contingency without Finance and Audit Committee (FAC) approval.
- Limited tolerance for local unit budgets experiencing a negative variance of >10% or >$2M. When this occurs, the variance, together with remedial actions to bring the local unit back on budget requires UFPC approval.
The University has a high appetite for innovation in new ways of ensuring quality and translatability research that answers the biggest questions.

- No appetite for a sustained reduction in research quality.
- Moderate appetite for loss of highly performing researchers (e.g., high citation, laureate fellow) researchers due to sub-standard central University support, technological or physical facilities or the absence of an equitable and inclusive research culture.

- No appetite for a reduction in research quality.
- Moderate appetite for loss of highly performing researchers (e.g., high citation, laureate fellow) researchers due to sub-standard central University support, technological or physical facilities or the absence of an equitable and inclusive research culture.

- No appetite for innovation of new ways of ensuring quality and translatability research that answers the biggest questions.
- Moderate appetite for a reduction in research quality.
- Low tolerance for research areas characterised by evidence of performance below world standards and/or for their potential to contribute to our strategic research objectives and that are currently underfunded.

- Low appetite for a new initiative.
- Moderate appetite for loss of highly performing researchers (e.g., high citation, laureate fellow) researchers due to sub-standard central University support, technological or physical facilities or the absence of an equitable and inclusive research culture.

- Low appetite for innovation of new ways of ensuring quality and translatability research that answers the biggest questions.
- Moderate appetite for a reduction in research quality.
**Revised Enterprise Thematic Risk (ETR) Register**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETR #</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Risk Owner</th>
<th>Residual risk rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The University fails to improve both its performance culture and leadership culture</td>
<td>VC</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited capability and capacity to assess and effectively challenge clinical trial research design leading to poor quality trials and greater risks to patients</td>
<td>DVC Research</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>We are unable to provide students with an integrated and high-quality experience that results in a strong connection to the University community</td>
<td>DVC Education</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Failure to deliver consistently excellent research outcomes, including those delivered through our multidisciplinary initiatives and our focus on research collaboration and partnerships</td>
<td>DVC Research</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lack of appropriate project and change management capability and capacity to effectively deliver on the University's transformation programs</td>
<td>VC</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Our current safety culture is not consistently mature, embedded or leader-led</td>
<td>VP Operations</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Our cybersecurity technical capability is limited and the supporting culture is immature and not embedded</td>
<td>VP Operations</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>We do not capitalise on our opportunities in China</td>
<td>VC</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>We are unable to effectively or efficiently respond to the market on changing demands for post graduate courses and micro-credentialing</td>
<td>DVC Education</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Our limited student diversification puts our finances and reputation at risk</td>
<td>VC</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Failure to deliver a high-quality approach for western Sydney and to underutilise, or not coordinate the use of, our existing and future asset base in the region</td>
<td>VP Strategy</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Watching brief register**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETR #</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Risk Owner</th>
<th>Residual risk rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Financial sustainability is put at risk by fee revenue concentration and higher non-discretionary cost base</td>
<td>VP Operations</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Our ICT solutions and capability are not fit for purpose and do not enable for the scale, complexity, competitiveness and future plans of the University</td>
<td>VP Operations</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ineffective business resilience response plans</td>
<td>VP Operations</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Avoidable brand damage leading to adverse impact on our reputation with donors, affiliates, industry and Government and leading to a reduction in quality students</td>
<td>VP External Relations</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>We are unable to effectively attract and administer alumni and donor support</td>
<td>VP Advancement</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Non-compliance/breach with legal and/or regulatory obligations, code of conduct, or internal policies and procedures</td>
<td>General Counsel</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Our ability to effectively influence the political and regulatory environment puts our reputation and finances at risk</td>
<td>VC</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Our Education strategy does not enable the learning and graduate outcomes that are required to ensure leadership capability in a dynamic world</td>
<td>DVC Education</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Physical infrastructure does not enable for the scale, breadth, competitiveness and future plans of the University</td>
<td>VP Operations</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Our service design and delivery model inhibits our competitiveness and capability and increases our cost base</td>
<td>VP Operations</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The risk that the cultures of the colleges at times do not hold to the same values of safety and respect as that of the University</td>
<td>VC</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Emerging academic risks

## # Causes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Causes</th>
<th>Potential Risk</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Mitigation Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | • Academic units enter into teaching/research arrangements with 3rd party without consulting the Board  
• Lack of awareness among academic units  
• Lack of resources for the Board to police everything | Failure to provide education/research expected by an external provider | • Learning and Teaching Policy  
• Ongoing review and approval of course/curriculum resources | ↑ | ⬆ |
| 2 | • Effectiveness of different admission pathways is questionable  
• Course delivery deviates from the original course plan, potentially impacting the accreditation requirements  
• Lack of end to end assurance | Inability to realise our learning and graduate outcomes expected | • Ongoing and regular review and monitoring of admission pathway providers  
• Periodic reviews of the degree/course/program  
• Review of the student survey review outcomes | ↔ | ⬇ |
| 3 | • Inconsistent standards across Academic Units  
• Conflicts of interest  
• Increasing pressure on timely completion of PhD (external reviewers) | Inconsistent application of our assessment standards by academic units | • Annual course monitoring  
• Audit  
• Compliance reviews  
• NB tablau/interdisciplinary units require further monitoring | ↔ | ⬇ |
| 4 | • Difficulty in ensuring all the voices are heard  
• Lack of resources to review and monitor all areas of the Board’s roles and powers  
• Lack of accountability by the sub-committees  
• Sustainability and effectiveness of the current governance model is questionable | Inability to comply with the University of Sydney (AB) Rule 2017 | • Succession planning & knowledge transfer  
• Adequate and thorough inductions for board members  
• Ongoing monitoring  
• Publication of minutes | ↑ | ⬆ |
| 5 | • Increasing number of academic dishonesty and misconduct cases | Number of unaddressed cheating cases becomes unacceptable to the University | • Office of Educational Integrity and Associate Deans (Education  
• Educational integrity coordinators  
• Academic Honesty Procedures  
• Education for students and staff | ↑ | ⬇ |
| 6 | • High levels of reuse of assignments by unit of study coordinators  
• Failure to detect, report and investigate instances of possible contract cheating | Number of contract cheating cases exceeds our ability to address cheating cases | • Collaborative and scaled monitoring of the use of the University’s IP, venues and the contract cheating companies  
• Investigation procedures | ↑ | ⬇ |
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<tr>
<td>Paper title</td>
<td>Implementing policy-mandated education in sexual consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To set out the policy framework for mandating education in sexual consent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION**

That AB Academic Standards and Policy Committee endorse the policy and procedural amendments for establishing mandatory education in sexual consent.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The University Executive Student Life Committee, at its 1 May 2019 meeting, endorsed refined policy and procedural amendments for establishing mandatory education in sexual consent. Subsequent to that meeting, amendments to the Student Sexual Misconduct Policy 2018 and the Student Sexual Misconduct Response Procedures 2018 were proposed which will reflect the decisions of the UE Student Life Committee.

The proposed amendments will formally establish:

- delegated authority to approve education programs around consent, sexual violence and sexual harassment; and
- requirements for mandatory education in sexual consent

The amendments have been written with a view to: providing greater clarity around the requirement to complete mandatory education in sexual consent; detailing the basis on which students can apply for exemption from the mandatory requirements; and articulating enforceable sanctions for non-compliance.

**BACKGROUND / CONTEXT**

Commencing in July 2017, consent education has been made available to students at the University of Sydney via an online version of the module ‘Consent Matters: Boundaries, Respect and Positive Intervention’ (Consent Matters). From 28 February 2018, all new commencing undergraduate and postgraduate students, plus some other specific cohorts, were automatically enrolled in the Consent Matters module which appeared in Canvas. Consent education is now an important component of a suite of initiatives delivered as part of the Safer Communities project.

In July 2019, the Vice-Chancellor and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) signed off on the name change to the policy and the procedures, and the replacement of ‘sexual assault’ with ‘sexual misconduct’ as required within the documents.

**Policy framework**

Although compulsory consent education has been promoted since early 2018, there is currently no policy requirement to enforce students to undertake the module. Without a policy requirement, the University can only encourage students to complete the module by promoting it with strongly worded and persuasive messaging. Whilst this approach has resulted in high rates of completion, not all students engage with it and it is difficult to take action to promote higher levels of completion. In the absence of a policy mandate it is difficult to reach the group of students, including conscientious objectors, who are resistant to undertaking the module.
Exemptions and sanctions

Exemptions are currently provided to students for whom completion of the module is likely to cause further or renewed distress arising from previous experience with sexual violence or sexual harassment. The proposed procedural amendment will limit the grounds on which an exemption may be sought to those causing “personal distress”.

Three sanctions are proposed for students not subject to an exemption and who have failed to complete the mandatory education in sexual consent as required:

1. the suppression of coursework results;
2. delaying the progress of HDR candidature; and
3. blocking graduation.

Review and consultation

The proposed amendments to the Policy and the Procedures will also make provision for a formal review and consultation process to ensure that there is a structured process for responding and acting on student and staff feedback and for the University’s approach to consent education to keep pace with changes in circumstances.

Management of education modules through University systems

A number of areas across the University have opted to make completion of the Consent Matters module compulsory for additional cohorts of students, beyond new commencing students. Some of these groups have already defined penalties for non-completion. Additionally some faculties and University schools would like to make completion compulsory for all continuing students. In order to accommodate such requests in a way that is compatible with licence conditions and system capability, it is proposed that additional requests for mandatory completion of the education module and conditions be approved by the DVC Education. These provisions have been included in the Procedures.

Proposal for amendments to policy and procedures

Policy amendment

The following clause has been inserted in the Student Sexual Misconduct Policy 2018:

20A Educational measures to prevent sexual misconduct and sexual harassment
(1) Subject to clause 20A(2), the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education):
   (a) may establish educational programs about sexual misconduct and sexual harassment; and
   (b) stipulate the conditions on which such education must be completed.
(2) In establishing such programs the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) will consult with student organisations and the Associate Deans (Student Life) in each faculty or University school.

Procedural amendment

The following clause has been inserted into the Student Sexual Misconduct Response Procedures 2018:

13 Educational measures to prevent sexual misconduct and sexual harassment
(1) This clause applies to all students enrolled in a University award course after 1 January 2020.
(2) The “Consent Matters” module is the approved educational program about sexual misconduct and sexual harassment.
(3) The “Consent Matters” module must be completed by all students:
   (a) enrolling for the first time in a University award course; and
   (b) who have not previously completed the module at the University.
(4) Students required to complete the module must do so within their first semester of enrolment or, in the case of higher degree by research students, in their first research period of enrolment.

(a) Requirements for other students to complete the “Consent Matters” module may only be imposed with the approval of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).

(5) Students may apply for exemption on the grounds of personal distress by using the relevant online form.

(a) The Pro-Vice Chancellor (Student Life) will consider and determine applications for exemptions.

(6) Students may appeal the result of an exemption application to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) within:

(a) 20 working days of being informed of it; or

(b) any longer time period approved by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) in their absolute discretion;

(7) If a Student fails to comply with the requirement to complete the module without an exemption:

(a) the student’s academic records may be suppressed or higher degree by research progression delayed;

(b) the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Student Life) may issue a warning to the student stating that a failure to complete the module will prevent them from graduating; and

(c) if the module is not completed, student may not be eligible to graduate.

Additional amendments to the Procedures

in addition to the above amendments definitions relating to the “Consent Matters” module and ‘suppression of academic record’ have been included in Clause 3: Interpretation.

IMPLEMENTATION

Once the amendments to the Policy and the Procedures have been endorsed and registered on the University Policy Register, there will be communication through relevant channels regarding the changes and the requirement that completion of the Consent Matters module is mandated by policy, with consequential sanctions for non-completions.

CONSULTATION

Feedback on the proposed policy framework for establishing formal requirements for mandatory education on sexual consent has been sought through the following stakeholders:

- Policy Management Unit
- Director, Compliance and Student Affairs
- UE Student Consultative Committee
- UE Student Life Committee
- UE SCC Safer Communities Advisory Group
- UE Education Committee

The changes will be sent to the Colleges Consultative Committee for noting.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Amended version of the Student Sexual Misconduct Policy 2018
Attachment 2: Amended version of the Student Sexual Misconduct Response Procedures 2018
STUDENT SEXUAL MISCONDUCT POLICY 2018

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

Dated: 1 August 2018
Dated Amended: 30 July 2019
Signature:
Position: Vice-Chancellor and Principal
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1 Name of policy

This is the Student Sexual Misconduct Policy 2018.

2 Commencement

This policy commences on 1 August 2018.

3 Policy is binding

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

4 Statement of intent

This policy:

(a) prohibits sexual misconduct and sexual harassment by members of the University community;
(b) protects the safety and welfare of students and former students disclosing or complaining about sexual misconduct or sexual harassment;
(c) sets out the meaning of sexual misconduct and sexual harassment;
(d) explains the difference between disclosures and complaints of sexual misconduct and sexual harassment;
(e) explains the difference between complaints to the University and reports to the NSW Police;
(f) encourages safe active bystander intervention;
(g) sets out the principles applicable to disclosures and complaints of sexual misconduct and sexual harassment; and
(h) supports the University’s values of inclusion and diversity, and respect and integrity.

Note: See the University’s Strategic Plan 2016-2020.

5 Application

(1) This policy applies to disclosures by students and former students of sexual misconduct and sexual harassment, including:
(a) anonymous disclosures;
(b) disclosures about recent or historical events; and
(c) disclosures about University related and non-University related conduct.
(2) This policy applies to complaints by students and former students of University related sexual misconduct and sexual harassment including, but not limited to, conduct by:

(a) current students; and

(b) current staff members or affiliates.

Note: For an explanation of the difference between disclosures and complaints of sexual misconduct and sexual harassment, see clauses 12 and 13.

(3) This policy applies to disclosures and complaints by all students and former students, irrespective of gender, gender identity, intersex status, sexual orientation, race, religion, cultural background or disability.

(4) Clauses 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21 and 22 of this policy apply to complaints by any person of University related sexual misconduct or sexual harassment by a current student.

(5) For the avoidance of doubt, the rights and obligations of students under this policy are in addition to the rights and obligations set out in the Code of Conduct for Students and the Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Policy 2015.

6 Definitions

In this policy:

**active bystander intervention** means seeing and recognising a potentially harmful situation and choosing to respond in a safe way that could prevent or stop the harm from happening or continuing.

**affiliate** has the meaning given in the Code of Conduct – Staff and Affiliates.

At the date of this policy, this is:

Clinical title holders; adjunct, conjoint and honorary appointees; consultants and contractors to the University; holders of offices in University entities; members of Boards of University Foundations; members of University committees; and any other persons appointed or engaged by the University to perform duties or functions on its behalf.

**Apprehended Violence Order** means an ADVO (Apprehended Domestic Violence Order) or an APVO (Apprehended Personal Violence Order) made by a court.

Note: An ADVO protects a person where the parties live together. An APVO protects a person in other circumstances, including where the parties are both students.

**complainant** means any person who makes a complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment in accordance with this policy.

**complaint** means a complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment made in accordance with clause 13.

**disclosure** means a disclosure of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment made in accordance with clause 12.
Residential College means one or more of:

- Mandelbaum House;
- Sancta Sophia;
- St Andrew’s College;
- St John’s College;
- St Paul’s College;
- Wesley College;
- Women’s College.

respondent means a person whose conduct is the subject of a complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment.

staff or staff member means an employee of the University, including a casual employee.

student means any person who is considered to be a student for the purposes of the Coursework Policy 2014 or the Continuing and Extra-Curricular Education Policy 2017, and includes any of:

- award students (i.e. studying for a formal qualification);
- exchange students;
- study abroad students;
- continuing education students;
- other non-award students; and
- students of the Centre for English Teaching (CET).

Student Affairs Officer means a specialist member of staff within the Student Affairs Unit.

Student Affairs Unit means the specialist staff within the office of the Registrar, who assist with the resolution of student complaints and reports of student misconduct in accordance with University policies and procedures.

student caseworker means a designated employee of the Students’ Representative Council (SRC) or the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association (SUPRA).

Student Liaison Officer means a specialist member of staff within Student Services, with responsibility for responding to disclosures and complaints of sexual misconduct and sexual harassment.

University lands has the meaning given in the University of Sydney (Campus Access) Rule 2009.

As at the date of this policy, this includes:

any land or roads occupied or used in connection with the University, including the whole or any part of any building or structure and any land or roads occupied or used in connection with the whole or part of any building or structure.
University related conduct means any conduct that is connected to the University, including conduct that:

- refers or relates to the University, its activities, or its staff, affiliates or students in their status as staff, affiliates or students of the University;
- occurs on, or in connection with, University lands or other property owned by the University;
- occurs at, or in connection with, a Residential College;
- occurs at or in connection with University owned or affiliated student accommodation;
- occurs using, or is facilitated by, University ICT resources or other University equipment;
- occurs during, or relates to, the performance of duties for the University;
- occurs during, or in connection to, any University related function or event (whether sanctioned or organised by the University or not) or when representing the University in any capacity;
- occurs during any event run by or affiliated with student organisations, clubs or societies (whether sanctioned or organised by the University or not);
- occurs during students’ clinical, practicum, internship or work experience placements; or
- occurs while a University of Sydney student is participating in an overseas exchange, study abroad or other approved program.

Visitor means an academic or other guest, invitee or visitor to University lands or to a class, function or event sanctioned or organised by the University.

7 Sexual misconduct and sexual harassment are prohibited

(1) Students, staff, affiliates and visitors must not engage in sexual misconduct towards or sexually harass any other person.

(2) Behaviour that is intimidating, abusive, disrespectful or threatening, including sexual misconduct and sexual harassment, is not acceptable and will not be tolerated.

8 Emergency and ongoing assistance and support

(1) Students and former students who have experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment are encouraged to seek assistance and support from a trusted member of the University’s staff.

Note: For information on supporting students who have experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment, see clause 7 of the Student Sexual Misconduct Response Procedures 2018.
(2) Contact details for emergency assistance for students and former students who have experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment are set out in Schedule 1.

(3) Contact details for ongoing support and assistance for students and former students who have experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment are set out in Schedule 2.

(4) Contact details for support and assistance for students who are accused of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment are set out in Schedule 3.

9 Meaning of sexual misconduct

(1) The term sexual misconduct is used in this policy to cover a range of unacceptable sexual and physical behaviours, which are criminal offences.

Note: Sexual misconduct can be experienced by people of all ages, genders and sexualities, within or outside a relationship. Sexual misconduct is an abuse of power, and is never the fault of the person who does not consent to the sexual behaviour.

(2) For the purposes of this policy, sexual misconduct means any sexual act that a person does not consent to, including:

(a) **rape (also called sexual assault)** – the forced penetration of the vagina or anus of any person with any part of the body of another person (including their fingers), or with any object, without the first person's consent;

(b) **unwanted oral sex** – insertion of the penis into the mouth of another person, or use of the tongue or lips on the vagina, penis, scrotum or anus of another person, without their consent;

(c) **sexual touching** – kissing or touching a person’s body in a sexual manner, without their consent. This includes unwanted touching of a person’s breast, bottom or genitals;

(d) **sexual acts** – doing an act of a sexual nature with or towards another person without their consent, or making another person do an unwanted act of a sexual nature. This includes:

   (i) a person showing another person their genitals ('flashing');
   (ii) a person sending another person an unwanted still or moving image of their own or someone else's genitals;
   (iii) making a person show another person their breasts, bottom or genitals;
   (iv) masturbating in front of another person;
   (v) pretending to masturbate in front of another person;

(e) **voyeurism** - for the purpose of obtaining sexual arousal or sexual gratification, observing a person who is:

   (i) in a state of undress;
   (ii) using the toilet, showering or bathing; or
   (iii) engaged in a sexual act;

   without their consent; and
(f) recording or distributing an intimate image of another person without their consent, whether in person or by electronic, digital or other means, including a still or moving image of:
   (i) a person's breast, bottom or genitals, whether bare or covered by underwear;
   (ii) a person in a state of undress;
   (iii) a person using the toilet, showering or bathing;
   (iv) a person engaged in a sexual act.

(3) For the purposes of this policy, a person will be considered to have engaged in sexual misconduct towards another person if:
   (a) the other person did not consent to the first person's actions; and
   (b) the first person:
      (i) knew that the other person did not consent;
      (ii) was reckless as to whether the other person consented; or
      (iii) should reasonably have known, having regard to all the circumstances, that the other person did not consent.

(4) For the purposes of this policy, attempting or threatening to engage in any of the above conduct may also constitute sexual misconduct.

Note: Stalking or intimidating another person with the intention of causing them to fear physical or mental harm is also a criminal offence. See the Crimes (Domestic and Personal Violence) Act 2007 and the Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Policy 2015.

10 Meaning of consent

(1) For the purposes of this policy, a person consents to a sexual act if they freely and voluntarily consent to the sexual act.

(2) For the purposes of this policy, a person is not able to freely and voluntarily consent to a sexual act when:
   (a) they are:
      (i) asleep or unconscious;
      (ii) significantly intoxicated or affected by drugs;
      (iii) intimidated, coerced or threatened, including when they are afraid of harm to themselves or someone else;
      (iv) unclear about the identity of the person performing the act;
      (v) tricked into doing something they do not want to do;
      (vi) detained or held against their will;
      (vii) under 16 years of age; or
      (viii) under 18 years of age and the person performing the act is a staff member of the University; or
   (b) the person is pressured to engage in the sexual act by another person, who is in a position of power or authority over them.
(3) Students, staff, affiliates and visitors must make sure that consent to a sexual act is clear and obvious. The fact that a person does not say ‘no’ to, or does not physically resist, a sexual act does not of itself mean that they consent to it.

(4) A person is free to withdraw their consent at any time prior to or during a sexual act, for any reason.

11 Meaning of sexual harassment

(1) Sexual harassment occurs if a person:
   (a) makes an unwelcome sexual advance, or an unwelcome request for sexual favours, to the person harassed; or
   (b) engages in other unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature in relation to the person harassed;

   in circumstances in which a reasonable person, having regard to all the circumstances, would have anticipated the possibility that the person harassed would be offended, humiliated or intimidated.

   Note: See also clause 12 of the Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Policy 2015.

(2) Sexual harassment includes:
   (a) unwelcome touching, hugging or kissing;
   (b) inappropriate staring or leering;
   (c) sexual gestures;
   (d) sexually suggestive comments or jokes;
   (e) displaying, sending or requesting sexually explicit pictures or posters;
   (f) giving sexually explicit gifts;
   (g) making or distributing a sexually explicit audio recording or photo-shopped image of another person;
   (h) repeated or inappropriate invitations to go out or ‘hook up’;
   (i) intrusive questions about a person’s private life or physical appearance;
   (j) requests or pressure for sexual intercourse, or other sexual acts.

(3) Sexual harassment can occur through email, text, messaging, social media posts and other forms of electronic communication.

(4) Acts of sexual harassment may also constitute sexual misconduct.

12 Disclosures of sexual misconduct and sexual harassment by students and former students

(1) Students and former students who have experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment have a right to decide whether they want to disclose the incident to the University, or not.

(2) A student or former student can make a disclosure of any incident of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment to the University online anytime at
https://sydney.edu.au/students/sexual-assault.html or by calling 1800 SYD HLP (1800 793 457) from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Friday.

Note: Students and former students who prefer to make a disclosure in person can call 1800 SYD HLP (1800 793 457) to make an appointment.

(3) Students and former students can elect to make disclosures anonymously.

(4) The University is committed to supporting students and former students who disclose sexual misconduct or sexual harassment. Details of inclusive and non-discriminatory support services for students and former students are set out in Schedule 2.

(5) Students and former students should make a disclosure (rather than a complaint) of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment if they do not want the University to investigate or to take any specific action in response to the incident.

(6) Students and former students who choose to make a disclosure of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment may later decide to make a complaint to the University about the same incident. The University will provide guidance about how to make a complaint.

(7) The University will treat all disclosures confidentially, and:
   (a) will not investigate a disclosure unless:
       (i) there appears to be an imminent risk to the health or safety of the student or another person; or
       (ii) one or more other people name the same perpetrator in a separate incident disclosure and the University is concerned that there may be a risk to the health or safety of other persons; and
   (b) will inform the student before commencing an investigation into a disclosure.

(8) The University will otherwise use information contained in disclosures on a de-identified basis to identify trends and to develop targeted responses to sexual misconduct and sexual harassment in the University community.

13 Complaints of sexual misconduct and sexual harassment by students and former students

(1) Students and former students who have experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment have a right to decide whether they want to make a complaint to the University, or not.

(2) A student or former student who has experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment can make a complaint to the University online anytime at https://sydney.edu.au/students/sexual-assault.html or by calling 1800 SYD HLP (1800 793 457) from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Friday.

Note: Students who prefer to make a complaint in person can call 1800 SYD HLP (1800 793 457) to make an appointment.

(3) A person cannot make a complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment on behalf of a student or former student, except for Student Liaison Officers, Student Affairs Officers and student caseworkers.

Note: Staff members may assist a student or former student to make a complaint. See clause 6(4) of the Student Sexual Misconduct Response Procedures 2018.
(4) Students and former students who have experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment should make a complaint (rather than a disclosure) if:
   (a) they want the University to investigate or to take specific action; and
   (b) the complaint is about University related conduct, including conduct by:
       (i) other students; or
       (ii) current staff members or affiliates.

(5) Students and former students do not have to specify what action they want the University to take in order to make a complaint. If students and former students choose to specify what action they want the University to take, the University may decide to take that action or some other action, as appropriate.

(6) A former student who has experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment can make a complaint if:
   (a) the complaint is about University related conduct; and
   (b) the respondent is a current student, staff member or affiliate of the University.

(7) The University is committed to supporting students and former students who complain about sexual misconduct or sexual harassment. Details of inclusive and non-discriminatory support services for students are set out in Schedule 2.

(8) In most circumstances, a student or former student wishing to make a complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment will need to provide their name. The University will not act on anonymous complaints of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment unless:
   (a) it is not necessary for the respondent to be aware of the identity of the complainant in order to properly respond to the complaint; or
   (b) there is independent documentary or other evidence supporting the complaint and the allegation can be tested fairly.

(9) The University is unable to act on complaints from complainants who decline to provide information about the respondent. In such cases, the complaint will be treated as a disclosure.

(10) The University will handle complaints by students and former students of sexual misconduct and sexual harassment in accordance with the Student Sexual Misconduct Response Procedures 2018 and the Student Complaints Procedures 2015.

(11) If a student or former student makes a complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment by a visitor or other person over whom the University has no jurisdiction, the University may seek assistance from another organisation or refer the complaint to an external agency for resolution.

   Note: Other organisations may include a student's home institution, or clinical, practicum, internship or work experience provider. The University may refer complaints of sexual harassment to the NSW Anti-Discrimination Board or the Australian Human Rights Commission.

(12) If a student or former student makes a complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment occurring at or in connection with a Residential College, or University owned or affiliated student accommodation, the University may liaise with or seek assistance from the Residential College or accommodation provider to resolve the complaint.
14 Confidentiality

(1) Except as provided in subclause 15(7), the University will keep confidential all information relating to a disclosure or complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment, unless the student or former student consents to disclosure of part or all of the information for a specified purpose.

(2) Subject to this clause, complainants and respondents must keep confidential:

(a) the identity of the complainant, the respondent and participants in the resolution or investigation of a complaint;

(b) the information provided or collected during the resolution or investigation of a complaint;

(c) the fact that a complaint has been made;

(d) any interim measures taken under clause 18; and

(e) any report, outcome or determination of a complaint.

(3) Complainants and respondents may disclose the information in subclause (2) in order to obtain support or advice from:

(a) their immediate family members;

(b) a qualified counsellor or psychologist;

(c) their student representative or lawyer;

(d) the Police;

(e) the NSW Anti-Discrimination Board or Australian Human Rights Commission.

(4) A breach of confidentiality may result in disciplinary action including, where the person is a student, action under the University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016.

15 Reports to the NSW Police

(1) The University supports the right of students and former students who have experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment to decide whether they want to report the incident to the NSW Police, or not.

Note: Students and former students may also elect to contact the NSW Anti-Discrimination Board or the Australian Human Rights Commission to make a complaint of sexual harassment under anti-discrimination legislation.

(2) A student or former student may decide to make a disclosure or complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment to the University, but not report the incident to the Police. Alternatively, they may decide to report sexual misconduct or sexual harassment to the Police, but not to make a disclosure or complaint to the University.

(3) A person’s decision to make a report to the Police will not necessarily preclude the University from investigating or taking action in response to sexual misconduct or sexual harassment. However, any internal University process may have to be suspended pending completion of the criminal process.
(4) When deciding whether to suspend an internal University process pending completion of a criminal process, the University will consult the Police and the complainant and will consider:

(a) the potential for the internal process to impede or contaminate the criminal process;

(b) the potential for the criminal process to impede or contaminate the internal process; and

(c) whether investigating or responding to the incident has the potential to impact adversely on the rights of either or both the complainant or the respondent.

Note: The standard of proof to be satisfied in University investigations of sexual misconduct and sexual harassment is ‘on the balance of probabilities’, which requires satisfaction on the evidence that the matter found to have occurred is more likely to have occurred than not. The University will take into account the nature and seriousness of the alleged conduct when deciding whether the standard of proof is met. The standard of proof used in criminal investigations and trials is ‘beyond reasonable doubt’, which is a higher evidentiary standard of proof.

(5) The University is required to report information about the commission of a ‘serious indictable offence’ to the Police in accordance with sections 316 and 316A of the Crimes Act 1900 (NSW).

Note: A ‘serious indictable offence’ is an offence that is punishable by imprisonment for five years or more, such as conduct referred to in this policy as rape (also called sexual assault) or sexual touching.

(6) If a student or former student decides not to report an incident of sexual misconduct to the Police, the University will use its best efforts to protect the confidentiality of information relating to their disclosure or complaint, while meeting its obligations under the Crimes Act 1900 (NSW).

(7) In some limited circumstances, the University may need to report an incident of sexual misconduct to the Police against a person’s wishes, to ensure their safety or the safety of other members of the University community, or to meet its legal obligations.

(8) The University will inform the student or former student before reporting an incident of sexual misconduct to the Police.

16 Active bystander intervention

(1) The University encourages and values reasonable safe active bystander intervention by members of the University community to prevent or stop sexual misconduct and sexual harassment from occurring or continuing.

(2) The steps involved in safe active bystander intervention are:

(a) noticing the situation – paying attention to what is going on nearby;

(b) deciding if it is a problem – investigating whether someone might need help, and checking with people around if unsure;

(c) accepting responsibility to take action – not assuming someone else will do something;

(d) making a plan to step in – indirectly or directly confronting the issue, without being aggressive or putting oneself or others in danger.
17 No victimisation

(1) A person must not victimise or otherwise subject another person to detrimental action as a consequence of that person:
   (a) making a disclosure or a complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment;
   (a) providing information about a disclosure or a complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment;
   (b) supporting a person who has made a disclosure or complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment; or
   (c) engaging in reasonable safe active bystander intervention.

(2) A breach of this clause may result in disciplinary action including, where the person is a student, action under the University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016.

18 Opportunity to be heard

(1) Complaints of sexual misconduct and sexual harassment will be resolved sensitively, fairly, confidentially and with a minimum of disruption, while following the principles of procedural fairness.

(2) Complainants and respondents will have a reasonable opportunity to state or respond to a complaint orally and in writing, and to provide any documents relevant to the complaint.

(3) Complainants and respondents may be accompanied to any meeting by a support person, if they wish.

(4) At no time will the complainant and respondent be required to meet with or to participate in any activity with one another, unless they have both given their prior informed consent.

19 Interim measures

(1) Interim measures should not be interpreted as anticipating or revealing the outcome of any University or criminal investigation process.

(2) In order to minimise the potential for harm to any person, the Registrar may take interim measures against a student in response to:
   (a) a complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment against the student, pending:
      (i) resolution of the complaint;
      (ii) investigation of the complaint;
      (iii) the conclusion of an internal disciplinary process; or
      (iv) criminal investigation and hearing; or
   (b) an Apprehended Violence Order, whether interim or final.

(3) As an interim measure the Registrar may:
   (a) suspend a student from entering specified parts of the University's lands;
(b) restrict a student's access to particular classes;
(c) restrict a student's access to specified University buildings, facilities or accommodation; or
(d) prohibit a student from speaking to or approaching another person (including by social media, email, letter or through a third party);

for such period, and on such terms, as the Registrar considers necessary.

(4) Interim measures must be:
(a) taken on a case-by-case basis;
(b) set for a fixed period of time; and
(c) reasonable and proportionate;

having regard to the seriousness and circumstances of the alleged conduct.

(5) Interim measures may be taken summarily, and the Registrar:
(a) is not required to provide a hearing to the student before making a decision; and
(b) may inform themselves in relation to any matter in any manner that they think fit.

(6) Interim measures once taken will continue to apply until they:
(a) are revoked or varied by the Registrar; or
(b) expire in accordance with their terms.

(7) The Registrar must notify the student of the imposition of interim measures within 24 hours of doing so, and provide the information specified in the Student Sexual Misconduct Response Procedures 2018.

(8) A student who is the subject of interim measures may seek an internal review of those measures by application to the Student Affairs Unit, in the manner specified in the Student Sexual Misconduct Response Procedures 2018.

(9) Nothing in this policy or the Student Sexual Misconduct Response Procedures 2018 affects the power of:
(a) the Registrar to suspend a student in accordance with the University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016; or
(b) a University representative to issue a Termination of License Notice in accordance with the University of Sydney (Campus Access) Rule 2009.

20 Vexatious complaints

(1) A student or former student must not make a vexatious or malicious complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment.

(2) For the purposes of this policy, a complaint will be considered vexatious or malicious if the student or former student makes it:
(a) knowing it to be false; and
(b) for the primary purpose of damaging the University or the person against whom the complaint is made.
(3) Making such a complaint may result in disciplinary action including, where the person is a student, action under the *University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016*.

**20A Educational measures to prevent sexual misconduct and sexual harassment**

(1) Subject to clause 20A(2), the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education):
   (a) may establish educational programs about sexual misconduct and sexual harassment; and
   (b) stipulate the conditions on which such education must be completed.

(4)(2) In establishing the programs the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) will consult with student organisations and the Associate Deans (Student Life) in each faculty or University school.

**21 Breach of this policy**

(1) The University may take disciplinary action against any person who is knowingly involved in a breach of this policy.

(2) Where the person is a student, this may include disciplinary action under the *University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016*.

(3) Where the person is staff member, this may include disciplinary action under the *University of Sydney Enterprise Agreement 2018-2021* or any successor or replacement agreement.

(4) Where the person is an affiliate, this may include the revocation of a title and any accompanying privileges under the *Honorary Titles Policy 2013*.

**22 Recordkeeping and reporting**

(1) The University will:
   (a) keep appropriate records of all disclosures and complaints of sexual misconduct and sexual harassment in a secure location;
   (b) keep appropriate records of its communications with the Residential Colleges and University owned or affiliated student accommodation about disclosures and complaints of sexual misconduct and sexual harassment occurring at, or in connection with, them; and
   (c) subject to the confidentiality requirements specified in clause 14(1), allow reasonable access by students and former students to information about themselves.

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

(2) The University will collect, store and use de-identified information about disclosures and complaints by students and former students to identify trends and to develop targeted responses to sexual misconduct and sexual harassment in the University community.
(3) Access to information relating to a disclosure or complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment will be restricted to University staff who have a need to access and use the information in order to carry out their responsibilities under this policy or the Student Sexual Misconduct Response Procedures 2018.

Note: See the University’s Privacy Policy 2017 and the Privacy Procedures 2018.

(4) The University will publish annually a de-identified report on the records kept in accordance with subclause (1). The report will be prepared in such a way as to ensure that no specific disclosure or complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment can be identified.

23 Review

This policy will be reviewed within one year of the date of commencement.
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<td>15(6)</td>
<td>Insert ‘or former student’ and replace ‘the student’ with ‘their’</td>
<td>11 February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15(7)</td>
<td>Clause re-written</td>
<td>11 February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15(8)</td>
<td>Insert ‘or former student’</td>
<td>11 February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17(1)(b)</td>
<td>Replace ‘student’ with ‘person’</td>
<td>11 February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Change Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18(4)</td>
<td>Replace ‘other’ with ‘another’</td>
<td>11 February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(3)(d)</td>
<td>Replace ‘student’ with ‘person (including by social media, email, letter or through a third party’</td>
<td>11 February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20(1); 20(2)</td>
<td>Insert ‘or former student’</td>
<td>11 February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21(3)</td>
<td>Remove ‘or affiliate’</td>
<td>11 February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21(4)</td>
<td>New clause added</td>
<td>11 February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22(1)(c)</td>
<td>Insert ‘and former students’</td>
<td>11 February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22(2)</td>
<td>Insert ‘by students and former students’</td>
<td>11 February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 2</td>
<td>Update counselling services to clarify current students only; excludes CCE and CET students</td>
<td>11 February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10(2);</td>
<td>‘For the purposes of this policy’ inserted</td>
<td>20 February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10(2)(a)(viii)</td>
<td>New clause relating to students under 18 years of age</td>
<td>20 February 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Change Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title of policy changed to Student Sexual Misconduct Policy</td>
<td>30 July 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendments relating to change of nomenclature from sexual violence to sexual misconduct</td>
<td>30 July 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20A</td>
<td>New clause added regarding educational measures to prevent sexual misconduct and sexual harassment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHEDULE 1 – Emergency contacts

(1) In an emergency, students should contact emergency services by dialling triple zero (000).

(5) Students who feel unsafe on campus or are concerned for someone else’s safety can also contact Campus Security on 9351 3333, 24 hours a day.

(6) Students and former students who have experienced sexual misconduct can contact:

(a) NSW Rape Crisis Service on 1800 424 017, 24 hours a day;

(b) 1800RESPECT on 1800 737 732 or online via www.1800respect.org.au, 24 hours a day;

(c) Royal Prince Alfred (RPA) Hospital Sexual Assault Service on 9515 9040 (Monday to Friday) or 9515 6111 (after hours). Counselling and medical services are available for anyone who has been sexually assaulted. Campus Security can arrange transport to RPA.
SCHEDULE 2 – University support for students and former students who have experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment

(1) A student or former student who has experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment can make a disclosure or a complaint to the University online at https://sydney.edu.au/students/sexual-assault.html or by calling 1800 SYD HLP (1800 793 457) from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Friday.

(2) Students who have experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment have access to a range of University support services and assistance, including:

- **Student Liaison Officers** – contact 8627 6808 or email safer-communities.officer@sydney.edu.au, 8.30am-5.30pm, Monday to Friday;
- **on campus emergency accommodation** - contact Student Accommodation Services on 9351 3322, 9am to 5pm, Monday to Friday. For after hours emergency accommodation, contact Campus Security on 9351 3333;
- **security services** - contact Campus Security on 9351 3333, 24 hours a day;
- **health services** (for current students only) - contact the University Health Service on 9351 3484, 8:30am to 5pm, Monday to Friday;
- **counselling services** (for current students, other than students of CCE and CET, only) – contact Counselling and Psychological Services (CAPS) on 8627 8433, 9am to 5pm, Monday to Friday;
- **disability support** - contact Disability Services on 8627 7422, 9am-5pm, Monday to Friday;
- **academic support** - [special consideration](#) for examinations and assessments; and
- **student representative associations** – undergraduate students: contact the Student Representative Council (SRC) on 9660 5222, 9am-5pm, Monday to Friday; postgraduate students: contact the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association (SUPRA) on 9351 3715, 9am to 5pm (closed 12-1pm), Monday to Friday.

(3) Former students who have experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment have access to a range of University support services and assistance, which may include:

- **Student Liaison Officers** – contact 8627 6808 or email safer-communities.officer@sydney.edu.au, 8.30am-5.30pm, Monday to Friday;
- **security services** - contact Campus Security on 9351 3333, 24 hours a day;
- **student representative associations** – undergraduate students: contact the Student Representative Council (SRC) on 9660 5222, 9am-5pm, Monday to Friday; postgraduate students - contact the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association (SUPRA) on 9351 3715, 9am to 5pm (closed 12-1pm), Monday to Friday.
SCHEDULE 3 – University support for students who have been accused of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment

Students who are accused of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment have access to a range of University support services and assistance, including:

- **health services** - contact the University Health Service on 9351 3484, 8:30am to 5pm, Monday to Friday;
- **counselling services** - (for current students, other than students of CCE and CET, only) contact Counselling and Psychological Services (CAPS) on 8627 8433, 9am to 5pm, Monday to Friday;
- **on campus emergency accommodation** - contact Student Accommodation Services on 9351 3322, 9am to 5pm, Monday to Friday. For after hours emergency accommodation, contact Campus Security on 9351 3333;
- **disability support** - contact Disability Services on 8627 7422, 9am-5pm, Monday to Friday
- **academic support** - special consideration for examinations and assessments; and
- **student representative associations** – undergraduate students: contact the Student Representative Council (SRC) on 9660 5222, 9am-5pm, Monday to Friday; postgraduate students: contact the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association (SUPRA) on 9351 3715, 9am to 5pm (closed 12-1pm), Monday to Friday.
1 Purpose and application

(1) These procedures are to give effect to the Student Sexual Misconduct Policy 2018 ('the Policy').

(2) These procedures apply to all disclosures or complaints of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment made under the Policy.

Note: See clauses 12 and 13 of the Policy.

2 Commencement

These procedures commence on 1 August 2018.

3 Interpretation

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

Note: For definitions, see clause 6 of the Student Sexual Misconduct Policy 2018.

“Consent Matters” module means “Consent Matters: boundaries, respect and positive intervention” which is an online module about sexual consent.

Suppression of academic record has the meaning given in clause 8(1) of the Student Debtor Sanctions Policy 2014. As at the date of these procedures this is:

Access to the student’s academic record may be denied to the student and to anyone outside the University, in the absence of legal documentation to provide it. This includes access to results, grades and evidence of awards.
4 Responding to emergencies

Emergency contact information for students and former students who have experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment is set out in Schedule 1 to the Policy and Schedule 1 to these procedures.

5 Making a disclosure of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment

(1) A student or former student can make a disclosure of any incident of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment to the University online anytime on the University’s ‘Sexual Misconduct’ web page or by calling 1800 SYD HLP (1800 793 457) from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Friday.

Note: Students who prefer to make a disclosure in person can call 1800 SYD HLP (1800 793 457) to make an appointment.

(2) Staff members and student caseworkers may assist a student or former student to make a disclosure.

(3) Students and former students may make disclosures anonymously by asking a staff member or student caseworker to make a disclosure on their behalf, or by calling from a private number.

(4) Students and former students should advise staff members and student caseworkers if they have already made a disclosure.

Note: A student or former student who chooses to make a disclosure of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment may later decide to make a complaint to the University about the same incident. See subclause 12(6) of the Policy.

Note: The University will not investigate a disclosure, except in certain limited circumstances. See subclause 12(7) of the Policy.

(5) If the University needs to investigate a disclosure, a Student Liaison Officer may contact the person who made the disclosure to ask whether they would be prepared to make a complaint or to participate in an investigation process.

6 Making a complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment

(1) A student or former student who has experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment can make a complaint to the University online anytime on the University’s ‘Sexual Misconduct’ web page or by calling 1800 SYD HLP (1800 793 457) from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Friday.

Note: Students and former students who prefer to make a complaint in person can call 1800 SYD HLP (1800 793 457) to make an appointment.
(2) Complaints of sexual misconduct and sexual harassment will be referred to the Student Affairs Unit, for handling in accordance with the Student Complaints Procedures 2015.

(3) Students and former students will be supported in their dealings with the Student Affairs Unit by the Student Liaison Officers.

(4) Staff members may assist a student or former student to make a complaint.

(5) Student Liaison Officers, Student Affairs Officers and student caseworkers may make a complaint on behalf of a student or former student.

(6) A student or former student who has made a complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment is free to withdraw it at any time. However, if the University has already commenced misconduct proceedings against a student, staff member of affiliate as a result of the complaint, those proceedings will be completed.

(7) The making, investigation or resolution of a complaint under these procedures must be in accordance with the principles set out in the Policy.

(8) Complainants are required to engage with the complaints process, and to provide sufficient details of their complaint to permit the University to conduct a preliminary assessment and investigation, as appropriate.

Note: Complainants are not required to put their complaint in writing in the first instance. However, a written complaint will be required if an investigation is needed. See clause 7(4) of the Student Complaints Procedures 2015.

7 Supporting students who have experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment

(1) Contact details for ongoing support and assistance for students and former students who have experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment are set out in Schedule 2 to the Policy and Schedule 2 to these procedures.

(2) Students, staff, affiliates and student caseworkers can seek advice and assistance with supporting a student or former student who has experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment by calling 1800 SYD HLP (1800 793 457) from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Friday.

(3) Students, staff, affiliates and student caseworkers should:

(a) refer students and former students who have experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment to the available support services, and to the online portal and 1800 SYD HLP (1800 793 457); and

(b) advise students and former students of their right to make a disclosure or complaint.

(4) Where appropriate, staff and affiliates should also seek advice from the University’s Office of General Counsel on whether the matter should be reported to the NSW Police in accordance with clause 15 of the Policy.

(5) Students, staff, and affiliates and student caseworkers can support a student or former student who has experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment by:

(a) listening without interrupting;

(b) letting them express how they feel and respecting the words they use in reference to the incident;
(c) letting the student know they believe what the student is telling them and acknowledging the student’s distress;
(d) letting the student know that the incident was not their fault;
(e) respecting their decisions;
(f) directing them to the available support services.

Note: When a student or former student has experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment, they may express a range of emotional and physical symptoms. The NSW Rape Crisis Service website provides information on common impacts of sexual assault.

8 Supporting students who have been accused of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment

Contact details for ongoing support and assistance for students who have been accused of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment are set out in Schedule 3 to the Policy and Schedule 3 to these procedures.

9 Preliminary assessment of a complaint

(1) Upon receiving a complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment, the Student Affairs Unit will conduct a preliminary assessment in accordance with clause 8 of the Student Complaints Procedures 2015.

Note: For details of timeframes, the information that will be recorded in the case management system and the process that will be undertaken, see clause 8 of the Student Complaints Procedures 2015.

Note: Where the complaint relates to the conduct of a staff member or affiliate, the Student Affairs Unit must refer the complaint to Workplace Relations. See subclause 8(11) of the Student Complaints Procedures 2015.

(2) The Student Affairs Unit will consult with the complainant during the preliminary assessment process.

(3) Sexual misconduct and most sexual harassment by students will constitute student misconduct.

(a) The Student Affairs Unit will not refer a complaint about a student to the Registrar, for handling in accordance with the University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016, without consulting the complainant.

(b) If a complaint about a student is referred to the Registrar, the Student Affairs Unit will update the complainant regularly on the progress of the misconduct proceedings.

(4) The Student Affairs Unit will inform the complainant before referring a complaint to the Registrar.

(5) If a complaint about a student is not referred to the Registrar:

(a) the University will be unable to take disciplinary action against the respondent; and

(b) the Student Affairs Unit will determine, in consultation with the complainant, whether the complaint is appropriate for investigation or assisted resolution.
10 Investigation of a complaint

(1) Where the Student Affairs Unit determines that investigation of a complaint about a student is appropriate and the complaint has not been referred to the Registrar for handling in accordance with the *University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016*, the complaint will be investigated in accordance with the *Student Complaints Procedures 2015*.

Note: Investigators must make findings of fact and may make recommendations for resolving complaints. See subclause 11(4) of the *Student Complaints Procedures 2015*.

(2) If an investigator recommends that a complaint about a student be referred to the Registrar for handling in accordance with the *University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016*, the Student Affairs Unit will not refer the complaint to the Registrar without consulting the complainant.

(3) The Student Affairs Unit will inform the complainant before referring a complaint to the Registrar.

(4) If the complaint is not referred to the Registrar:

(a) the University will not take disciplinary action against the respondent; and

(b) the Student Affairs Unit will take into account the investigator’s findings of fact and any recommendations, and determine, in consultation with the complainant, whether the complaint is appropriate for assisted resolution.

Note: The Student Affairs Unit will provide the complainant and the respondent a written statement of the outcome of the complaint, including reasons and details of any right to an appeal. See subclause 11(1) of the *Student Complaints Procedures 2015*.

(5) Alleged misconduct by staff members may be investigated in accordance with clause 384 of the *University of Sydney Enterprise Agreement 2018-2021* or any successor or replacement agreement (where applicable).

(6) Alleged misconduct by affiliates will be investigated by the University and may result in the revocation of a title and any accompanying privileges under the *Honorary Titles Policy 2013*.

11 Outcome of a complaint

(1) The outcome of a complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment will be determined by the findings of any investigation, the seriousness of the complaint and the wishes of the complainant.

(2) For complaints that result in misconduct proceedings:

(a) the *University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016* sets out the process for establishing penalties for, and appeal rights from, findings of misconduct against a student.

Note: See sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the *University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016*.

(b) the *University of Sydney Enterprise Agreement 2018-2021* sets out the process for establishing penalties for, and appeal rights from, findings of misconduct against a staff member.
Note: See clauses 3 and 384 of the University of Sydney Enterprise Agreement 2018-2021.

(3) The Student Affairs Unit will inform complainants of the outcome of misconduct proceedings against students, staff members or affiliates, on a confidential basis. Where possible, this information will be delivered in person, to allow the complainant to ask questions and seek clarification about the effect of the outcome.

Note: See subclause 14(2) of the Policy in relation to the confidentiality of complaint outcomes.

(4) If the complainant does not provide sufficient detail or evidence of a complaint about a student, staff member or affiliate to enable the alleged conduct to be properly investigated, a finding of misconduct will not be made and the University will be unable to take disciplinary action against the respondent.

(5) If a complaint about a student is not referred to the Registrar for handling in accordance with the University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016, or if a finding of misconduct is not made, the Student Affairs Unit will determine whether the complaint is appropriate for investigation or assisted resolution in accordance with the Student Complaints Procedures 2015.

Note: Assisted resolution may include, an apology, mediation or conciliation, an agreed plan of action to avoid further incidents, and implementing awareness-raising or educational sessions about behaviour. See clause 9 of the Student Complaints Procedures 2015.

(6) If a complaint about a staff member or affiliate does not result in misconduct proceedings, or if a finding of misconduct is not made, Workplace Relations will determine whether the complaint is appropriate for mediation or an alternative form of dispute resolution.

(7) In most circumstances, mediation and conciliation will be considered inappropriate for resolving complaints of sexual misconduct.

12 Interim measures

(1) If the Registrar imposes interim measures against a student, they must provide a written notice to the student within 24 hours:

(a) specifying the terms of the interim measures;

(b) specifying the period of the interim measures;

(c) summarising the reasons for the interim measures; and

(d) providing a copy of, or an electronic link to, the Policy and these procedures.

Note: The University will keep confidential all information relating to a disclosure or complaint of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment, unless the student who made the disclosure or complaint consents to disclosure of part or all of the information. See subclause 14(1) of the Policy.

(2) Applications for internal review of interim measures must be lodged:

(a) in writing to the Student Affairs Unit;

(b) within 20 working days of the date on which written notice of the interim measures was provided to the student.
(3) Applications for internal review will be considered by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).

(4) Any internal review will be:
   (a) conducted on the basis of the written material; and
   (b) limited to a review of the term, period and reasons for taking the interim measures.

(5) Where reasonable, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) will review the interim measures within 20 working days of the application for review.

(6) Where 20 days is not reasonable, the Student Affairs Unit will advise the student of the reasons for the delay, and the projected timeframe for completion of the internal review.

(7) At the conclusion of the internal review, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) will provide the student with a written statement of the outcome of the review, including reasons.

(8) Nothing in these procedures affects the power of:
   (a) the Registrar to suspend a student in accordance with the University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016; or
   (b) a University representative to issue a Termination of License Notice in accordance with the University of Sydney (Campus Access) Rule 2009.

13 Educational measures to prevent sexual misconduct and sexual harassment

(1) This clause applies to all students enrolled in a University award course after 1 January 2020.

(2) The “Consent Matters” module is the approved educational program about sexual misconduct and sexual harassment.

(3) The “Consent Matters” module must be completed by all students:
   (a) enrolling for the first time in a University award course; and
   (b) who have not previously completed the module at the University.

(4) Students required to complete the module must do so within their first semester of enrolment or, in the case of higher degree by research students, in their first research period of enrolment.
   (a) Requirements for other students to complete the “Consent Matters” module may only be imposed with the approval of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).

(5) Students may apply for exemption on the grounds of personal distress by using the relevant online form.
   (a) The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Student Life) will consider and determine applications for exemption.

(6) Students may appeal the result of an exemption application to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) within:
   (a) 20 working days of being informed of it; or
(b) any longer time period approved by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) in their absolute discretion.

(7) If a student fails to comply with the requirement to complete the module without an exemption:

(a) the student’s academic records may be suppressed or higher degree by research progression delayed;

(b) the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Student Life) may issue a warning to the student stating that a failure to complete the module will prevent them from graduating; and

(c) if the module is not completed, the student may not be eligible to graduate.

**1314 Review**

These procedures will be reviewed within one year of the date of commencement.
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14 Renumbered to accommodate addition of new clause 13
SCHEDULE 1 – Emergency contacts

(1) In an emergency, students should contact emergency services by dialling triple zero (000).

(2) Students who feel unsafe on campus or are concerned for someone else’s safety can also contact Campus Security on 9351 3333, 24 hours a day.

(3) Students and former students who have experienced sexual misconduct can contact:

(a) NSW Rape Crisis Service on 1800 424 017, 24 hours a day;

(b) 1800RESPECT on 1800 737 732 or online via www.1800respect.org.au, 24 hours a day;

(c) Royal Prince Alfred (RPA) Hospital Sexual Assault Service on 9515 9040 (Monday to Friday) or 9515 6111 (after hours). Counselling and medical services are available for anyone who has been sexually assaulted. Campus Security can arrange transport to RPA.
SCHEDULE 2 – University support for students and former students who have experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment

(1) A student or former student who has experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment can make a disclosure or a complaint to the University online on the University’s ‘Sexual Misconduct’ web page or by calling 1800 SYD HLP (1800 793 457) from 9am to 5pm, Monday to Friday.

(2) Students who have experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment have access to a range of University support services and assistance, including:

- **Student Liaison Officers** – contact 8627 6808 or email safer-communities.officer@sydney.edu.au, 8.30am-5.30pm, Monday to Friday;
- **on campus emergency accommodation** - contact Student Accommodation Services on 9351 3322, 10am to 4pm, Monday to Friday. For after hours emergency accommodation, contact Campus Security on 9351 3333;
- **security services** - contact Campus Security on 9351 3333, 24 hours a day;
- **health services** (for current students only) - contact the University Health Service on 9351 3484, 8:30am to 5pm, Monday to Friday;
- **counselling services** (for current students, other than students of CCE and CET, only) – contact Counselling and Psychological Services (CAPS) on 8627 8433, 9am to 4:30pm, Monday to Friday;
- **disability support** - contact Disability Services on 8627 7422, 9am-4pm, Monday to Friday;
- **academic support** - [special consideration](#) for examinations and assessments; and
- **student representative associations** – undergraduate students: contact the [Student Representative Council](#) (SRC) on 9660 5222, 9am-5pm, Monday to Friday; postgraduate students - contact the [Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association](#) (SUPRA) on 9351 3715, 9am to 5pm (closed 12-1pm), Monday to Friday.

(3) Former students who have experienced sexual misconduct or sexual harassment have access to a range of University support services and assistance, which may include:

- **Student Liaison Officers** – contact 8627 6808 or email safer-communities.officer@sydney.edu.au, 8.30am-5.30pm, Monday to Friday;
- **security services** - contact Campus Security on 9351 3333, 24 hours a day;
- **student representative associations** – undergraduate students: contact the [Student Representative Council](#) (SRC) on 9660 5222, 9am-5pm, Monday to Friday; postgraduate students: contact the [Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association](#) (SUPRA) on 9351 3715, 9am to 5pm (closed 12-1pm), Monday to Friday.
SCHEDULE 3 – University support for students who have been accused of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment

Students who are accused of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment have access to a range of University support services and assistance, including:

- **health services** - contact the University Health Service on 9351 3484, 8:30am to 5pm, Monday to Friday;
- **counselling services** - (for current students, other than students of CCE and CET, only) contact Counselling and Psychological Services (CAPS) on 8627 8433, 9am to 4:30pm, Monday to Friday;
- **on campus emergency accommodation** - contact Student Accommodation Services on 9351 3322, 10am to 4pm, Monday to Friday For after hours emergency accommodation, contact Campus Security on 9351 3333;
- **disability support** - contact Disability Services on 8627 7422, 9am-4pm, Monday to Friday
- **academic support** - special consideration for examinations and assessments; and
- **student representative associations** – undergraduate students: contact the Student Representative Council (SRC) on 9660 5222, 9am-5pm, Monday to Friday; postgraduate students: contact the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association (SUPRA) on 9351 3715, 9am to 5pm (closed 12-1pm), Monday to Friday.
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**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the draft Curriculum Timetabling Procedures 2020 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 or procedures. 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 Procedures has been created by a Policy Working Group. It has been circulated for review and feedback to the Project’s Policy Reference Group, Faculty and School Managers Reference Group, and other key stakeholders, with a broad representation of University academic and administrative roles. The Policy Working Group revised the draft Procedures 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 and Policy Committee, and to additional committees listed in “Consultation” and “Implementation” below, and then for the Vice-Chancellor’s approval.

**BACKGROUND / CONTEXT**

The Curriculum Timetabling Procedures 2020 have 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 Procedures 2020 has been subject to consultation and review by:

- Policy Working Group, Curriculum Timetabling Project
- Policy Reference Group, Curriculum Timetabling Project
- Faculty & School Managers Reference Group, Curriculum Timetabling Project
- Campus Infrastructure & Services Reference Group, Curriculum Timetabling Project
- Disability Services
- Health and Wellbeing
- The software vendor of the timetabling product Syllabus Plus, which the University will procure.
- The software vendor of the student class allocation production Allocate Plus, which the University will procure.
- Provost Steering Committee, Sydney Operating Model
- Faculty Academic Services Committee (FAS)
- Education Committee (UE)
- Joint Consultative Committee (under the Enterprise Agreement)
BENEFITS

The benefits of the University implementing the Curriculum Timetabling Procedures 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;
- Provide a strong performance management and continual improvement framework for timetabling in the University;
- Improve the student experience of timetabling within the University; and
- Improve the staff experience of timetabling within the University.

IMPLEMENTATION

In addition to the consultation listed above, the Procedures will be noted and/or tabled to the following committees in 2019:

- Academic Board
- University Executive

In December, it will be submitted for the Vice-Chancellor’s endorsement.

In August 2020, the Procedures will be registered with Office of General Counsel (OGC) and will commence.

The Procedures will commence a year later than the Curriculum Timetabling Policy 2019, which is planned to commence in August 2019. Policy describes the governing principles of timetabling within the University, but is not tied to a specific operating model. However, the Procedures are specific to the operating model of timetabling that will be implemented in 2020, in preparation for creating the Semester 1 2021 timetable.

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 model for timetabling.

ATTACHMENTS

Curriculum Timetabling Procedures 2020
1 Purpose and application
(1) These procedures are to give effect to the Curriculum Timetabling Policy 2019 (“the policy”).

(2) These procedures apply to:
(a) all students undertaking coursework;
(b) all participants in non-award courses recorded in Sydney Student; and
(c) all staff and affiliates involved in
   (i) planning;
   (ii) scheduling;
   (iii) maintaining;
   (iv) monitoring; and
   (v) teaching;
the University’s educational offerings.

2 Commencement
These procedures commence on [date].

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

Note: See clause 6 of the policy.
**Associate Dean (Education)** has the meaning given in the *Learning and Teaching Policy 2015*, which at the date of this policy is:

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

**CIS** means the University's Campus and Infrastructure Services Unit.

**Disability Services** means the University department that acts on behalf of students with disabilities, including reviewing their needs and determining support services and adjustments to give them equal access to learning.

**Elite Athlete or Performers Scheme** means the special admissions program for student athletes and performers established in the *Coursework Policy 2014*.

**flexible working arrangements** means working arrangements entered into under the flexible work provisions of the *Enterprise Agreement* or the *Flexible Working Arrangements Policy*.

**general teaching space** means teaching space to which any teaching and learning activity can be allocated.

**ICT** means the University's Information and Communications Technology unit.

**Institutional Analytics and Planning (IAP)** means the University's data reporting unit.

**prioritised teaching space** means teaching space to which a principal use will be given priority, but which can also be timetabled for other use depending on need and availability.

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

the person responsible, at a program, major or degree level, for managing the curriculum and providing coordination and advice to staff and students.

**room frequency** means, for a given period, the number of hours a room is in use divided by the number of hours it is available for use.
room occupancy means the average number of students allocated to the room for scheduled teaching, compared to the total room capacity.
specialised space means teaching space which has specialised use and is unsuitable for general use.
School Manager has the meaning given in the University of Sydney (Governance of Faculties and University Schools) Rule 2016, which at the date of this policy is:
- means a person formally appointed to that position in a school within a faculty.
Sydney Student The University's student management system.
teaching delivery requirements means the resources needed for teaching activities that must be considered in order to timetable these activities, such as the properties of teaching spaces and the availability of teaching staff.
Timetable Unit means the functional area with the University responsible for managing unit of study timetables, student personal timetables and associated information and systems.

4 Timetable production schedule

(1) The annual timetable production schedule will be approved by the Timetabling Committee.

(2) The Timetabling Committee may override the annual timetable production schedule in exceptional circumstances, such as a building becoming unavailable at short notice.

(3) If deadlines in the annual timetable production schedule are not met;
   (a) by an academic unit, the matter must be addressed by the Associate Dean (Education) and, if no resolution is achieved, the Dean; or
   (b) by the Timetable Unit, the matter must be addressed by the Director of Student Operations and, if no resolution is achieved, the Executive Director, Student Administration.

(4) CIS and ICT will provide proposals for teaching venue maintenance, refurbishment, commissioning and decommissioning to the Timetable Unit at the date stated in the annual timetable production schedule.
   (a) The Timetable Unit will model impacts of the proposals on timetabling and request changes to them if they would have a significant impact on timetabling.
   (b) If agreement cannot be reached, the matter will be resolved by the Vice-Principal (Operations).

(5) Teaching spaces will be unavailable for timetabling when they are undergoing CIS or ICT venue maintenance and refurbishment.

(6) If staff to whom roles are allocated in these procedures are absent during the annual timetable production schedule,
(a) where the roles are academic, the relevant Head of School must nominate others to perform these roles; and

(b) where the roles are administrative, the relevant Faculty or University School General Manager must nominate others to perform these roles.

5 Collecting timetable information

(1) Unit of study coordinators, or if they are unavailable program directors, will provide the Timetable Unit with the teaching delivery requirements needed for timetabling for each unit of study.

(2) If a unit of study has been previously taught, the Timetable Unit will provide the existing teaching delivery requirements to the unit of study coordinator to review and update if needed.

(3) The Timetable Unit will provide the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) with a list of commonly selected unit of study combinations to be made clash free, based on previous years' patterns of enrolment.

(a) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) will review this list in consultation with the Associate Deans (Education), and, where necessary, provide additional combinations to be made clash free, based on guidelines from the Timetable Unit.

(b) The additional combinations will include:

(i) combinations for new units of study; and

(ii) combinations for existing units of study missing from the provided list, that they expect multiple students would select.

(4) The Timetable Unit will obtain projected enrolment numbers from IAP for units of study that have been previously taught and provide them to School Managers, School General Managers of University schools, and the Faculty General Manager of the Business School, who will:

(a) review these projections and may:

(i) override them if they believe there are variables that could not be predicted by historical patterns of enrolment alone; and

(ii) provide projections where IAP cannot, such as for new units of study.

(5) For teaching activities that require setting up or removing equipment or materials, the draft timetable will include as needed:

(a) a default period of 30 minutes for setting up before the teaching activity; and

(b) a default period of 30 minutes for removal after the teaching activity.

(6) Setting up and removal periods longer than 30 minutes will be provided if requested by the unit of study coordinator.

(a) The unit of study coordinator should liaise with Technical Services staff on the amount of time required.
6 Teaching staff allocation

(1) School Managers, School General Managers of University schools, or the Faculty General Manager of the Business School may provide the Timetable Unit with the names of the teaching staff who are expected to teach the class types for their units of study, where this is known at the time of timetable planning.

(2) If a unit of study has been previously taught, the Timetable Unit will provide the relevant School Manager, School General Manager of a University school, or the Faculty General Manager of the Business School with details of the existing teaching staff identified for that unit of study, to review and update if needed.

(3) School Managers, School General Managers of University schools, or the Faculty General Manager of the Business School may provide the Timetabling Unit with the number of staff who they expect to engage to teach the class types for their units of study, where this is known at the time of timetabling planning.

(4) School Managers, School General Managers of University schools, or the Faculty General Manager of the Business School may provide detail of accommodations required for teaching staff with disabilities, where known.

(5) If teaching staff for specific class types are not known during timetable planning, the Timetable Unit will schedule the classes without identified teaching staff.

(a) The actual teaching staff may be recorded for these classes in the timetabling system by faculty or school staff after the draft timetable has been created.

(6) The Timetable Unit will not allocate teaching staff to classes beyond a maximum span of teaching hours on a single day.

(a) The Provost will determine the maximum span in consultation with the University Executive.

(7) The Timetable Unit will only schedule classes on weekends with the agreement of the Head of School.

(8) The School Manager, School General Manager of a University school, or the Faculty General Manager of the Business School may inform the Timetable Unit of any approved flexible working or outside earning arrangements which would make a teaching staff member unavailable to teach at specific times of the week.

Note: See Flexible Working Arrangements Policy, Outside Earnings of Academic Staff Policy 2011.

(9) The School Manager, School General Manager of a University school, or the Faculty General Manager of the Business School may provide the Timetable Unit with details of the availability of honorary and adjunct title holders to teach at specific times of the week.

7 Teaching space allocation

(1) Unit of study coordinators will provide the Timetable Unit with information on the teaching space properties that each class type requires, based on the teaching space properties published by the Timetabling Committee.
(2) The Timetable Unit will match the classes to teaching spaces with these properties.

Note: Schedule 1 of the Curriculum Timetabling Policy 2019 describes the Terms of Reference of the Timetabling Committee, including ownership of the list of teaching space properties.

(3) If a unit of study has been previously taught, the Timetable Unit will provide the existing teaching space requirements for that unit of study to the unit of study coordinator, to review and update if needed.

(4) If classes cannot be scheduled because of competition for venues, the Timetable Unit will liaise with the relevant unit of study coordinators to seek a resolution.

(a) If agreement cannot be reached:
   (i) matters affecting a single faculty or University school will be resolved by the relevant Associate Dean (Education); and
   (ii) matters involving multiple faculties or University schools will be resolved by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).

(5) The Timetable Unit will only allocate specialised teaching spaces to classes that require them for their teaching.

(a) School Managers, School General Managers of University schools, and the Faculty General Manager of the Business School may apply to the Timetabling Committee to have spaces classified as specialised, if the spaces have:
   (i) access or Work Health and Safety (WHS) restrictions; or
   (ii) specialised fixed equipment of very high cost.

(6) The Timetable Unit will allocate prioritised teaching spaces firstly to classes that require them for their teaching.

(a) If prioritised spaces are available at other times, they may be allocated to other classes.

(7) School Managers, School General Managers of University schools, and the Faculty General Manager of the Business School may apply to the Timetabling Committee to have spaces classified as prioritised if the spaces have:

(a) specialised fixed equipment; or
(b) specialised software.

(8) The Timetable Unit will allow for travel time between venues when considering teaching spaces for consecutive classes for a teaching staff member.

Note: See clause 11(2), for student travel time between venues.

(9) Unit of study coordinators may provide the Timetable Unit with information on scheduled independent student learning activities for which teaching spaces are required.

(a) The Timetable Unit will allocate teaching spaces for these activities but will not make the activities available for student allocation or include them in students' personal timetables.

(10) The Timetable Unit will seek to allocate evening and weekend teaching activities to particular zones of the University, so that supporting services can be provided to these zones during these periods. If no appropriate facilities are available in the
proposed zones, activities will be allocated to the nearest appropriate teaching space.

8 Timetable draft

(1) The Timetable Unit will contact relevant staff to discuss any timetable input data that may adversely affect creation of the timetable.

(a) If agreement cannot be reached on appropriate changes:

(i) matters affecting a single faculty or University school will be resolved by the relevant Associate Dean (Education); and

(ii) matters involving multiple faculties or University schools will be resolved by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).

(2) The Timetable Unit will distribute the draft timetable to unit of study coordinators for review by the date stated in the annual timetable production schedule, provided that earlier schedule deadlines have been met.

(3) Unit of study coordinators who request a change of teaching space during the draft review period must specify the property which the currently allocated teaching space lacks and which the proposed venue provides.

(a) The Timetable Committee will evaluate adding this property to the teaching space properties for a subsequent timetable planning period.

(4) The Timetable Unit will only consider change of venue requests from unit of study coordinators during the draft review period if:

(a) the allocated teaching space does not match the teaching delivery requirements provided when timetable information was collected;

(b) the teaching delivery requirements have changed since the timetable information was collected; or

(c) a requested room which matches teaching delivery requirements is available.

(5) The Timetable Unit will only consider change of time requests from unit of study coordinators during the draft review period if:

(a) the scheduled time does not match the teaching delivery requirements provided when timetable information was collected;

(b) the teaching delivery requirements have changed since the timetable information was collected; or

(c) another reason validated by the Head of School of the Unit of Study Coordinator is provided.

(6) Requests for changes of time will only be accommodated if appropriate teaching resources (such as identified teaching staff and suitable venue) are available at the requested time.

(7) The Timetable Unit may change teaching space and time during the draft review period provided that changes are consistent with agreed teaching delivery requirements. Where a change is not consistent with agreed teaching delivery requirements, the Timetable Unit will consult relevant staff to seek agreement on changes.

(8) Where a class would occur on a public holiday, the unit of study coordinator may:
(a) accept that the class will not be able to proceed and not seek an additional scheduled class; or
(b) request that the Timetable Unit schedule a replacement class if possible.

9 Timetable publication

(1) The Timetable Unit will make the timetable available to students:
(a) as a reference to help students plan the units of study in which they will enrol on the date confirmed during the annual timetable production schedule; and
(b) for students to select and enrol in classes, on the date confirmed in the annual timetable production schedule.

(2) The published timetables will display accessibility properties of the teaching spaces.

(3) The Timetable Unit will publish in advance on the University website the dates on which:
(a) the timetable will be available to students as a reference; and
(b) the timetable will be available for student selection and allocation.

(4) The Timetable Unit will provide the following information to relevant faculty and University school staff:
(a) student numbers for scheduled classes;
(b) the timetables for units of study; and
(c) staff members’ scheduled classes.

(5) The Timetable Unit will permit casual room bookings by the date stated in the annual timetable production schedule, provided that earlier schedule deadlines have been met.

10 Student allocation to classes

(1) Students will be able to complete timetable selection by the date stated in the annual timetable production schedule, provided that earlier schedule deadlines have been met.

(2) If a student would have inadequate travel time between venues for consecutive classes, this will be considered a clash.

(3) The Timetable Unit will allow over-allocation of students to classes if:
(a) approved by the unit of study coordinator; and
(b) there is no health or safety issue identified.

(4) The Timetable Unit will seek to resolve clashes in student allocation, and where necessary will liaise with affected students and unit of study coordinators.

(5) Students may select lectures that clash with other teaching activities unless the unit of study coordinator has specified that the lecture must not clash with other teaching activities due to lecture attendance requirements.

(6) Students may apply to the Timetable Unit for adjustments to their class allocations.
(a) The Timetable Unit will process these adjustments based on rules annually endorsed by the Timetabling Committee and published prior to semester 1 allocation on the University website.

(7) Students who have selected classes may apply to swap to a class that is currently full if a place in that class becomes available.

(a) Applications may be made, and fulfilled, until the end of the last day for adding a unit of study in a teaching period.

(8) Students should not change the classes they attend unless the change has been made in their timetable.

(9) The Timetable Unit will seek to change the allocation of students with an approved timetable adjustment from Disability Services, to a matching teaching space or time.

(10) The Timetable Unit will seek to change the allocation of students admitted under the Elite Athlete or Performers Scheme with an approved timetable adjustment, to a matching teaching time.

(11) Unit of study coordinators will be able to manually allocate students to classes where there are pedagogical reasons to control their class allocation, if approved by Associate Dean (Education) of the unit of study coordinator’s faculty.

(12) The Timetable Unit will provide student class lists to unit of study coordinators.

(13) The Timetable Unit will release all unused class bookings for casual booking:

(a) at the completion of student timetable allocation; and

(b) on the date stated in the annual timetable production schedule provided that earlier schedule deadlines have been met.

(14) The Timetable Unit will not make changes to student allocation requested by a unit of study coordinator if they would generate a clash for the student.

(a) The Timetable Unit will inform the requesting unit of study coordinator in such cases.

11 Timetable changes after student allocation commences

(1) The Timetable Unit will monitor the over-allocation and under-allocation of students to scheduled classes.

(2) The Timetable Unit, in consultation with unit of study coordinators, may make changes after student allocation commences if the enrolment for a unit of study is higher or lower than projected. These changes may include, as appropriate:

(a) reallocating classes to teaching spaces with a different capacity;

(b) increasing class limits of existing classes;

(c) scheduling additional classes; or

(d) closing classes and reallocating students to clash-free alternative times.

(3) Unit of study coordinators may request the Timetable Unit to change the timetable or student allocation after student allocation has commenced.

(a) If the requested change has no impact on students, the Timetable Unit will make it wherever possible.
(b) If the requested change would have an impact on students, the Timetable Unit will make it wherever possible, provided it is approved by the relevant Head of School.

(c) If the requested change cannot be made due to competition for teaching resources or clashes, the Timetable Unit will liaise with the relevant unit of study coordinators to seek a resolution. If agreement cannot be reached:

(i) If agreement cannot be reached, the matter will be addressed by the relevant Heads of School.

(ii) If agreement is still unable to be reached, the matter will be determined by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).

(4) In exceptional circumstances where teaching spaces become unsuitable for teaching at short notice after student allocation or teaching has commenced, the Timetable Unit may change the timetable and student allocation as needed to accommodate the exceptional circumstances.

(5) The Timetable Unit will manage communication with students affected by any timetable change after student allocation commences.

12 Reporting and diagnostics

(1) The Timetable Unit will provide timetable and student allocation data to IAP for use in analytics.

(2) The Timetable Unit will report annually to the UE Education Committee on:

(a) room occupancy;

(b) room frequency;

(c) the number and type of changes made to timetable after student allocation commences, by faculty and University school;

(d) the number of clashes in student timetables;

(e) the percentage of students who obtain their timetable without staff support;

(f) the percentage of students who require staff support to obtain their timetable;

(g) the number of days before classes start that the student timetables are published;

(h) student satisfaction with timetabling and class allocation, as measured in student surveys; and.

(i) units of study where the Associate Dean (Education) has approved manual allocation of students to classes.
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### SCHEDULE ONE

**ANNUAL TIMETABLE PRODUCTION SCHEDULE TEMPLATE**

This template will specify the key dates for the production of the annual timetable. It is anticipated that a full-year timetable will be produced prior to semester 1, with an adjustment period prior to semester 2, and student allocation prior to each semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yearly Timetable Production Schedule</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meeting with Campus Infrastructure Services re facilities changes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Month YYYY</td>
<td><strong>All staff fulfilling timetabling roles are confirmed for the full year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Month YYYY</td>
<td><strong>Data collection period commences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Month YYYY</td>
<td><strong>Data collection period ends</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Month YYYY</td>
<td><strong>Draft timetable released to staff for review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Month YYYY</td>
<td><strong>Draft timetable review period ends</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Month YYYY</td>
<td><strong>Timetable released to students for planning their enrolment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Month YYYY</td>
<td><strong>Timetable released to students for recording preferences for semester 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Month YYYY</td>
<td><strong>Student personal timetables released for semester 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Month YYYY</td>
<td><strong>Enable casual room booking</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Month YYYY</td>
<td><strong>Last day for timetable changes for semester 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week X of Period</td>
<td><strong>Last day for student self-allocation adjustments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Month YYYY</td>
<td><strong>Unutilised class bookings released for casual bookings</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Semester 2 Adjustment Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DD Month YYYY</td>
<td><strong>Meeting with Campus Infrastructure Services re facilities changes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Month YYYY</td>
<td><strong>Semester 2 timetable adjustment period commences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Month YYYY</td>
<td><strong>Semester 2 timetable adjustment period ends</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Month YYYY</td>
<td><strong>Timetable released to students for recording preferences for semester 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Month YYYY</td>
<td><strong>Student personal timetables released for semester 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Month YYYY</td>
<td><strong>Enable casual room booking</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Month YYYY</td>
<td><strong>Last day for timetable changes for semester 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Month YYYY</td>
<td><strong>Last day for student self-allocation adjustments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD Month YYYY</td>
<td>Unutilised class bookings released for casual bookings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

Changes to the Admission Pre-requisite Standards - Mathematics are proposed (Attachment 1) to accommodate implementation in 2020.

The changes are:
1. Add ‘international applicants applying on the basis of Australian secondary study’ to the coverage of section 3.
2. Permit students entering on the basis of secondary studies to demonstrate mathematics standards by a pass or better in an approved mathematics prerequisite course.
3. Modify 6 to apply to University of Sydney Preparation Program students for 2020 and to other approved preparation programs (including the High Achievers Preparation Program (HAPP)) from 2021.
4. Specify that, where a student enters on the basis of mathematics study within a preparation program, the standard must be equivalent to either a required NSW mathematics result or an approved mathematics prerequisite course.
5. Amend 3 (3) (b), relating to students in the Gadigal Scheme to allow passing in a subsequent attempt.

Attachment 1 also includes the changes conditionally approved by the Admissions Committee on 7 May (in red text).

Background / Context

On 7 May the Admissions Committee (item 4.24) considered changes to the Admission Pre-requisite - Standards Mathematics, with the recommendation:

*That the Undergraduate Studies Committee recommend that Academic Board:
(1) Approve the Process Map for assessing NRSL Mathematics Prerequisite in 2020 onwards; and
(2) the changes to the Admission Prerequisite Standards: Mathematics.*

The decision of the committee was that the proposal was endorsed for submission to Academic Board conditional upon the Chair, A/Prof. Masters and A/Prof. McCallum reviewing and amending the wording of the standards for domestic students to include the MOOC as an equivalent approved Mathematics prerequisite course.

The attached proposal clarifies the status of the MOOC in connection with students applying on the basis of secondary study and also makes adjustments clarifying that international students who take an Australian secondary qualification (whether in Australia or offshore) must also demonstrate that they have met the mathematics standard for courses where the prerequisite applies. This is achieved by permitting students entering on the basis of secondary study to also satisfy the standard by a pass or better in an approved mathematics prerequisite course (according to the Standard the MOOC MATH1111 is already an approved mathematics prerequisite course).
In addition changes are made to stagger implementation of the standard for approved preparation programs to ensure that students seeking entry on the basis of an approved program other than the University of Sydney Foundation Program are given adequate notice. Students of the University of Sydney Foundation Program were advised of the standard in 2018 so that students enrolling in the program during 2019 have had adequate notice.

**Implementation**

All except clause 6 changes take effect from 1 January 2020. Clause 6 takes effect from 1 January 2020 for students from the University of Sydney Foundation Program and from 1 January 2021 for other approved preparation programs.

**Further information**

The following is available for further information in the Resource Centre:

**Attachments**

**Attachment 1**: Admission Prerequisite Standards – Mathematics. Proposed amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Peter McCallum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Requests for further information | Peter McCallum Education Portfolio  
Wencong Chair Admissions Office |
ADMISSIONS PREREQUISITE STANDARDS - MATHEMATICS

1 Definitions

(1) Words and phrases used in these standards and not otherwise defined in this document have the meanings they have in the Coursework Policy 2014.

(2) In these standards:

- **approved mathematics prerequisite course**
  - Math 1111 (including MOOC version): for admission to all award courses subject to these standards
  - ECON 1003: for admission to the Bachelor of Economics and Bachelor of Economics/Bachelor of Advanced Studies
  - ENVX 1002: for admission to the Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Agriculture), Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Animal and Veterinary Bioscience); Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Food and Agribusiness), and Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Taronga Wildlife Conservation)

- **MOOC**
  - means Massive Open Online Course.

- **required NSW mathematics result**
  - means, in the New South Wales Higher School Certificate:
    - a band 4 or higher result in Mathematics (2019 or earlier); or
    - a band 4 or higher result in Mathematics Advanced (2020 or later).

- **Table 1 award course**
  - means any award course listed in Table 1 to these standards

2 Mathematics prerequisites generally

Except as provided in subclause 3(3), in order to be eligible for admission to any award course listed in Table 1 to these standards, students must meet the standards specified in this document.

3 Domestic applicants applying on the basis of secondary study and international applicants applying on the basis of Australian secondary study

(1) These standards apply to:
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(a) domestic and international applicants seeking admission for study commencing on or after 1 January 2019, who obtained an Australian school leaving qualification in 2018 or equivalent school leaving qualification undertaken in Australia; and

(b) all domestic applicants seeking admission for study commencing on or after 1 January 2020; and.

(b)(c) all international applicants seeking admission for study on the basis of an Australian school leaving qualification or equivalent school leaving qualification undertaken in Australia, for study commencing on or after 1 January 2020.

(2) In addition to the otherwise applicable admission requirements, a domestic applicant seeking admission to a Table 1 award course on the basis of secondary study must demonstrate achievement in mathematics through:

(a) a required NSW mathematics result; or

(b) a result in a secondary school-leaving qualification considered by the Academic Board to be equivalent to a required NSW mathematics result; or-

(b)(c) a pass or higher grade in an approved mathematics prerequisite course.

(3) An Associate Dean may admit an applicant under the Gadigal Scheme, who has not met the standards specified in this document, to a course listed in Table 1:

(a) if satisfied that they have the capacity to succeed in coursework at a university level; and

(b) subject to a requirement that they enrol in, and pass, an approved mathematics pre-requisite course in their first year of enrolment or, where required in a subsequent attempt.

Note: The Cadigal Scheme is a special admission program for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander applicants. See clause 28 of the Coursework Policy 2014.

4 Domestic applicants applying on the basis of tertiary study

(1) These standards apply to domestic applicants seeking admission on the basis of tertiary study, for study commencing on or after 1 January 2020.

(2) In addition to the otherwise applicable admission requirements, a domestic applicant seeking admission to a Table 1 award course on the basis of tertiary study must demonstrate achievement in mathematics through:

(a) a pass or higher grade in an approved mathematics prerequisite course;

(b) completing other tertiary mathematical study which, in the opinion of the relevant Associate Dean in the faculty or University school responsible for the award course, provides preparation in mathematics to an equivalent or higher standard to is equivalent to a pass or higher grade in an approved mathematics prerequisite course; or

(c) having achieved:

(i) a required NSW mathematics result; or

(ii) a result in a secondary school-leaving qualification considered by the Academic Board to be equivalent.
5 Domestic applicants applying on the basis of other qualifications

(1) These standards apply to all domestic applicants seeking admission on the basis of qualifications other than secondary or tertiary study, for study commencing on or after 1 January 2020.

(2) In addition to the otherwise applicable admission requirements, a domestic applicant seeking admission to a Table 1 award course on the basis of another qualification approved by the Academic Board under clause 12 of the Coursework Policy 2014 must demonstrate achievement in mathematics through:

(a) achieving a result which is considered by the Academic Board to be equivalent to:
   (i) a required NSW mathematics result or
   (ii) a pass grade or higher in an approved mathematics pre-requisite course; or

(b) completing other tertiary mathematical study which, in the opinion of the relevant Associate Dean in the faculty or University school responsible for the award course, provides preparation in mathematics to an equivalent or higher standard to is equivalent to a pass or higher grade in an approved mathematics prerequisite course.

6 Applicants applying on the basis of approved preparation programs

(1) These standards apply to applicants seeking admission on the basis of the University of Sydney Preparation Program for study commencing on or after 1 January 2020 and to all preparation programs approved by the Academic Board under clause 15 of the Coursework Policy 2014, for study commencing on or after 1 January 20210.

(2) In addition to the otherwise applicable admission requirements, an applicant seeking admission to a Table 1 award course on the basis of an approved preparation program must demonstrate achievement in mathematics through:

(a) achieving a result which is considered by the Academic board to be equivalent to:
   (i) a required NSW mathematics result; or
   (ii) a pass grade or higher in an approved mathematics pre-requisite course; or

(b) completing other tertiary mathematical study which, in the opinion of the relevant Associate Dean in the faculty or University school responsible for the award course, provides preparation in mathematics to an equivalent or higher standard to is equivalent to a pass or higher grade in a required NSW mathematics result or an approved mathematics prerequisite course.
TABLE 1

Undergraduate award courses with mathematics prerequisites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>UAC CODE</th>
<th>AWARD COURSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>523115</td>
<td>B. Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>513230</td>
<td>B. Economics / B. Advanced Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>B. Economics (Sciences Po Dual Degree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>513260</td>
<td>B. Education (Secondary: Mathematics) / B. Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>513265</td>
<td>B. Education (Secondary: Science) / B. Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney Business School</td>
<td>513300</td>
<td>B. Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>513305</td>
<td>B. Commerce / B. Advanced Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>513310</td>
<td>B. Commerce / B. Advanced Studies (Dalyell Scholars)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology</td>
<td>513500</td>
<td>B. Advanced Computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>513505</td>
<td>B. Advanced Computing / B. Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>513510</td>
<td>B Advanced Computing / B. Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>513515</td>
<td>B. Advanced Computing / B. Science (Health)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>513520</td>
<td>B. Advanced Computing / B. Science (Medical Science)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>513525</td>
<td>B. Engineering Honours (Aeronautical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>513530</td>
<td>B. Engineering Honours (Biomedical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>513535</td>
<td>B. Engineering Honours (Chemical and Biomolecular)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>513540</td>
<td>B. Engineering Honours (Civil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513545</td>
<td>B. Engineering Honours (Electrical)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513545</td>
<td>B. Engineering Honours (Flexible First Year)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513555</td>
<td>B. Engineering Honours (Mechanical)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513560</td>
<td>B. Engineering Honours (Mechatronic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513565</td>
<td>B. Engineering Honours (Software)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513570</td>
<td>B. Engineering Honours with Space Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513575</td>
<td>B. Engineering Honours / B. Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513580</td>
<td>B. Engineering Honours / B. Commerce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513585</td>
<td>B. Engineering Honours (Civil) / B. Design in Architecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513590</td>
<td>B. Engineering Honours / B. Project Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513595</td>
<td>B. Engineering Honours / B. Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513600</td>
<td>B. Engineering Honours / B. Science (Health)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513605</td>
<td>B. Engineering Honours / B. Science (Medical Science)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513610</td>
<td>B. Project Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University of Sydney Law School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>513800</td>
<td>B. Commerce / B. Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513800</td>
<td>B. Economics / B. Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513800</td>
<td>B. Engineering Honours / B. Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513800</td>
<td>B. Science / B. Laws</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty of Medicine and Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>513715</td>
<td>B. Arts / D. Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513760</td>
<td>B. Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513765</td>
<td>B. Pharmacy and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513705</td>
<td>B. Science / D. Dental Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513720</td>
<td>B. Science / D. Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513745</td>
<td>B. Science / M. Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513750</td>
<td>B. Science (Health) / M. Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Faculty of Science</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513905</td>
<td>B. Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513910</td>
<td>B. Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513915</td>
<td>B. Science (Health)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513925</td>
<td>B. Science (Medical Science)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513930</td>
<td>B. Science / B. Advanced Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513911</td>
<td>B. Science / B. Advanced Studies (Dalyell Scholars including Mathematical Science)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513935</td>
<td>B. Science / B. Advanced Studies (Advanced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513940</td>
<td>B. Science / B. Advanced Studies (Agriculture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513945</td>
<td>B. Science / B. Advanced Studies (Animal and Veterinary Bioscience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513950</td>
<td>B. Science / B. Advanced Studies (Food and Agribusiness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513920</td>
<td>B. Science / B. Advanced Studies (Health)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513960</td>
<td>B. Science / B. Advanced Studies (Medical Science)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513965</td>
<td>B. Science / M. Nutrition and Dietetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513970</td>
<td>B. Veterinary Biology / D. Veterinary Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513961</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science / Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Taronga Wildlife Conservation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>B. Science/M Mathematical Sciences</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION

This paper is intended for the ASPC board to note that the attached Cyber Security Policy 2019, the Cyber Security Procedure 2019 and the Acceptable Use of ICT Resources Policy 2019 has been developed within the University Policy Development framework, followed extensive University consultation and has been approved by the Vice Chancellor and the CIO. The policies and procedure will be published on the University Policy Register and will be effective from early August 2019.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The establishment of the Cybersecurity Transformation Program (the Program) was approved by the University Executive in June 2017 with the objective of bringing the University's exposure to cyber security risks within tolerance. The Program's implementation of a mature, fit-for-purpose, cyber security risk management framework is central to achieving this objective and is supported by the University Executive's endorsement of the Cyber Security Policy 2019; Cyber Security Procedure 2019; and Acceptable Use of ICT Resources Policy 2019.

The framework documents have been informed by the international standard “ISO/IEC 27001:2013 Information Security Management Systems (ISMS) Techniques”, and finalised following extensive University engagement and formal University-wide consultation for all Faculties, Schools and DVC and VP Portfolios. Framework implementation will be supported by the Program, with ongoing maintenance and compliance activities to be performed by the newly established ICT Cyber Security Governance function.

BACKGROUND

The Program’s implementation of a mature, fit-for-purpose, cyber security risk management framework is central to bringing the University’s cyber security risk exposure within tolerance. Achieving this objective will be supported by the endorsement and publication of the following framework documents:

- Cyber Security Policy 2019;
- Cyber Security Procedure 2019; and

Development of the framework documents has followed extensive University engagement and informed by the international standard “ISO/IEC 27001:2013 Information Security Management Systems (ISMS) Techniques”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Derek Winter, Head of Cyber Security, ICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer/Approver</td>
<td>Stephen Phillips, Vice-Principal, Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To inform the Committee that the attached policies and procedure supporting the University’s cyber security risk management framework has been approved and will be registered in the University Policy Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cyber Security Policy 2019 (Approved by the Vice Chancellor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Acceptable Use of ICT Resources Policy 2019 (Approved by the Vice Chancellor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cyber Security Procedure 2019 (Approved by the CIO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Formal University-wide consultation for all Faculties, University Schools and DVC and VP Portfolios, including face-to-face briefings, was undertaken, and included:

- Human Resources
- Workplace Relations
- Unions (engaged through HR)
- Student Representative Council (SRC)
- Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association (SUPRA)
- Student Administration Services
- Safety, Health and Wellbeing Unit
- DVC (Research) portfolio
- Faculty General Managers, Heads of Centres and Head of Schools
- Archives and Records Management
- Disability Action Plan Project Implementation Officer
- Privacy Officer
- Chief Risk Officer
- Chief Information Officer
- Head of Internal Audit

Feedback received during the formal consultation has been considered and the final revisions presented for approval have been endorsed by the University’s Policy Management Unit.


- Applies to Faculty, staff, affiliates, students and any visitor using or accessing the University's ICT resources, and all information and communications technology (ICT) resources that are managed by the University;
- Identifies key roles and responsibilities in managing the University's exposure to cyber security risk; and
- Establishes the principles to be followed in protecting the security of the University’s information and technology resources; including:
  - University commitment to protecting information under our care and to mitigating harm to employees, students and other partners associated with cyber security breaches
  - The existence of a shared responsibility for maintaining the security of University information and ICT resources and reporting cyber security events
  - The requirement for appropriate controls to be implemented to manage risk, including safeguards against attacks and breaches
  - Access to the University’s ICT resources must be authorised and restricted on the basis of need

The associated Cyber Security Procedure 2019 gives effect to the Policy and references a suite of Technical Standards, administered by ICT, that detail controls requirements applicable to various cyber security controls domains.

The proposed Acceptable Use of ICT Resources Policy 2019 replaces the Policy on the Use of University Information and Communication Technology Resources (ICT Resources) 2003. The Policy:

- Applies to all users of the University’s ICT resources, including staff, students and affiliates;
- Establishes principles for ensuring the University’s ICT resources are used in a legal, ethical and responsible manner;
- Establishes the limitations on personal use of University ICT resources; and
- Penalties for misuse of the University’s ICT resources.
Implementation of the aforementioned policies, procedure and technical standards will be supported by the Cyber Security Transformation Program, with ongoing maintenance and compliance activities being performed by the newly established ICT Cyber Security Governance function.

The policies are currently with the Policy Management Unit (PMU) for registration and will be published on the University’s Policy Register in early August 2019.

ATTACHMENTS

Please refer to the attachments for copies of the documents during the registration period. Once the policies have been published, refer to the University’s Policy Register, for the latest versions of the papers.

- Attachment 1 - Cyber Security Policy 2019_15 Jul
- Attachment 2 - Acceptable use of ICT Resources policy 2019_15 Jul
- Attachment 3 - Cyber Security Procedures 2019
The Vice-Chancellor as delegate of the Senate of the University of Sydney, as the governing authority of the University of Sydney, by resolution adopts the following policy.

Dated: 15/7/19

Last amended:

Signature: [signature]

Position: Secretary to Senate

CONTENTS

Contents .................................................................................................................. 1

1 Name of policy ................................................................. 1

2 Commencement ................................................................. 1

3 Policy is binding ................................................................. 1

4 Statement of intent ............................................................ 2

5 Application ........................................................................ 2

6 Definitions ........................................................................ 2

7 Cyber security principles ....................................................... 4

8 Technical standards ............................................................. 5

9 Cyber security framework ....................................................... 5

10 Roles and responsibilities ..................................................... 5

11 Rescissions and replacements .............................................. 7

Notes .................................................................................. 8

Amendment history .............................................................................. 8

1 Name of policy

This is the Cyber Security 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, staff, students and affiliates.
4 Statement of intent

This policy:

(a) sets out the principles for protecting the confidentiality, integrity and availability of the University's information and communications technology resources;
(b) establishes compliance requirements for cyber security;
(c) allocates responsibilities for the governance and management of cyber security;
(d) establishes a framework for managing cyber security; and
(e) supports the University's values of respect and integrity.

Note: See the University's Strategic Plan 2016-20.

5 Application

This policy applies to:

(a) the University, its staff, affiliates, students;
(b) any visitor, including any contractor, using or accessing the University's ICT resources; and
(c) all digital information and ICT resources.

6 Definitions

In this policy:

business system owner means a person with primary accountability for the business or technology functions provided by one or more University ICT resources, including any associated cyber security risk (also known as ICT Service Sponsors).

cyber security means the measures taken to:

- protect ICT, electronic systems, networks, devices and digital information from compromise or interruption; and
- facilitate rapid and effective detection and response to any compromise or interruption.

cyber security control means any management, operational or technical measure (including safeguards or countermeasures) put in place for cyber security.

cyber security event means an event relating to any cyber security control protecting University ICT resources from compromise or interruption. This includes internal or external acts which:

- may bypass or contravene applicable controls, policies or procedures; or
- may potentially compromise the confidentiality, integrity or availability of ICT resources.
cyber security incident means a cyber security event that may, in the opinion of the Head of Cyber Security, adversely impact the confidentiality, integrity or availability of a University ICT resource.

digital information means information that is in a digital or electronic form and is stored, processed or transmitted within an ICT service or ICT asset.

ICT means information and communications technology within the remit of any University organisational unit.

ICT asset means hardware, software, cloud-based services, communication devices, data centres, or networks that are owned by the University or provided by the University to users.

ICT resource means any ICT service, ICT asset or digital information.

ICT service means any business or technology function provided using one or more ICT assets, including, but not limited to:

- application systems (including software-as-a-service); and
- ICT infrastructure services such as operating systems, databases, voice and data telecommunications services, network services, media services, file and print services, and email service.

Organisational Resilience Framework has the meaning provided in the Risk Management Policy 2019 which at the date of this policy is:

the document or set of documents required by clause 10 of the Risk Management Policy 2019

organisational unit means any of the following:

- faculty;
- University school;
- a portfolio or professional services unit controlled by a Principal Officer;
- a level 4 centre, as described in the Centres and Collaborative Networks Policy 2017.

Principal Officer has the meaning provided in the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule 2016 which at the date of this policy is:

means a collective reference to:

Vice-Chancellor and Principal;
Deputy Vice-Chancellor;
Vice-Principal;
General Counsel;
Director, University Libraries.

procedures means the Cyber Security Procedures 2019 [insert hyperlink]
risk has the meaning provided in the Risk Management Policy 2019, which at the date of this policy is:

the effect of uncertainty on objectives.

Risk Management Framework has the meaning provided in the Risk Management Policy 2019, which at the date of this policy is:

the set of documents required by clause 9 of the Risk Management Policy 2019, which provide the foundation and arrangements for designing, implementing, monitoring, reviewing and continually improving risk management at the University.

risk owner has the meaning provided in the Risk Management Policy 2019, which is:

the role recorded against a particular risk in a risk register to discharge the responsibilities specified in clause 11 of the Risk Management Policy 2019.

technical standards means the mandatory standards for specific ICT activities determined by the Chief Information Officer under clauses 8 and 10 of this policy.

technology risk owner means any person to whom a cyber security related risk is assigned in any organisational unit local risk register.

University Executive means the management committee of that name which comprises members of the University’s senior leadership.

7 Cyber security principles

(1) Cyber security risks to individuals, the University’s operations and its ICT resources must be:

(a) identified and assessed; and

(b) managed with an appropriate risk treatment plan in accordance with the Risk Management Framework.

(2) The University’s ICT resources and external environment must be appropriately monitored in order to detect cyber security events.

(3) Cyber security response and recovery plans must be:

(a) maintained;

(b) tested;

(c) coordinated with internal and external stakeholders; and

(d) periodically improved;

in accordance with the Organisational Resilience Framework.
The effectiveness of the University's management of cyber security risks must be regularly assessed and improved.

All access to a University ICT service or ICT asset must be:
(a) authorised;
(b) restricted on the basis of need; and
(c) periodically verified.

All users have a shared responsibility for maintaining the security of University ICT resources that they use or manage.

Users must not communicate the University's cyber security risks, controls, events and incidents outside the University except where required or authorised to do so by law, University policy or procedures, or applicable technical standards.

8 Technical standards
(1) The Chief Information Officer may determine mandatory technical standards for specific ICT activities and operations.
(2) The technical standards must be published on the University Intranet.

9 Cyber security framework
The University's cyber security framework consists of:
(a) this policy;
(b) the procedures; and
(c) the technical standards. insert link.

10 Roles and responsibilities
(1) Senate is accountable for the overall management of cyber security risk at the University. It is also responsible for:
(a) setting the University's cyber security risk appetite and tolerance levels; and
(b) considering and responding appropriately to reports about the University's cyber security risks and their management.

(2) The Vice-Chancellor is responsible for:
(a) overall cyber security risk management and compliance across the University;
(b) promoting an appropriate cyber security risk management culture across the University; and
(c) overseeing the allocation of resources to enable effective cyber security risk management.
(3) **The Provost** is responsible for:
   (a) promoting an appropriate cyber security risk management culture across the University;
   (b) receiving and acting on reports of cyber security risk management issues from faculties and University schools; and
   (c) raising cyber security risk management issues with the Vice-Chancellor and University Executive where appropriate.

(4) The **University Executive** is responsible for
   (a) overseeing and advising on the application of the Risk Management Framework to the University.
   (b) considering and responding appropriately to reports about the University’s cyber security risk and its management.

(5) The **University Executive Operations Committee** is responsible for:
   (a) endorsing the strategic direction and governance of cyber security measures;
   (b) endorsing cyber security related purchases and acquisitions; and
   (c) overseeing and advising on the application of the Risk Management Framework to cyber security; and
   (d) considering and responding appropriately to reports about the University’s cyber security risk and its management.

(6) **The Vice-Principal (Operations)** is responsible for overseeing development of, and approving, the University’s cyber security strategy.

(7) **The Chief Information Officer** is responsible for:
   (a) managing cyber security risks within the Information and Communications Technology unit, including assigning risk owners;
   (b) managing cyber security funding;
   (c) assigning management responsibility for cyber security; and
   (d) determining technical standards.

(8) **The Head of Cyber Security** is responsible for:
   (a) overseeing the design and implementation of the University’s cyber security strategy and capabilities;
   (b) reviewing and reporting on the management of cyber security risks;
   (c) reviewing and reporting on the operation of cyber security controls within the University’s organisational units;
   (d) determining the cyber security controls and cyber security related ICT Services required to support:
      (i) the University’s cyber security strategy; and
      (ii) the University’s strategic priorities, legal and contractual obligations, policies and procedures;
   (e) recommending appropriate technical standards to the Chief Information Officer;
   (f) administering technical standards to implement the required cyber security controls and services; and
(g) reporting on the University's cyber security risks as required, including to Senate, the Vice Chancellor, the University Executive and relevant committees.

(9) **Heads of organisational units** are responsible for:

(a) identifying and effectively managing cyber security risk;
(b) promoting an appropriate cyber security risk management culture within their unit;
(c) assigning technology risk owners for cyber security risks within their local risk register;
(d) assigning one or more business systems owners within their unit, in consultation with the Chief Information Officer or Head of Cyber Security; and
(e) reporting and escalating identified cyber security risks in accordance with the Risk Management Framework, and applicable technical standards.

(10) **Technology risk owners** and **business system owners** are responsible for:

(a) complying with this policy, the procedures, and applicable technical standards;
(b) managing cyber security risks associated with ICT resources and third party service providers under their remit;
(c) requiring the development, implementation and maintenance of any necessary cyber security capabilities or cyber security controls for ICT resources under their remit, in accordance with the Risk Management Framework and applicable technical standards; and
(d) reporting and escalating identified cyber security risks in accordance with the Risk Management Framework, and applicable technical standards.

11 **Rescissions and replacements**

This document replaces the *Information Security Policy 2010*, which is rescinded as from the date of commencement of this policy.
NOTES

Cyber Security Policy 2019

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

Date commenced: [This is the date on which the policy will commence, suggest at least two weeks from date of adoption/approval]

Administrator: Chief Information Officer

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

Rescinded documents: Information Security Policy 2010

Related documents: Acceptable Use of ICT Resources Policy 2019
Privacy Policy 2017
Recordkeeping Policy 2017
Risk Management Policy 2019
Privacy Procedures 2018
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ACCEPTABLE USE OF ICT RESOURCES POLICY 2019

The Vice- Chancellor as delegate of the Senate of the University of Sydney, as the governing authority of the University of Sydney, by resolution adopts the following policy.
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Signature: [Signature]
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1 Name of policy

This is the Acceptable Use of ICT Resources 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, staff, students and affiliates.

4 Statement of intent

This policy:

(a) sets out the principles for ensuring the University's ICT resources are used in a legal, ethical and responsible manner;
(b) sets out the conditions of personal use of the University's ICT resources;
(c) informs users of University ICT resources of their responsibilities and the penalties for misuse;
(d) establishes compliance requirements for users of the University's ICT resources;
(e) establishes requirements for reporting cyber security events; and
(f) reflects the University's values of:
   (i) respect and integrity; and
   (ii) openness and engagement;

Note: See the University's Strategic Plan 2016-20.

5 Application

(1) This policy applies to all users of the University's ICT resources.
(2) For the avoidance of doubt:
   (a) the obligations of staff and affiliates under this policy are in addition to obligations set out in the Code of Conduct – Staff and Affiliates and the Public Comment Policy; and
   (b) the obligations of students under this policy are in addition to obligations set out in the Code of Conduct for Students.

6 Definitions

In this policy:

**authorised University officer** means any of:

- Principal Officer;
- Executive Dean;
- Dean;
- Head of School and Dean of a University school;
- Head of Clinical School;
- Head of School.
cyber security has the meaning provided in the Cyber Security Policy 2019,[insert link] which at the date of this policy is:
the measures taken to:
• protect information and communications technology, electronic systems, networks, devices and digital information from compromise or interruption; and
• facilitate rapid and effective detection and response to any compromise or interruption.

cyber security control means any management, operational or technical measure (including safeguards or countermeasures) put in place for cyber security.

cyber security event has the meaning given in the Cyber Security Policy 2019[INSERT LINK], which at the date of this policy is:
means an event relating to any cyber security control protecting University ICT resources from compromise or interruption. This includes internal or external acts which:
• may bypass or contravene applicable controls, policies or procedures; or
• may potentially compromise the confidentiality, integrity or availability of ICT resources.

digital information means information that is in a digital or electronic form and is stored, processed or transmitted within an ICT service or an ICT asset.

Head of Administrative Area has the meaning given in the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule 2016. At the date of this policy this is:
a senior staff member, outside a faculty or University school, whose position is declared as such by the Vice-Chancellor in writing and recorded as such in the relevant human resources recordkeeping systems.

ICT means information and communications technology within the remit of any University organisational unit.

ICT asset means any hardware, software, cloud-based services, communication devices, data centres or networks that are owned by the University or provided by the University to users.

ICT resource means any ICT service, ICT asset or digital information.

ICT service means any business or technology function provided using one or more ICT assets including but not limited to:
• application systems (including software-as-a-service); and
• ICT infrastructure services such as operating systems, databases, voice and data telecommunications services, network services, media services, file and print services, and email service.
**limited personal use** means use that is consistent with the requirements of clause 10.

**misuse** means use of the University’s ICT resources in contravention of any law or University policy, procedures or relevant technical standards.

**organisational unit** means any of the following:
- faculty;
- University school;
- a portfolio or professional services unit controlled by a Principal Officer;
- a level 4 centre, as described in the *Centres and Collaborative Networks Policy 2017*.

**personal device** means a non University owned or provided device that is used by an individual to access, store, process or transmit University data or digital information. This includes desktops and laptop computers, personal digital assistants, tablets, smartphones, mobile PIN pads, radio communication devices, USB keys or any form of portable storage device.

**Principal Officer** has the meaning given in the *University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule 2016*. At the date of these procedures, this is:

a collective reference, for the purpose of this document to:

Vice Chancellor and Principal
Deputy Vice-Chancellor
Vice Principal
General Counsel
Director, University Libraries

**prohibited material** means illegal content, such as:
- child exploitation material including child pornography or material that instructs, promotes or incites child abuse;
- content that shows extreme sexual violence or materials that are overly violent;
- materials that provoke the viewer into committing crimes and carrying out violent acts. This might be material that instructs, promotes or incites violent acts;
- material that is vilificatory or instructs, promotes or incites discrimination; and
- content that promotes terrorism or encourages terrorist acts.

**restricted material** means content that:
- is obscene or pornographic material permitted by law; or
- is material that instructs or promotes gambling.
technical standards means the mandatory standards for specific ICT activities determined by the Chief Information Officer under clauses 8 and 10 of the Cyber Security Policy 2019 [insert link].

University account means the access to University ICT resources provided to holders of a Unikey or University email address.

7 Compliance

(1) Users of the University’s ICT resources must comply with applicable:

(a) laws;
(b) University policies;
(c) University procedures; and
(d) the technical standards. [insert link]

(2) Users must not use University ICT resources to:

(a) harass, menace, defame, vilify or discriminate against any other person;

Note: Refer to the Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Policy 2015.

(b) collect, use or disclose personal information except in accordance with the Privacy Policy 2017 and Privacy Procedures 2018;

(c) infringe copyright or breach University software licence restrictions.

Note: Refer to the Intellectual Property Policy 2016.

(d) distribute:

(i) junk mail;
(ii) for-profit messages;
(iii) chain mail; or
(iv) unsolicited commercial emails; including
(v) commercial emails on behalf of the University (including marketing and promotional emails), unless all intended recipients have consented or the message is required by law, the University is clearly identified and there is a clear means for the intended recipient to opt out of further commercial emails of the same kind; and
(vi) commercial emails on behalf of a third party, unless all intended recipients have clearly consented, both the University and the third party are clearly identified, and there is a clear means for the intended recipient to opt out of further commercial emails of the same kind.

Note: Refer to the Spam Act 2003 (Cth).
8 Restricted and Prohibited Use

(1) Users must not access, store or transmit prohibited material on the University's ICT resources except:
   (a) for research or teaching purposes;
   (b) in accordance with all laws, policies, procedures and technical standards; and
   (c) with express written approval of an authorised University officer.

(2) Users may only use the University's ICT resources to access restricted material:
   (a) using a personal device;
      (i) within a University owned or affiliated student accommodation that permits such use;
      (ii) using the residential wired network ports or University provided residential WiFi network;
   (b) or for research or teaching purposes;
      (i) consistent with the requirements of subclause 8(1); and
      (ii) with express written approval of an authorised University officer.

9 User responsibilities

(1) Users are responsible for all activities originating from their University account.

(2) Users must take all reasonable steps to protect the University's ICT resources from physical theft, damage or unauthorised use.

(3) Users must not:
   (a) use another person's account;
   (b) facilitate or permit the use of the University's ICT resources by anyone not authorised by the University
   (c) attempt to gain unauthorised access to any university ICT resource;
   (d) gain unauthorised access to external services;
   (e) use University ICT resources in ways which are likely to corrupt, damage or destroy the University's or any other person's data, software or hardware.

(4) Users must not
   (a) test, bypass, deactivate or modify the function of any cyber security control;
   (b) knowingly install or use malicious software;
   (c) connect compromised devices to University assets except
      (d) for research or teaching purposes;
      (e) with express written approval from an authorised University officer; and;
      (f) in an isolated testing environment;
(5) Users must only store, process or transmit the University's highly protected digital information using:
   (a) University approved systems; or
   (b) personal devices, that are:
      (i) encrypted using University approved mechanisms; and
      (ii) protected using a strong password, PIN or equivalent control.

Note: See the Cyber Security Policy 2019, Cyber Security Standard – Data Classification, Cyber Security Standard – Data Handling

(6) Users are responsible for determining the controls to apply when storing, processing or transmitting their own personal information using the University’s ICT resources for personal use.

10 Personal use of University ICT Resources

(1) Users are permitted personal use of the University’s ICT resources, of a limited nature.

(2) Limited personal use:
   (a) is of a purely personal nature;
   (b) does not directly or indirectly impose an unreasonable burden on any ICT resource, or burden the University with incremental costs;
   (c) does not unreasonably deny any other user access to any ICT resource;
   (d) does not contravene any law or University policy or procedure; and
   (e) in the case of staff and affiliates, does not interfere with the execution of duties.

(3) Users must not use the University’s ICT resources to generate or process crypto-currency except:
   (a) for research or teaching purposes; and
   (b) with the express written approval of an authorised University officer.

Note: The use of a crypto-currency wallet in a payment is not considered processing for the purposes of this policy.

(4) The University’s ICT resources must not be leased, lent or otherwise made available to third parties for personal profit.

(5) Staff and affiliates must not use University ICT resources for financial or commercial gain for themselves or any third party.

Note: Staff and affiliates should refer to the Code of Conduct – Staff and Affiliates. Academic staff should also refer to the Outside Earnings of Academic Staff Policy 2011.
11 Personal devices

(1) Users may use a personal device to:
   (a) connect to a University Wi-Fi network; or
   (b) remotely access ICT resources through the Internet.

(2) Users must not connect a personal device to a wired network port within the University:
   (a) without authorisation; or
   (b) with a known security vulnerability.

(3) Users must only connect a personal device to the University’s network in accordance with the technical standards.

12 Terms of Use and Limitations on Use

(1) The University does not guarantee that University ICT resources will:
   (a) always be available; or
   (b) be free from any defects, including malicious software.

(2) The University accepts no responsibility for loss or damage (including consequential loss or damage or loss of data) arising from:
   (a) the use of University ICT resources; or
   (b) the maintenance and protection of ICT resources.

(3) The University may take any necessary action in accordance with the technical standards, in order to mitigate any threat to the University’s ICT resources, with or without prior notice.

(4) The use of University ICT resources is not considered private. All electronic communications using University ICT resources:
   (a) may be recorded and monitored in accordance with the technical standards;
   (b) are subject to the Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009 (NSW);
   (c) may be subject to the
      (i) Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1997;
      (ii) Health Records and Information Privacy Act 2002; and
      (iii) State Records Act 1996 (NSW);
   (d) remain in the custody and control of the University.

Note: Users of ICT Resources should be aware that they do not have the same rights as they would using personally owned devices through commercial service providers.

(5) The University reserves the right to:
   (a) limit the use of University ICT resources, with or without notice; or
   (b) view and copy digital information stored, processed or transmitted using the University’s ICT resources; or
   (c) monitor, inspect, access or examine any University ICT resource for any lawful purpose.
in accordance with the technical standards.

**Note:** Users should be aware that personal use of the University’s ICT Resources may result in the University holding personal information about the user or others which may then be accessed and used by the University to ensure compliance with this, and other policies.

(6) The University may at any time require a user to:
   (a) acknowledge in writing that they will abide by this policy; or
   (b) complete relevant training in the University’s policies and procedures.

13 **Cyber security events**

(1) Any person who identifies or suspects a cyber security event must report it as soon as possible to:
   (a) the University’s Shared Service Centre; or
   (b) ICT unit Cyber Security Team.

14 **Misuse**

(1) In the event of misuse or suspected misuse of the University’s ICT resources (as determined by the Head of Cyber Security), the University may:
   (a) withdraw or restrict a user’s access to University ICT resources;
   (b) commence disciplinary action;
      (i) for staff or affiliates: disciplinary action in accordance with the *Code of Conduct Staff and Affiliates* and the *University of Sydney Enterprise Agreement 2018-2021*;
      (ii) for students: action for misconduct under the *Code of Conduct for Students* and the *University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016*; and
   (c) notify the Police or other relevant government authority.

15 **Rescissions and replacements**

This document replaces the *Policy on the Use of Information and Communications Technology Resources*, which is rescinded as from the date of commencement of this policy.

**NOTES**

**Acceptable Use of ICT Resources Policy 2019**

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

Rescinded documents: Policy on the Use of Information and Communication Technology Resources.

Related documents:

- Copyright Act 1968 (Cth)
- Spam Act 2003 (Cth)
- Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009 (NSW)
- Health Records and Information Privacy Act 2002 (NSW)
- Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998 (NSW)
- State Records Act 1998 (NSW)
- University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule 2016
- University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016
- Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Policy 2015
- Code of Conduct – Staff and Affiliates
- Code of Conduct for Students
- Cyber Security Policy 2019
- Intellectual Property Policy 2016
- Outside Earnings of Academic Staff Policy 2011
- Privacy Policy 2017
- Cyber Security Procedures 2019
- Privacy Procedures 2018
- Public Comment Policy
- Recordkeeping Policy 2017
- University of Sydney Enterprise Agreement 2018 - 2012
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Academic Standards and Policy Committee  
13 August 2019  
Item 4.1  
Page 22 of 27
1 Purpose and application

(1) These procedures are to give effect to the *Cyber Security Policy 2019* ("the policy")

(2) These procedures apply to:
   (a) the University, staff, students and affiliates; and
   (b) all ICT resources.

(3) These procedures detail how the University will manage cyber security, cyber security risk, and cyber security incidents.

2 Commencement

These procedures commence on

3 Interpretation

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

   **Note:** See clause 6 of the policy.

(2) **Technical standards** must be read in conjunction with the *Cyber Security Standard – Glossary*

   **Note:** See [*Technical Standards website*](#)
Head of Administrative Area has the meaning given in the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule 2016. At the date of these procedures this is:

a senior staff member, outside a faculty or University school, whose position is declared as such by the Vice-Chancellor in writing and recorded as such in the relevant human resources recordkeeping systems.

high impact personnel means any person that has a high cyber security risk as determined by, and notified to them by, the Head of Cyber Security.

cyber security control means any management, operational or technical measure (including safeguards or countermeasures) put into place for cyber security.

high risk ICT service means an ICT service that has been rated as high risk in accordance with the technical standards.

ICT asset owner means the person who is accountable for the day to day operation and protection of an ICT service or associated ICT asset (also known as an ICT service lead).

ICT service owner means the person responsible for defining, operating, measuring and improving an ICT service and associated cyber security controls (also known as ICT infrastructure service owner or ICT technical application owner).

privileged access means access or administrative powers within an ICT service or ICT asset, above those of a normal user.

4 Managing cyber security risks

(1) The head of each organisational unit must:

(a) assign a business system owner for each ICT service or group of ICT services used by that unit;

(b) identify and manage cyber security risks within their unit, in accordance with the Risk Management Framework and all relevant technical standards.

(2) Business system owners must classify digital information held within ICT services within their remit, in accordance with all relevant technical standards.

(3) Technology risk owners and business system owners must:

(a) identify and manage cyber security risks within their remit, in accordance with the Risk Management Framework and all applicable technical standards; and

(b) review ICT services within their remit at least annually for compliance with the technical Standards; and

(c) report non-compliance to the Head of Organisational Unit and Head of Cyber Security in accordance with any applicable technical standards.

Note: See Technical Standards website and Risk Management Framework

(4) Business system owners, ICT service owners and ICT asset owners must obtain written approval from the Head of Cyber Security for:
(a) any exception to the technical standards;
(b) any cyber security control not covered by a technical standard;
(c) any work instruction or guideline for a cyber security control for which they are responsible; and
(d) any ICT service providing a cyber security control to other ICT services, that is operated outside the remit of the University's ICT unit.

5 Managing ICT Services

(1) Business system owners:
(a) are responsible for identifying and managing cyber security risks related to ICT services within their remit, in consultation with the Head of Cyber Security;
(b) may assign management of an ICT service or group of ICT services to an ICT service owner or retain the associated responsibilities in this procedure or the relevant technical standards.

(2) ICT service owners may assign ICT asset owners for day-to-day operation of an ICT service or associated ICT asset or retain the associated responsibilities in this procedure or the relevant technical standards.

ICT service owners and ICT asset owners must:
(a) classify;
(b) design;
(c) build;
(d) operate; and
(e) maintain
ICT services and ICT assets, and associated cyber security controls, in accordance with applicable technical standards.

Note: See Technical Standards website.

6 Managing ICT vendors

(1) Technology risk owners, business system owners, and technology risk owners must:
(a) procure ICT services;
(b) manage third parties providing ICT services within their remit; and
(c) review cyber security risks and cyber security controls within ICT services provided by third parties annually
in accordance with applicable policy, procedures and technical standards.

Note: See Procurement Policy; Procurement: Purchase Order Procedures; and Procurement: Tendering Procedures. See also Technical Standards.

7 Access to ICT resources

(1) Heads of organisational units must:
(a) identify roles within their unit that have privileged access to high risk ICT services; and
(b) apply additional controls to any person in those roles, in accordance with the Cyber Security Standard – IT Access Control, prior to granting access.

(2) Technical standards may provide specific cyber security controls for ICT services related to high impact personnel.

Note: See Technical Standards website

(3) Business system owners must require all access to ICT services to be controlled in accordance with applicable technical standards.

Note: See Technical Standards website

(4) ICT service owners and ICT asset owners must only establish controls and operational processes which are consistent with applicable technical standards.

Note: See Technical Standards website

(5) All users must:
(a) access or operate ICT resources in accordance with the Acceptable Use of ICT Resources Policy 2019 [INSERT LINK]; and
(b) store, process and transfer digital information in accordance with applicable technical standards.

Note: See Technical Standards website

8 Cyber security awareness and training

(1) Heads of organisational units must:
(a) require all unit staff and affiliates to participate in any Head of Cyber Security specified cyber security awareness training; and
(b) require that all technology risk owners, business system owners, ICT service owners and ICT asset owners within their unit undertake any additional training required to perform their cyber security related accountabilities and responsibilities, as identified by the Head of Cyber Security,

9 Managing cyber security incidents

(1) Any person noticing a cyber security event must report it as soon as possible to the University’s Shared Service Centre or ICT unit Cyber Security Team.

Note: Physical security events, including theft of ICT assets, and non-digital information, should be reported to Campus Security.

(2) All communications to parties outside the University in relation to cyber security risks, cyber security controls or cyber security incidents must comply with applicable policies and technical standards.

Note: See Public Comment Policy and Technical Standards website

(3) Business system owners and ICT service owners must participate in any cyber security incident management training and testing conducted by the Head of Cyber Security.
10 Rescissions and replacements

This document replaces the *Information Security Policy*, which was adopted on 9 March 2010 and which is rescinded as from the date of commencement of this document:

NOTES

**Cyber Security Procedures 2019**

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

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

Administrator: Head of Cyber Security

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

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

Related documents:

- *Cyber Security Policy 2019*
- *Acceptable Use of ICT Resources Policy 2019*
- *Privacy Policy 2017*
- *Recordkeeping Policy 2017*
- *Privacy Procedures 2018*
- *Risk Management Policy 2019*
- *Risk Management Framework*
- *Organisational Resilience Framework*
- *Payment Card Industry Data Security Policy 2019*
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Cyber Security Procedures 2019
Non-Confidential

Author | Hugh O'Dwyer, Manager, Policy and Projects
Reviewer/Approver | Assoc. Prof. Peter McCallum, Academic Director, Education Quality and Policy, and Registrar
Paper title | 2017 Quality Verification System Review
Purpose | To inform the Academic Standards and Policy Committee about the feedback provided to the University of Sydney regarding the units of study that were submitted to the 2017 Group of Eight Quality Verification System review.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the feedback provided about the University of Sydney units of study that were reviewed during the 2017 Group of Eight Quality Verification System review.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The University of Sydney participates in the Group of Eight (Go8) Quality Verification System (QVS) review annually. For the 2017 round, reviews were conducted in 2018 and 2019 of 2017 units of study. The reviews provided positive feedback about the objectives and assessment tasks of units of study provided for review, while also identifying some areas for improvement. In particular, concerns were raised regarding the volume of learning outcomes contained in some units. Unit materials and assessment samples for twelve units of study were submitted to the Go8, of which eight were reviewed. The reviews of University of Sydney units of study are provided in attachment 1.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

The University of Sydney has been participating in the QVS since it commenced in 2011. As required by the Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF), its purpose is to provide an externally referenced quality assurance process to review academic standards at all levels of achievement across Go8 institutions and provide public assurance that learning outcomes are comparable with world leading universities.

The 2017 QVS involved the review of capstone or core final year units in six nominated discipline areas by academic reviewers from Go8 universities. The Go8’s Deputy Vice-Chancellors Academic Group selected the following disciplines for review across the Go8: Chemical sciences, Computer science, Electrical and Electronic Engineering and Technology, Architecture and Urban Environment, Agriculture, and Medical Studies. Two units of study were submitted for each discipline. The University has received reviews from the Go8 for eight of the twelve units of study submitted for review. The table below provides information on the University’s units of study that were reviewed by academic staff in other institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline area</th>
<th>Unit of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and Urban Environment</td>
<td>BADP3002 Property and the Built Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and Urban Environment</td>
<td>BDES3011 Architectural History – Theory 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Sciences</td>
<td>CHEM3114 Metal Complexes – Medicine and Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>INFO3220 Object Orientated Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and Electronic Engineering and Technology</td>
<td>ELEC4505 Digital Communications Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and Electronic Engineering and Technology</td>
<td>ELEC4713 Honours Thesis B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Studies</td>
<td>ANAT3008 Musculoskeletal Anatomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Studies</td>
<td>BIOS3065 Anatomical Analysis of Exercise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Go8 Reviewers evaluated the appropriateness of learning outcomes and assessment tasks for each unit of study, and assessed whether each sampled item of student work received an appropriate grade, or whether the reviewer considered the mark to be either too high or too low. Of the assessments graded by Go8 reviewers for the 2017 round, 108 aligned with the University of Sydney grade awarded and nine disagreed. Of those that disagreed, seven grades were deemed to be unduly high, while two grades were considered to be unduly low.

For the majority of units, the Go8 reviews were positive and considered the assessment tasks and processes to be appropriate. Reviewers were asked to provide an overall summary judgement of the unit and only one selected the option identifying immediate concerns relating to the unit’s learning outcomes and assessment tasks. Assessment tasks and marking criteria generally compared favourably with analogous or relevant units of study at other universities. However, some reviewers identified areas for improvement, particularly relating to learning outcomes. Three unit of study reviews considered the units to have too many learning outcomes, for instance one piece of reviewer feedback stated that the unit ‘appears overloaded with Learning Outcomes (21 Learning Outcomes for a six credit point class that has four hours of face-to-face content) is potentially too heavily subdivided’. Additionally, the immeasurability or lack of clarity about the level of achievement required to meet learning outcomes was raised in some units.

The University will continue to participate in the Go8 QVS review, with the review of 2018 units of study currently in progress. The completed reviews for the 2017 QVS round are included in attachment 1.

**ATTACHMENTS**

**Attachment 1:** Go8 QVS Reviews of 2017 University of Sydney Units of Study
Quality Verification System 2017

Objective

The Group of Eight (Go8) universities collaborate and jointly participate annually in the Quality Verification System (QVS) to:

- demonstrate the appropriateness of the standards of learning outcomes and grades awarded in Go8 universities;
- maintain and improve the academic standards of Go8 universities;
- enable comparisons of learning outcomes in similar subjects across Go8 universities; and
- promote discussion on good practice in teaching and learning in the Go8 universities.

Core Elements

The Go8 QVS is a process of external, discipline-led, academic peer review of final year undergraduate student outcomes. The QVS reviews two core subjects, or the equivalent of 25 percent of final year assessments, in undergraduate programs across Go8 universities.

Based on their academic judgement and the set of documents provided, the Go8 QVS External Reviewers:

- review the appropriateness and comparative quality of the specified learning outcomes, assessment tasks, assessment criteria and assessment processes set for samples of final year subjects; and
- report on the appropriateness of the grades awarded to stratified random samples of student work in these subjects.

Distinctive features of the Go8 QVS are:

- the QVS focuses upon assessment in a sample of final year subjects in undergraduate programs (the review must cover a minimum of 25 percent of final year assessment requirements);
- the QVS concentrates on benchmarking for comparing grades awarded in similar programs across Go8 universities;
- the QVS is conducted by senior discipline-specific academics who will have an understanding of academic standards in similar universities around the world; and
- the QVS is sufficiently flexible to complement other quality assurance mechanisms within Go8 universities to minimise duplication of efforts.

Report

The information provided in this report is part of an annual activity, designed to provide public assurance and confidence that undergraduate learning outcomes and grades are comparable across the Go8.
Reviewer Evaluation
Go8 Quality Verification System 2017

Reviewer Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Institution:</th>
<th>The University of Adelaide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline area:</td>
<td>Architecture and Urban Environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Go8 University:</th>
<th>The University of Sydney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline:</td>
<td>Architecture and Urban Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Subject reviewed (Subject Code):</td>
<td>BADP 3002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assessments</th>
<th>Below Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed in total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with grade awarded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.

*Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment.*

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.

*HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.*

---

1 Adapted from the University of Cambridge’s report Coversheet for External Examiners (2009); www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf
There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed. These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.

Comments (optional)
If you wish, please include further comments which may be used by the associated Faculty or Department in marketing materials.

Statement of potential conflicts of interest
For example, being involved in collaborative teaching, research or consultancy work with colleagues teaching in the subjects being reviewed, or recent transfer from the institution being reviewed.

Review of specified learning objectives
1. To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).
   
   Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely

   Please list up to three reasons for making this rating
1. There are probably too many learning outcomes which makes assessing them all very difficult and not fully achieved. Whilst the two development projects are impressive it is difficult to see where
LO3 is tested in any of the assessments. This indicates the course is too ambitious in its scope and results in some very scattergun questions in the test and at least one Lo not really assessed.

2. Some of the learning outcomes are very generic and do not represent good taxonomy practice or are appropriate for third year. "Understand" is particularly difficult to assess and should be reviewed. LO5 is very long and ambitious and I would certainly find it very difficult to assess.

3. The mixing of Aims, Learning Outcomes and what are effectively graduate outcomes in the same section is, in my opinion, very confusing.

2. To what extent are the specified learning objectives appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. As above the use of 'Understand' is too vague and simplistic for a final year subject. There are too many learning outcomes spreading the learning whilst the projects actually focus very well on some learning outcomes but not on others. So there is a mis-match between what is assessed and the LO's. I would suggest they are reviewed, simplified and re-focused around the two projects which effectively deliver a broad understanding of the context of development form a real estate perspective.

2. Trying to extend this into planning policy (other than an appreciation of being one of the constraints of a Highest & Best Use analysis) seems in my opinion to be too much for a single course.

3. The very broad LO's and aims of this course and the very specific housing content at the end of course do not seem to sit comfortable together.

3. How do the specified learning objectives compare with those of final year or postgraduate subjects (as relevant) from similar universities?

Most of the learning outcomes are at an appropriate taxonomy level but the use of 'Understand' is very difficult to assess and fix at an appropriate level. Quite a mixture of broad skill objectives and very specific knowledge outcomes which reflects the rather ambitious and wide coverage of the course. There are issues with the ability to assess some of the LO's as they are currently worded. So in summary some do and some do not. The course seems to be over ambitious and tries too hard. Reviewing it and focusing it more on development processes and operations and allowing more space for the excellent projects is recommended.
Review of assessment tasks

1. To what extent are the assessment tasks suitable for the specified learning objectives? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

   Not at all  | Somewhat  | Adequately  | Very well  | Completely

   Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

   1. This is difficult because the form only allows one option for three tasks.
   2. In fact the two projects are very well organized and executed to deliver against the appropriate learning outcomes.
   3. The problem is with the “short answer exam” which seems to be a very odd mixture of questions with very little depth in the answers with no application. It really is a pure memory test, perhaps designed to ensure participation in the final few weeks of the course? In my opinion it is not at an appropriate level or achieves very much other than perhaps attendance. It is a shame because it detracts from some of the excellence observed in the two projects which are very effective in driving students to be able to achieve the better worded LO’s (1, 6 and 7).

2. To what extent are the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

   Not at all  | Somewhat  | Adequately  | Very well  | Completely

   Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

   1. Again, unfortunately, this is a game of two halves. The projects are very well articulated in terms of the individual and group components. An answer key with the completed grades makes it very clear. Assessment descriptors for the two projects in the Course outline are excellent. This is where the real learning and achievement of most of the important LO’s is achieved and should be seen as good practice.
   2. However, the scanned hand written short answers are not fully legible and it is not clear to see where marks are allocated especially to some of the vague questions. To be frank, in my opinion, the short answer test is irrelevant and the marking quite opaque.
   3. All of the Property Development projects are assessed as CREDIT - this is appropriate but my concern is that there is little scope for students to differentiate their submissions resulting in this crowding of achievement.
3. To what extent are the assessment tasks and marking criteria appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. As before - polarized between an inappropriate, and in my opinion, irrelevant short answer test and some excellent practice in the two projects.

2. The nature of the test is of knowledge retention, not application, so the taxonomy is too basic for final year. For example the question. "What was the change in house prices for the quarter to Sept 2017" is just memory surely the question should be around WHY? at this level. Why did house price change by . . . . ? I therefore do not believe that what is provided to get 8/8 and therefore a HD grade for this assessment is appropriate or sufficient at final year.

3. Whereas the application and problem solving inherent in the projects is fully consistent with final year subject expectations and the marking on the whole appropriate and consistent.

4. How do the assessment tasks and marking criteria compare with those of final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject from similar universities?

As before - polarized between an inappropriate, and in my opinion, irrelevant short answer test and some excellent practice in the two projects. The project work drives engagement, integration and practical application of the key subject areas and helps to deliver the graduate attributes, skills mentioned in the course outline. The sample assignments demonstrate solid student performance and integration of the materials studied which reflects good teaching and assessment practice.
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Objective

The Group of Eight (Go8) universities collaborate and jointly participate annually in the Quality Verification System (QVS) to:

- demonstrate the appropriateness of the standards of learning outcomes and grades awarded in Go8 universities;
- maintain and improve the academic standards of Go8 universities;
- enable comparisons of learning outcomes in similar subjects across Go8 universities; and
- promote discussion on good practice in teaching and learning in the Go8 universities.

Core Elements

The Go8 QVS is a process of external, discipline-led, academic peer review of final year undergraduate student outcomes. The QVS reviews two core subjects, or the equivalent of 25 percent of final year assessments, in undergraduate programs across Go8 universities.

Based on their academic judgement and the set of documents provided, the Go8 QVS External Reviewers:

- review the appropriateness and comparative quality of the specified learning outcomes, assessment tasks, assessment criteria and assessment processes set for samples of final year subjects; and
- report on the appropriateness of the grades awarded to stratified random samples of student work in these subjects.

Distinctive features of the Go8 QVS are:

- the QVS focuses upon assessment in a sample of final year subjects in undergraduate programs (the review must cover a minimum of 25 percent of final year assessment requirements);
- the QVS concentrates on benchmarking for comparing grades awarded in similar programs across Go8 universities;
- the QVS is conducted by senior discipline-specific academics who will have an understanding of academic standards in similar universities around the world; and
- the QVS is sufficiently flexible to complement other quality assurance mechanisms within Go8 universities to minimise duplication of efforts.

Report

The information provided in this report is part of an annual activity, designed to provide public assurance and confidence that undergraduate learning outcomes and grades are comparable across the Go8.
Reviewer Evaluation
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Reviewer Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Institution</th>
<th>The University of Adelaide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline area</td>
<td>Architecture and Urban Environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Go8 University</th>
<th>The University of Sydney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Architecture and Urban Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Subject reviewed (Subject Code)</td>
<td>BDES 3011 Architectural History/Theory 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assessments</th>
<th>Below Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed in total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with grade awarded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.

*Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment.*

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.

*HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.*
There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed.

These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.

Comments (optional)

If you wish, please include further comments which may be used by the associated Faculty or Department in marketing materials.

This is a provocative core course focusing on Architectural History and Theory which draws on the expertise of the Course Coordinator, Associate Professor Chris Smith, who is internationally recognized in the field. Architectural History/Theory 3 provides an opportunity for students to engage with architectures, thoughts and selves in alternate ways. Inspired by a rigorous lecture series and challenging critical assessment tasks, architectural students are encouraged 'to breathe recklessly'.

Statement of potential conflicts of interest

For example, being involved in collaborative teaching, research or consultancy work with colleagues teaching in the subjects being reviewed, or recent transfer from the institution being reviewed.

No conflict of interest.

Review of specified learning objectives

1. To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Learning objectives are directly connected to the assessment tasks.

3. The learning outcomes employ appropriate action verbs to inform students about the intended application of their knowledge of architectural design.

2. **To what extent are the specified learning objectives appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject?** (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Please list up to three reasons for making this rating*

1. The learning objectives are suitably rigorous for a capstone course in a Bachelor degree.

2. The requirement to think abstractly, conceptually and critically about architecture and through different architectural and urban ideas, and demonstrate the pri

3. 

3. **How do the specified learning objectives compare with those of final year or postgraduate subjects (as relevant) from similar universities?**

This is a provocative, intellectually sophisticated and challenging course. The learning objectives compare very favorably with those of final year subjects from similar universities. Based on the information provided, I understand that Architectural History/Theory 3 is a 6 unit core course with an estimated total of 140 students (7 tutorial groups capped at 20 students). If the majority of the students can achieve the learning objectives successfully, these students would outrank students from similar universities. The course would not be out of place at Masters level.

**Review of assessment tasks**

1. **To what extent are the assessment tasks suitable for the specified learning objectives?** (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Please list up to three reasons for making this rating*

1. The assessment tasks are highly appropriate and directly related to the specified learning objectives.
2. The major assessment (Final Essay) is weighted at 75% which is quite high (in some other institutions a maximum of 70% is recommended for a single

3. To what extent are the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

   Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. Clear and unambiguous articulation of the requirements of the Final Essay task.
2. Clear relationship between the assessment criteria, assessment rubric and these are clearly aligned with the learning objectives.
3. Provision of a clear assessment rubric

3. To what extent are the assessment tasks and marking criteria appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

   Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. The Assessment Criteria is clear and there is an appropriate level of rigor for a final year subject.
2. The Final Essay feedback is clearly aligned with the course learning outcomes and the assessment task requirements.
3. 

4. How do the assessment tasks and marking criteria compare with those of final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject from similar universities?

I read each of the final essay submissions to enable this review of the assessment tasks. The work submitted was of a high quality and the marking criteria compares favorably to criteria prepared for final year courses in similar institutions. No examples of feedback provided to students were included in the 'box'. For this reason, I reviewed each of the 10 assessment tasks. In my experience, students are keen to
receive feedback which offers suggestions which can enable them to improve their work. I can see that there were many opportunities - in the tutorials and via the formative assessment - for students to receive feedback on work-in-progress. However, it might also be useful for students to have an indication of how they can improve their work in relation to the assessment criteria eg. Vision, Analysis, Communication etc. in the feedback sheet. Likely, the 'Comments on Final Essay' provided comments to this end. However, for the purposes of this review such examples would have been helpful for comparative purposes.
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Objective

The Group of Eight (Go8) universities collaborate and jointly participate annually in the Quality Verification System (QVS) to:

- demonstrate the appropriateness of the standards of learning outcomes and grades awarded in Go8 universities;
- maintain and improve the academic standards of Go8 universities;
- enable comparisons of learning outcomes in similar subjects across Go8 universities; and
- promote discussion on good practice in teaching and learning in the Go8 universities.

Core Elements

The Go8 QVS is a process of external, discipline-led, academic peer review of final year undergraduate student outcomes. The QVS reviews two core subjects, or the equivalent of 25 percent of final year assessments, in undergraduate programs across Go8 universities.

Based on their academic judgement and the set of documents provided, the Go8 QVS External Reviewers:

- review the appropriateness and comparative quality of the specified learning outcomes, assessment tasks, assessment criteria and assessment processes set for samples of final year subjects; and
- report on the appropriateness of the grades awarded to stratified random samples of student work in these subjects.

Distinctive features of the Go8 QVS are:

- the QVS focuses upon assessment in a sample of final year subjects in undergraduate programs (the review must cover a minimum of 25 percent of final year assessment requirements);
- the QVS concentrates on benchmarking for comparing grades awarded in similar programs across Go8 universities;
- the QVS is conducted by senior discipline-specific academics who will have an understanding of academic standards in similar universities around the world; and
- the QVS is sufficiently flexible to complement other quality assurance mechanisms within Go8 universities to minimise duplication of efforts.

Report

The information provided in this report is part of an annual activity, designed to provide public assurance and confidence that undergraduate learning outcomes and grades are comparable across the Go8.
Reviewer Evaluation
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Reviewer Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Institution:</th>
<th>The University of Queensland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline area:</td>
<td>Chemical Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject Review

Go8 University: The University of Sydney
Discipline: Chemical Sciences
Home Subject reviewed (Subject Code): CHEM 3114

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assessments</th>
<th>Below Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed in total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with grade awarded</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.

*Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment.*

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.

*HPOEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.*

---

1 Adapted from the University of Cambridge’s report Coversheet for External Examiners (2009); [www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf](http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf)
There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed.

*These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.*

**Comments (optional)**

If you wish, please include further comments which may be used by the associated Faculty or Department in marketing materials.

**Statement of potential conflicts of interest**

*For example, being involved in collaborative teaching, research or consultancy work with colleagues teaching in the subjects being reviewed, or recent transfer from the institution being reviewed.*

**Review of specified learning objectives**

1. **To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient?** *(Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).*

   - Not at all
   - **Somewhat**
   - Adequately
   - Very well
   - Completely

   *Please list up to three reasons for making this rating*
1. The learning aims and outcomes in the course profile do not match the apparent course disciplinary scope and activities - in particular learning outcomes (2.2) refer to (1) physical and general chemistry and (5) communicating work orally.

2. To what extent are the specified learning objectives appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

   Not at all    Somewhat    Adequately    Very well    Completely

   Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

   1. This is an appropriate level course for a final year course if the course profile learning objectives are revised to accurately describe what students are expected to achieve and are then explicitly assessed as outcomes in the course.

   2.

   3.

3. How do the specified learning objectives compare with those of final year or postgraduate subjects (as relevant) from similar universities?

   They are similar in terms of the level and depth of concepts covered and are appropriate for a final year subject so align with parallel subjects at other universities.

Review of assessment tasks

1. To what extent are the assessment tasks suitable for the specified learning objectives? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

   Not at all    Somewhat    Adequately    Very well    Completely

   Please list up to three reasons for making this rating
1. The assessment exemplars are one exam and two written assignments which appear to align with only learning objectives/outcomes numbered 1, 2, 4, 5 (excluding oral communication) and 8 in the course profile.

2. The assessment submitted for review did not include any laboratory assessment or related criteria to show how outcomes 3, 6 and 7 are explicitly assessed at all to graduate level. There were no marking criteria provided for the two assignment tasks to enable consideration of what students were expected to do - these were highly scaffolded tasks in which students sought literature information in response to specific questions. The absence of Failing grade exemplars for the second assignment is not surprising if students acted on feedback from the first assignment which was almost identical in format.

3. To what extent are the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

   Not at all  Somewhat  **Adequately**  Very well  Completely

**Please list up to three reasons for making this rating**

1. The marks available for each part in the written assignments are provided but there is no indication of how these are distributed (model answers) - students can choose a wide range of literature articles therefore it is not clear whether marks in the PS, CR and DI exemplars of work may have been based on student choice of a more detailed journal article rather than their understanding of the concepts and approaches. In the exam, it was difficult to discriminate the CR from the PS exemplars without seeing exemplar worked answers that were used for marking.

2. 

3. 

3. To what extent are the assessment tasks and marking criteria appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

   Not at all  **Somewhat**  Adequately  Very well  Completely

**Please list up to three reasons for making this rating**

1. It appears the marking is done holistically - if the marking criteria are made more explicit then the tasks do have potential to be appropriate for a final year subject. The exam is of sufficient scope and
challenge for a final year exam however its assessment weightings were not clear (the exam is stated as both 60% and 48% in the course profile).

2. It is concerning that there does not appear to be an assessment task that requires students to generate an evidence based case, position or an argument - the two assignments are essentially analysis of literature to identify information.

3. 

4. How do the assessment tasks and marking criteria compare with those of final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject from similar universities?

The assessment tasks are similar but it is not possible to evaluate the marking criteria as these were not made explicit to be able to discriminate the different grades.
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Objective

The Group of Eight (Go8) universities collaborate and jointly participate annually in the Quality Verification System (QVS) to:

- demonstrate the appropriateness of the standards of learning outcomes and grades awarded in Go8 universities;
- maintain and improve the academic standards of Go8 universities;
- enable comparisons of learning outcomes in similar subjects across Go8 universities; and
- promote discussion on good practice in teaching and learning in the Go8 universities.

Core Elements

The Go8 QVS is a process of external, discipline-led, academic peer review of final year undergraduate student outcomes. The QVS reviews two core subjects, or the equivalent of 25 percent of final year assessments, in undergraduate programs across Go8 universities.

Based on their academic judgement and the set of documents provided, the Go8 QVS External Reviewers:

- review the appropriateness and comparative quality of the specified learning outcomes, assessment tasks, assessment criteria and assessment processes set for samples of final year subjects; and
- report on the appropriateness of the grades awarded to stratified random samples of student work in these subjects.

Distinctive features of the Go8 QVS are:

- the QVS focuses upon assessment in a sample of final year subjects in undergraduate programs (the review must cover a minimum of 25 percent of final year assessment requirements);
- the QVS concentrates on benchmarking for comparing grades awarded in similar programs across Go8 universities;
- the QVS is conducted by senior discipline-specific academics who will have an understanding of academic standards in similar universities around the world; and
- the QVS is sufficiently flexible to complement other quality assurance mechanisms within Go8 universities to minimise duplication of efforts.

Report

The information provided in this report is part of an annual activity, designed to provide public assurance and confidence that undergraduate learning outcomes and grades are comparable across the Go8.
Reviewer Evaluation
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Reviewer Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Institution:</th>
<th>The University of New South Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline area:</td>
<td>Computer Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject Review

Go8 University: The University of Sydney
Discipline: Computer Sciences
Home Subject reviewed (Subject Code): INFO 3220

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assessments</th>
<th>Below Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed in total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with grade awarded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.

*Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment.*

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.

*HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.*

1 Adapted from the University of Cambridge’s report Coversheet for External Examiners (2009);
www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf
There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed.

_These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review._

Comments (optional)

If you wish, please include further comments which may be used by the associated Faculty or Department in marketing materials.

Statement of potential conflicts of interest

_For example, being involved in collaborative teaching, research or consultancy work with colleagues teaching in the subjects being reviewed, or recent transfer from the institution being reviewed._

I have no conflict of interest.

Review of specified learning objectives

1. **To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient?** (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. This course seems to be a mix of advanced C++ programming and some software engineering with a focus on design patterns. I am unsure if students have seen C or C++ before, or if they have done substantial software design with UML before. This information could be added to the course outline.
2. To what extent are the specified learning objectives appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  **Very well**  Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. An advanced course in C++ programming is definitely appropriate for a final year subject. The software engineering aspects of ‘design principles’ and the ‘project and team skills’ mentioned in the graduate attributes are certainly appropriate for a Computer Science degree, but it may be too late to be introducing these in an advanced course. In particular, there is very little teamwork or collaboration involved in the project, which is all done as an individual assignment. The course says it is not about project management (which it isn’t), so then it is not really about team skills either. In terms of software engineering, the course seems heavily focused on design patterns and aims to develop some only some basic skills needed for participation in teams (such as code reviews), without any substantial teamwork in the assessment.

2. 

3. 

3. How do the specified learning objectives compare with those of final year or postgraduate subjects (as relevant) from similar universities?

The objectives of C++ programming would be similar to other final year courses. However (this overlaps with the question above), I would have expected more teamwork in a final year course on object-oriented design (though maybe other courses at University of Sydney cover that). It seems late in the curriculum to be introducing such foundational concepts as design patterns and code reviews, and if anything, there is possibly even too much focus on design patterns (if the lecture schedule is anything to go by). On the other hand, I also understand that proficiency in C++ programming is a highly marketable skill, and the individual assignment in this course is an effective way to develop that skill.
Review of assessment tasks

1. **To what extent are the assessment tasks suitable for the specified learning objectives?** (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

   Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely

   Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

   1. With the exception of teamwork as noted above, the assignment is highly suitable for assessing individual proficiency in C++ programming and the use of design patterns. I liked the idea of the assessed code review as an example of ‘real-world’ practice. This assessment item could even be peer marked (I was not sure if it was peer assessed), where each student could review and assess code from two or more other students. The marks assigned to the project (30%) seems small in comparison to the work required, especially given that quizzes account for 20%. Maybe the quizzes should count for less.

   2. One thing the course does very well is assess the students’ understanding and use of design patterns, in the assignment, the code review and again in the final exam.

   3. 

2. **To what extent are the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly?** (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

   Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely

   Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

   1. The marking criteria for the assignments are suitable and seem to be broken down into small enough software features to enable consistent assessment. However, one thing that was especially confusing was requiring students in Stage 2 of the assignment to use other students’ code from Stage 1. This does seem to introduce an element of unfairness unless every student gets exactly the same Stage 1 code to extend (perhaps this was the case, though not stated explicitly on the specification).

   2. 

   3. 

3. **To what extent are the assessment tasks and marking criteria appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject?** (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)
Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. The single assignment is presumably oriented towards individual students gaining experience of C++ programming and using design patterns. The idea of having a single assignment assessed in stages is good, though perhaps more suitable for first or second-level courses than an advanced software engineering course, where arguably in a final year subject, students should be taking more responsibility for scoping their projects, and projects should be larger and involve more teamwork (perhaps there are other software engineering courses at University of Sydney where this happens). Also, as this is a course called ‘Object-Oriented Design’ maybe there should be more marks devoted to design, for example to whether students adequately followed a design process and were able to keep to their original design whilst coding, as opposed to simply whether they used one or other design pattern. Also, as it was not possible for me to run the submitted code, perhaps the students could be required to submit a make file to facilitate testing.

2. 

3. 

4. How do the assessment tasks and marking criteria compare with those of final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject from similar universities?

C++ courses are often taught with a heavy ‘systems’ flavour and an emphasis on high performance, efficiency and low-level programming language details. Design patterns are more suited to earlier software engineering courses. This course somehow sits between being a software design course (based on design patterns) and an advanced C++ programming course. The exam also reflects this hybrid nature, with a section on the finer points of the C++ language, and other questions on software design. I have seen C++ exams with questions like these before, but I wonder whether getting the students to also write some small code snippets in the exam is possible, rather than having only multiple choice questions. The exam questions on software design are good.
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Objective

The Group of Eight (Go8) universities collaborate and jointly participate annually in the Quality Verification System (QVS) to:

- demonstrate the appropriateness of the standards of learning outcomes and grades awarded in Go8 universities;
- maintain and improve the academic standards of Go8 universities;
- enable comparisons of learning outcomes in similar subjects across Go8 universities; and
- promote discussion on good practice in teaching and learning in the Go8 universities.

Core Elements

The Go8 QVS is a process of external, discipline-led, academic peer review of final year undergraduate student outcomes. The QVS reviews two core subjects, or the equivalent of 25 percent of final year assessments, in undergraduate programs across Go8 universities.

Based on their academic judgement and the set of documents provided, the Go8 QVS External Reviewers:

- review the appropriateness and comparative quality of the specified learning outcomes, assessment tasks, assessment criteria and assessment processes set for samples of final year subjects; and
- report on the appropriateness of the grades awarded to stratified random samples of student work in these subjects.

Distinctive features of the Go8 QVS are:

- the QVS focuses upon assessment in a sample of final year subjects in undergraduate programs (the review must cover a minimum of 25 percent of final year assessment requirements);
- the QVS concentrates on benchmarking for comparing grades awarded in similar programs across Go8 universities;
- the QVS is conducted by senior discipline-specific academics who will have an understanding of academic standards in similar universities around the world; and
- the QVS is sufficiently flexible to complement other quality assurance mechanisms within Go8 universities to minimise duplication of efforts.

Report

The information provided in this report is part of an annual activity, designed to provide public assurance and confidence that undergraduate learning outcomes and grades are comparable across the Go8.
### Reviewer Evaluation

**Go8 Quality Verification System 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Institution: Monash University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline area: Electrical and Electronic Engineering and Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subject Review

**Go8 University:** The University of Sydney  
**Discipline:** Electrical and Electronic Engineering and Technology  
**Home Subject reviewed (Subject Code):** ELEC 4505

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assessments</th>
<th>Below Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed in total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with grade awarded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.

*Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment.*

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.

*H owever, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.*

---

1 Adapted from the University of Cambridge’s report Coversheet for External Examiners (2009);  
[www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf](http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf)
There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed. These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.

Comments (optional)
If you wish, please include further comments which may be used by the associated Faculty or Department in marketing materials.

The unit ELEC4505: Digital Communication Systems is of an appropriate high standard compared with other G08 universities. The unit gives the student a fundamental understanding of the concepts, design and performance of digital communication systems and the student receives practical knowledge for experimental verification and measurement of critical factors in a communication system. The student assessment in the exams allows individual students to be assessed on their merits, whilst the quality of group work is assessed in the laboratory reports.

Statement of potential conflicts of interest
For example, being involved in collaborative teaching, research or consultancy work with colleagues teaching in the subjects being reviewed, or recent transfer from the institution being reviewed.

No conflict of interest.

Review of specified learning objectives

1. To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

   Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. Some LOs are not measurable nor clear on the level of achievement expected. This applies particularly to LO 1 and 4 that are phrased in terms of "an understanding". A better way to specify LOs is to use a SOLO (structure of observed learning outcomes by John Biggs) taxonomy with verbs
that have an understood level of achievement associated with them. Eg see http://w3.unisa.edu.au/gradquals/staff/program/solo.asp).

2. To be fair, the above comment may be mitigated by the use in the outline of Level 3 "Engineering/IT Specialisation" etc, but I did not have access to the meaning of these levels.

3. To what extent are the specified learning objectives appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. The LOs cover the range of concepts, design skills and critical analytical skills expected of a level 4 student in Electrical Engineering. Improvements could be made by offering a design assignment as noted below.

2. 

3. 

3. How do the specified learning objectives compare with those of final year or postgraduate subjects (as relevant) from similar universities?

The learning outcomes are of a similar standard to other G08 universities.

Review of assessment tasks

1. To what extent are the assessment tasks suitable for the specified learning objectives? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. Good explicit statement of team/individual assessment for each component.
2. The assessment tasks cover most aspects of the subject area.

3. LO 6 is not assessed according to the "Assessment Summary". I would recommend inclusion of an individual design assignment that covers LO6 to replace the 5% for tutorial attendance (as noted in handwriting on the outline supplied). Attendance is not a particularly good discriminator for student performance, even if it motivates participation. A design assignment could provide students with valuable formative assessment feedback as well.

2. To what extent are the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

Not at all Somewhat Adequately Very well Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. The team/individual requirements are explicit and clear.

2. Releasing marking rubrics before submission would help students target their efforts and allow more formative assessment.

3. To what extent are the assessment tasks and marking criteria appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

Not at all Somewhat Adequately Very well Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. Lab reports would be more effective if they are coupled with a student demonstration of ability in the lab or presentation. Just assessing a report is vulnerable to collusion by students potentially from different groups or previous years.

2. As mentioned above, a design assignment with some project component that involves a practical simulation or design/build component would challenge students to achieve better outcomes.

3. How do the assessment tasks and marking criteria compare with those of final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject from similar universities?
Match other G08 university reasonably, although other universities may require some self directed design work or assignments and may supply rubrics to the students.
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Report

The information provided in this report is part of an annual activity, designed to provide public assurance and confidence that undergraduate learning outcomes and grades are comparable across the Go8.
Reviewer Evaluation
Go8 Quality Verification System 2017

Reviewer Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Institution:</th>
<th>Monash University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline area:</td>
<td>Electrical and Electronic Engineering and Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Go8 University:</th>
<th>The University of Sydney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline:</td>
<td>Electrical and Electronic Engineering and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Subject reviewed (Subject Code):</td>
<td>ELEC 4713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assessments</th>
<th>Below Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed in total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with grade awarded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.

Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment.

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.

HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.

---

1 Adapted from the University of Cambridge’s report Coversheet for External Examiners (2009); [www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf](http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf)
There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed. These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.

Comments (optional)
If you wish, please include further comments which may be used by the associated Faculty or Department in marketing materials.

The unit ELEC4713 Thesis B is a high quality capstone project unit for Electrical and Information Engineering students. Students work individually on design and/or research projects that enable them to obtain independent skills for developing and managing solutions to engineering problems.

Statement of potential conflicts of interest
For example, being involved in collaborative teaching, research or consultancy work with colleagues teaching in the subjects being reviewed, or recent transfer from the institution being reviewed.

None.

Review of specified learning objectives
1. To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

   Not at all   Somewhat   Adequately   Very well   Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating
1. The learning outcomes include all the facets of capstone projects, from formulation, planning, drawing upon knowledge, analysis, originality, referencing other work, documentation, communication and presentation.

2. To what extent are the specified learning objectives appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. The outcomes are at an appropriate level since they bring together key concepts from lower levels of the course into a design and research problem that involves judgement, innovation and clear communication. This requires the maturity of a level 4 student.

2. 

3. 

3. How do the specified learning objectives compare with those of final year or postgraduate subjects (as relevant) from similar universities?

They are of the same or higher standard compared to other G08 universities. Other universities may include teamwork in their projects, but this may be covered in other units of the course.

Review of assessment tasks

1. To what extent are the assessment tasks suitable for the specified learning objectives? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. 

2. 

3. 

1. The assessment tasks explicitly include time management, presentation (both oral and written) and technical achievement which are all important. Two academics are involved in the assessment of the work. Some approach to the moderation of assessment across the cohort may improve outcomes.

2. To what extent are the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

   Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  **Very well**  Completely

*Please list up to three reasons for making this rating*

1. The different levels of achievement are defined well and clearly in the "Marking Scheme for Thesis Project" in the Thesis Marking Form.

2. They comprehensively broken down into a matrix with grade on one axis and criteria (eg originality, literature review, presentation) on the other axis.

3.

3. To what extent are the assessment tasks and marking criteria appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

   Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  **Very well**  Completely

*Please list up to three reasons for making this rating*

1. The thesis is an academic document that requires maturity and reflection to write well. These attributes are only developed well in final year of an engineering degree.

2. The ability to understand and answer in-depth questions again requires maturity only obtained at the end of the degree.

3.

4. How do the assessment tasks and marking criteria compare with those of final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject from similar universities?
The tasks are similar to other universities in terms of requiring oral and written presentation. The 20% assessment of time management is not usual but is considered valuable. Something that may be worth considering that occurs at other G08 universities is the production by the student of a 10-15 minute online video summarising their contributions. This has the dual benefit of providing a means of moderation across the cohort by academic staff in addition to the written thesis and also for students to promote their work when applying for jobs. One area that the assessment could be improved is through a moderation mechanism across the cohort of projects. This typically occurs during a board of examiners meeting where assessors are asked to justify high grades. There may be an actual or perceived conflict of interest for a supervisor where the student wants to work with that supervisor for a PhD and the student is applying for a scholarship. In that situation the supervisor may benefit from awarding a higher mark for a student applying for a scholarship.
Quality Verification System 2017

Objective

The Group of Eight (Go8) universities collaborate and jointly participate annually in the Quality Verification System (QVS) to:

- demonstrate the appropriateness of the standards of learning outcomes and grades awarded in Go8 universities;
- maintain and improve the academic standards of Go8 universities;
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Core Elements

The Go8 QVS is a process of external, discipline-led, academic peer review of final year undergraduate student outcomes. The QVS reviews two core subjects, or the equivalent of 25 percent of final year assessments, in undergraduate programs across Go8 universities.

Based on their academic judgement and the set of documents provided, the Go8 QVS External Reviewers:

- review the appropriateness and comparative quality of the specified learning outcomes, assessment tasks, assessment criteria and assessment processes set for samples of final year subjects; and
- report on the appropriateness of the grades awarded to stratified random samples of student work in these subjects.

Distinctive features of the Go8 QVS are:

- the QVS focuses upon assessment in a sample of final year subjects in undergraduate programs (the review must cover a minimum of 25 percent of final year assessment requirements);
- the QVS concentrates on benchmarking for comparing grades awarded in similar programs across Go8 universities;
- the QVS is conducted by senior discipline-specific academics who will have an understanding of academic standards in similar universities around the world; and
- the QVS is sufficiently flexible to complement other quality assurance mechanisms within Go8 universities to minimise duplication of efforts.

Report

The information provided in this report is part of an annual activity, designed to provide public assurance and confidence that undergraduate learning outcomes and grades are comparable across the Go8.
Reviewer Evaluation
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Reviewer Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Institution:</th>
<th>Monash University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline area:</td>
<td>Medical Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Go8 University:</th>
<th>The University of Sydney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline:</td>
<td>Medical Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Subject reviewed (Subject Code):</td>
<td>ANAT3008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assessments</th>
<th>Below Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed in total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with grade awarded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.

Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment.

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.

*HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.*

---

1 Adapted from the University of Cambridge’s report Coversheet for External Examiners (2009); www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf
There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed.

*These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.*

**Comments (optional)**

This reviewer would suggest the course could be enhanced by limiting the number of course objectives to 5 and making them more focused. It was difficult to determine whether all learning objectives had been met because the questions were often not accompanying the exam answers, particularly for the SBAQs.

It is difficult to determine from these assessments whether learners had "gained a deep understanding" of the MSK anatomy or whether students had "shown how various problems may be stated, understood, or solved". This reviewer would suggest less ambiguous L.O.s with a broader implication and clear indications of which assessment ties each L.O.

The assessments appear to include a great deal of drawing, one way to improve alignment would be to broaden out L.O.1 and suggest the following objective: Integrate knowledge of MSK anatomy identification and relevant anatomical relationships through observational skills and drawing. In this way, students may be more prepared for the drawing as being the mechanism by which they are significantly evaluated.

Also of consideration. All the assessments for which this reviewer could evaluate seem to only target the course objectives at the lower end of the scale. There were no links to course objective 15 and 15; there was difficulty knowing if grading included 13 or 14.

It is difficult to determine from these assessments whether learners had "gained a deep understanding" of the MSK anatomy or whether students had "shown how various problems may be stated, understood, or solved". This reviewer would suggest less ambiguous L.O.s with a broader implication and clear indications of which assessment ties each L.O.

The assessments appear to include a great deal of drawing, one way to improve alignment would be to broaden out L.O.1 and suggest the following objective: Integrate knowledge of MSK anatomy identification and relevant anatomical relationships through observational skills and drawing. In this way, students may be more prepared for the drawing as being the mechanism by which they are significantly evaluated.

Also of consideration. All the assessments for which this reviewer could evaluate seem to only target the course objectives at the lower end of the scale. There were no links to course objective 15 and 15; there was difficulty knowing if grading included 13 or 14.
Statement of potential conflicts of interest

For example, being involved in collaborative teaching, research or consultancy work with colleagues teaching in the subjects being reviewed, or recent transfer from the institution being reviewed.

None to report.

Review of specified learning objectives

1. To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

   Not at all  Somewhat  **Adequately**  Very well  Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

| 1. | The number of course learning objectives seems large for the type of course offered. The suggestion would be to combine some of this detail and develop more broad learning outcomes reflecting the assessment (see assessment section for a specific suggestion). 16 L.O.s seems too great for the course credit given. |
| 2. | The level of cognitive thinking appears relatively low for the LOs which were evaluated on assessment. There was no indication that the higher order cognitive unit learning outcomes were assessed. This is of concern - if these are important unit outcomes, they should be assessed accordingly. |
| 3. | |

2. To what extent are the specified learning objectives appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

   Not at all  **Somewhat**  Adequately  Very well  Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

| 1. | While the unit outcomes may include higher order cognitive, the assessments indicate an introductory level of anatomy knowledge. This course is targeting students who have previously had |
anatomy knowledge, yet the focus of the assessment (or rather the portions of assessment this reviewer could evaluate) on structure ID and relationships. A mechanism for improving this would be to focus the assessment more on the higher order L.O. and assume the lower order knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. How do the specified learning objectives compare with those of final year or postgraduate subjects (as relevant) from similar universities?

This reviewer is unable to assess this based on available resources.

Review of assessment tasks

1. To what extent are the assessment tasks suitable for the specified learning objectives? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

| Not at all | Somewhat | Adequately | Very well | Completely |

*Please list up to three reasons for making this rating*

| 1. | The reasons are the same as listed above in previous section. |
|---|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. To what extent are the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

| Not at all | Somewhat | Adequately | Very well | Completely |

*Please list up to three reasons for making this rating*

| 1. | I was unable to determine this based on the resources given to review. |
|---|

| 2. |
3. To what extent are the assessment tasks and marking criteria appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

   Not at all   Not at all   Somewhat   Adequately   Very well   Completely

*Please list up to three reasons for making this rating*

1. I was unable to determine this based on the resources given to review.

2. 

3. 

4. How do the assessment tasks and marking criteria compare with those of final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject from similar universities?

I was unable to determine this based on the resources given to review.
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- demonstrate the appropriateness of the standards of learning outcomes and grades awarded in Go8 universities;
- maintain and improve the academic standards of Go8 universities;
- enable comparisons of learning outcomes in similar subjects across Go8 universities; and
- promote discussion on good practice in teaching and learning in the Go8 universities.

Core Elements

The Go8 QVS is a process of external, discipline-led, academic peer review of final year undergraduate student outcomes. The QVS reviews two core subjects, or the equivalent of 25 percent of final year assessments, in undergraduate programs across Go8 universities.

Based on their academic judgement and the set of documents provided, the Go8 QVS External Reviewers:

- review the appropriateness and comparative quality of the specified learning outcomes, assessment tasks, assessment criteria and assessment processes set for samples of final year subjects; and
- report on the appropriateness of the grades awarded to stratified random samples of student work in these subjects.

Distinctive features of the Go8 QVS are:

- the QVS focuses upon assessment in a sample of final year subjects in undergraduate programs (the review must cover a minimum of 25 percent of final year assessment requirements);
- the QVS concentrates on benchmarking for comparing grades awarded in similar programs across Go8 universities;
- the QVS is conducted by senior discipline-specific academics who will have an understanding of academic standards in similar universities around the world; and
- the QVS is sufficiently flexible to complement other quality assurance mechanisms within Go8 universities to minimise duplication of efforts.

Report

The information provided in this report is part of an annual activity, designed to provide public assurance and confidence that undergraduate learning outcomes and grades are comparable across the Go8.
Reviewer Evaluation
Go8 Quality Verification System 2017

Reviewer Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Institution:</th>
<th>Monash University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline area:</td>
<td>Medical Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject Review

Go8 University: The University of Sydney

Discipline: Medical Studies

Home Subject reviewed (Subject Code): BIOS 3065

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assessments</th>
<th>Below Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed in total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with grade awarded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade to be unduly low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.

*Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment.*

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.

*HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.*

---

1 Adapted from the University of Cambridge’s report Coversheet for External Examiners (2009); www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf
There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed.

*These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.*

Comments (optional)

If you wish, please include further comments which may be used by the associated Faculty or Department in marketing materials.

Statement of potential conflicts of interest

*For example, being involved in collaborative teaching, research or consultancy work with colleagues teaching in the subjects being reviewed, or recent transfer from the institution being reviewed.*

I declare no conflict of interest in providing this review.

Review of specified learning objectives

1. **To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient?** (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

   Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely

   *Please list up to three reasons for making this rating*

   1. Mapping of learning outcomes and tasks clearly articulated.
2. Linkage of learning outcomes with larger degree program objectives clearly provided.

3. To what extent are the specified learning objectives appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (Please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

- Not at all
- Somewhat
- Adequately
- Very well
- Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. Very specific and targeted Learning Outcomes that address discipline specific tasks
2. Appears overloaded with Learning Outcomes (21 LOs for a 6 credit point class that has 4 hours of face-to-face content) is potentially too heavily subdivided.
3. 

3. How do the specified learning objectives compare with those of final year or postgraduate subjects (as relevant) from similar universities?

Consistent, but appears to be a large number for the contact hours per week. Could potentially reduce the number and rephrase to link to broader outcomes. AS read they are spanning both unit outcomes but equally specific task outcomes.

Review of assessment tasks

1. To what extent are the assessment tasks suitable for the specified learning objectives? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

- Not at all
- Somewhat
- Adequately
- Very well
- Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. Assessment is a difficult component of the course to evaluate as content from the 3 quizzes (30% of the course points) and the mid/end of semester exams was not provided because students are viewing videos and responding to them via either MCQ (quiz).
2. 
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2. To what extent are the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view).

Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. 

2. 

3. 

3. To what extent are the assessment tasks and marking criteria appropriate for a final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject? (please mark or highlight the statement that best represents your view)

Not at all  Somewhat  Adequately  Very well  Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

1. As noted above, there is some missing information to be able to respond to this question, particularly about how these assessments are being marked and how the 'model answer' is broken down to generate point totals for the short answer assessments. Equally, without the videos it is difficult to evaluate the prompts and responses in tandem. I would suggest, particularly to address the 'higher order' Learning Outcomes that they consider a longer-form assessment that encourages use of the literature and development of writing skills within a 3rd year course.

2. 

3. 

4. How do the assessment tasks and marking criteria compare with those of final year or postgraduate (as relevant) subject from similar universities?

Generally consistent, but I would expect 3rd year courses to more often integrate some sort of longer-form assessment (long answer formats, essays, projects that encourage integration of literature/communication) than what is reflected here (quiz or short answers from video prompts).