NOTICE OF MEETING

Meeting 3/2019 of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee will be held from 2:00pm – 4:00pm on Tuesday 7 May 2019 in Function Room, Level 5 Administration Building F23. The Agenda for the meeting is below.

AGENDA

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES
   Welcome  
   For item 4.1: Professor Ross Coleman (Director of Graduate Research, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education))
   Apologies  
   Professor Pip Pattison (Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education))

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS
   2.1 Minutes of Previous Meeting (19 March 2019)  
      Chair  
      attached

3 STANDING ITEMS
   3.1 Report of the Chair  
      Chair  
      verbal
   3.2 Report of Academic Board  
      Chair, Academic Board  
      attached
   3.3 Report of the Admissions Subcommittee  
      Tim Wilkinson  
      attached

4 ITEMS FOR ACTION
   4.1 Respectful Research Supervisory Relationships: Amendments to the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013  
      Ross Coleman  
      attached
   4.2 Amendments to the Coursework Policy 2014 and Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 for the Sydney Professional Certificate and Teaching Periods  
      Peter McCallum  
      attached
   4.3 Proposed Cadigal Early Conditional Offer Scheme  
      Peter McCallum  
      attached

5 ITEMS FOR NOTING
   5.1 Annual Student Misconduct Report 2018  
      attached
   5.2 Annual Report of Student Appeals Body 2018  
      attached

6 OTHER BUSINESS
   6.1 Any Other Business

Next meeting:
2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 25 June 2019
Level 5 Function Room, F23 Administration Building

Respect is a core value of the Academic Board
Academic Standards and Policy Committee - Terms of Reference

PURPOSE

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

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. To play an active role in assuring the quality of teaching, scholarship and research in the University by ensuring the body of academic policies and degree resolutions are internally consistent, incorporate the best ideas and are aligned with the strategic goals of the University.

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

3. To recommend to the Academic Board policy concerning the programs of study or examinations in any Faculty, University School or Board of Studies.

4. To advise the Academic Board and Vice-Chancellor on policies concerning the academic aspects of the conditions of appointment and employment of academic staff.

5. To provide academic oversight of admissions, credit and recognition of prior learning in relation to domains 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.2.1, 5.2.2, 5.2.4, 6.3.1 (a), (b), (d), 6.3.2 (a), (d), (e), of the *Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015*.

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

7. To actively seek and evaluate opportunities to improve the University’s pursuit of high standards in all academic activities.

8. To ensure proper communication channels are established with other committees of the Academic Board and the University Executive to promote cross-referencing and discussion of matters relating to academic standards and policy.

9. To receive reports from, and provide advice to, the Deputy Vice Chancellors relating to the operation and effectiveness of policy in the areas of teaching, scholarship and research.

10. To exercise all reasonable means to provide and receive advice from the University Executive and its relevant subcommittees.

11. To provide regular reports on its activities under its terms of reference to the Academic Board.

12. To consider and report on any matter referred to it by the Academic Board, the Vice-Chancellor or the Deputy Vice-Chancellors.
UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES
1.1 Welcomes and Apologies
The Chair welcomed members and advised of apologies as recorded above.

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS
2.1 Minutes of Previous Meeting
Resolution ASPC19/2-1
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolved that the minutes of meeting 1/2019, held on 12 February 2019, be confirmed as a true record.

2.2 Business Arising
There was no business arising.

3 STANDING ITEMS
3.1 Report of the Chair
The Chair did not have anything to report outside the items included in the written Report.

3.2 Report of Academic Board
The Chair of the Academic Board advised that presentations had been given to the Board regarding non-AQF micro-credentialing courses at its 5 March meeting. A formal course proposal is currently under development with the intent of introducing a Sydney Professional Certificate as the University’s first official post-Bachelor micro-credential; this will be submitted for consideration and approval via the University’s standard course approval process.
Resolution ASPC19/2-2
The Academic Standards & Policy Committee noted the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 5 March 2019.
3.3 Report of the Admissions Sub-Committee

Resolution ASPC19/2-3

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

4 ITEMS FOR ACTION

4.1 Academic Promotions Policy 2015

The Acting Associate Director (Operations) attended the meeting to speak to this item. In overview, the proposed amendments reflected in the Academic Promotions Policy (the ‘Policy’) reflect the recent amalgamated faculty and school structures.

Schedule 2 of the Policy stipulates Local Promotion Committee (LPC) constitution and compliance. The schedule has been amended to the effect that Faculties shall form single Faculty LPCs, while University Schools will continue to be combined. Committee composition will remain the same at Levels B and C, however at Levels D and E the proposed changes affect core committee composition.

The following detailed feedback on the Policy was offered by members, with discussion following:

- There are minor typographical errors in the Policy, requiring correction. Additionally, members submitted that the wording of Section 7, Clause 1(a) be changed to read “gender”.

- The proposed changes result in the stipulation that LPCs are not permitted to have two people from the same School discipline. In practice, most faculties now have a sufficient number of disciplines that this should not be an issue, however, for a smaller faculty, this may be difficult to comply with.

The Chair noted here that Schedule 2 of the Policy provides for the Provost to approve exceptions to address this issue on a case by case basis (see Constitution).

- Regarding the timeline and structure of making an application and being assessed for promotion, Clauses 13b (i) & (ii), and 14b (i) & (ii), do not allow for applicants to see a copy of the Head’s report, and to have an opportunity to respond in writing to its contents, until they are advised that their application for promotion has been unsuccessful. In the interest of procedural fairness, it was suggested that applicants should be privy to the Head’s report earlier, whilst their application is still under review, and be afforded the opportunity to encode a written response for consideration of the LPC – prior to the recourse of an appeal.

The Acting Associate Director (Operations) noted that the Appeals process provides an opportunity to apply for a thorough review of a decision on a promotions application. She further noted that the Policy has provision for a HoS report to be written by a nominee, where appointed. She observed that in experience, LPCs are very capable in discerning anomalies between applications and reports, and this is well supported by the checks and balances set out in the Policy.

The Chair of Academic Board noted the work being undertaken by the Vice-Provost (Academic Performance) in liaising with and supporting the HoS cohort to support and encourage academic staff potential. Some of the issues identified above have a large underlying ‘cultural’ component, which falls outside the remit of the Policy.

A member observed that many HoS may not have not sat on LPCs regularly, or recently, or may be recent external hires to the University, and as a result they may not be overly familiar with the promotions process. They suggested that improved HoS mentoring is needed. The Chair suggested that it may be productive for HoS or other senior staff to alternate year to year between being appointed to Committees and being available to act as mentors for staff considering applying for promotion.

A member drew attention to the success rates for promotion for Level D & E academic staff, observing that there is room for improvement in actively identifying and supporting staff who are good candidates for promotion. The Acting Associate Director (Operations) advised that the Provost runs a briefing session on this, which could be expanded further.
The Chair also noted that engaging a mentor should be part of the AP&D process for all staff.

- The proposed process for the appointment of assessors only allows for applicants to object on the basis of a belief that there exists a conflict of interest.

A member observed that the standard practice at U.S. universities is for the applicant and their academic department to work together to produce a long shortlist of assessors for the promotions panel and from there, both the applicant and the department choose three respectively from that agreed pool.

The Acting Associate Director (Operations) noted that the process for the appointment of assessors in the Policy is consistent with the policies of Go8 comparators.

**Secretary’s note:** Section 10, Clause 8(a) & (b) and Section 14, Clause 5 make clear that applicants will be notified of their assessors, but these are not selected in consultation with the applicant. The Policy makes provision for an applicant to object to the appointment of an assessor / assessors under Section 10, Clauses 12 & 13).

- The Policy appears to prevent academics from applying for promotion if they have not yet completed their annual AP&D and applicants, if unsuccessful in their application for promotion, must wait another year before being permitted to reapply.

The Acting Associate Director (Operations) clarified that the AP&D requirement is that an applicant must have completed AP&D or performance management and development review in the previous fifteen 15 months.

- The overall tone of the Policy is very declarative, with some Clauses reading as overly restrictive: ‘an applicant cannot apply unless…’ A member suggested that wording of such declarative clauses be made more flexible: ‘it would assist you in your application to discuss with your HoS/ Dean…’

- Where there are strict criterion for academic promotion, staff are in a position where they must consciously align their activities to conform with the system, which can be a disincentive to initiative and creativity – both qualities being core to the pursuit of research excellence.

The Chair noted that diversity in activities recognised for promotion has been considerably and concertedly broadened over the past two years in terms of promotion criteria to better recognise and facilitate this.

The Acting Associate Director (Operations) advised the Committee that she would relay the above feedback to the Vice-Provost and the Provost after the meeting. She noted that the Policy is due for a more comprehensive review in 2020, which will provide the opportunity to consult further and to convene an academic working party prior to flesh it out in thorough detail.

**Resolution ASPC19/2-4**

The Academic Standards and Policy Committee reviewed and endorsed the proposed changes to the Academic Promotions Policy 2015.

### 4.2 Code of Conduct for Students

Associate Professor Peter McCallum, Acting Registrar and Academic Director, Education Policy and Quality, attended the meeting to speak to this item.

He advised that the *Code of Conduct for Students 2005* (the ‘Code’), included in the agenda pack, has been recommended for revision in accordance with the general principles of the new Student Experience Strategy. As the existing version of the Code dates back to 2005, it requires an update to bring it into line with changes in behaviour and environment (for example, with the proliferation of activity in the social media space). Revision to the Code is an initiative driven by Professor Wei Fong Chua AM as the new Pro Vice-Chancellor (Student Life) and the DVC Education portfolio. The UE Student Life Committee is the main reporting body for this revision, which will provide opportunity for student consultation and input via its student membership, in addition to broader planned consultation. The Director of Educational Strategy noted that the Code will return to Academic Board in June 2019, as the approving body and owner of the existing Code, and will then progress to Senate for endorsement.
The Acting Registrar and Academic Director, Education Policy and Quality noted that the intent and form of a revised Code is to be student-centric, outcomes focussed, and fair and equitable. It will set out to improve upon the tone of the overall existing document - to shift from declarative expectations of student conduct to better capture the fundamental principle that students and teachers are colleagues in a mutually supportive learning environment. He noted that the existing Code needs further refinement, which may extract some existing features of the Code into an accompanying set of procedures. The Code could also benefit from greater clarity around the role students assume in their ambassadorial role for the University, particularly in the context of undertaking student mobility experiences. He further noted that the Code could be improved with clearer concentration on the imperative for students to act lawfully, ethically and respectfully towards others.

Comments and feedback on the Code was invited from Committee members, summarised as follows:

- Members noted that the existing Code, although it refers to other University policies, does not explicitly include any provision regarding remedial action to address failures by students to comply. A member suggested that the Code should have a section outlining the University’s procedures for addressing misconduct.

  The Acting Registrar and Academic Director, Education Policy and Quality noted that the Code is vague on the issue of the escalation of matters – particularly with reference to designating a threshold for determining where ‘low level’ conflicts tip over into being instances of misconduct.

- A member suggested that it may be useful to reframe the Code in the same terms as the University’s graduate qualities. Members agreed that this would supply consistency of principle, but noted caution that the document is fundamentally a policy, which will need to be reflected in its language.

  The Acting Registrar and Academic Director, Education Policy and Quality took this on notice, also observing that the graduate qualities currently do not cover the entirety of the student cohort.

- Professor Fekete noted that p.43 of the agenda pack re: ‘Reputational Risk’ indicates a joint obligation for students to uphold the University’s reputation and academic standing. He submitted that this is an unreasonable and inappropriate expectation to place on students, running the risk that it could then be used to suppress public criticism of the University and its practices and could limit peaceful student protests and demonstrations. Additionally, Professor Fekete noted that the emphasis on ‘acting lawfully’ is an overreach in the context of the Code – all citizens have obligations to the law, however this falls outside the remit of the University.

- The University Policy Manager noted that the University does have a formal, written set of institutional values and suggested that the Code for staff and students should be anchored by these and should make explicit reference to them. This will provide consistency and will translate those values into a set of expectations. She further cautioned against deploying ‘right-based’ language in the Code, as this can have complex legal implications. She noted that the developers of the revised Code should work closely with the Culture Strategy team to ensure that it is resonant with both staff and student cultures and efforts underway in that space.

- Professor Fekete urged the need for ongoing discussion with the student cohort during the revision process, noting that the one day of planning consultation indicated in the paper accompanying this item is insufficient to render meaningful feedback. The Acting Registrar and Academic Director, Education Policy and Quality advised the Committee that the DVC Education portfolio will be holding a lengthier engagement period via an online forum, where scenario-based ‘problems’ will be workshopped with students to flesh out conversation on what is considered ‘reasonable’ and what is not in a behavioural context.

- Members recommended that alongside a revised Code for Students should be revision of the equally dated Code of Conduct for staff, which should also align with the Culture
Strategy. Members noted that a shared Code for staff and students is impracticable as any staff Code will involve industrial matters that do not pertain to students.

- Associate Professor Helen Agus noted on the subject of incorporating behavioural prescriptions around students’ use of social media is complicated and in many ways, falls outside the remit of the University to monitor and apply enforceable principles.

The Acting Registrar and Academic Director, Education Policy and Quality noted that the same issue underlies the University’s policy addressing sexual harassment and sexual assault, however the latter nonetheless is not restricted to dealing with matters that exclusively occur on campus; as such, it may offer a useful case-study.

- The Chair of Academic Board noted that there are other contemporaneous policies that are due for review, such as the Charter of Academic Freedom, which are as old as the current Code and could also benefit from review.

Resolution ASPC19/2-5
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee:
(1) provided feedback on the current Code of Conduct for Students; and
(2) discussed issues to be considered in the review.

4.3 Academic Board Annual Report 2018
The Chair of Academic Board expressed his congratulations and thanks to the committees that had generated the content for the Academic Board Annual Report 2018, noting the significant effort involved. He asked Committee members to forward any suggested revisions to either himself or the Executive Officer to the Academic Board, as soon as possible.

Resolution ASPC19/2-6
The Academic Standards & Policy Committee recommended that the Academic Board approve the Academic Board Annual Report 2018 and present it to Senate.

5 ITEMS FOR NOTING

5.1 Curriculum Timetabling Policy 2019
The DVC (Education) advised the Committee that a working group has been active in developing a novel Curriculum Timetabling Policy (the ‘Policy’) for the past twelve months. The working group reports to a Steering Committee nested within the Office of the Provost & Deputy Vice-Chancellor, as part of the Sydney Operating Model (SOM). The Steering Committee has endorsed the draft for noting by the Academic Standards Policy Committee (attached to this item), as have several other committees. Curriculum Timetabling Procedures (the ‘Procedures’) are currently under development and will be separately submitted to the ASPC in due course. Subsequently, both the Policy and the Procedures will be considered together for consultation at the Academic Board, for final approval by the Vice-Chancellor. It is proposed that the Policy will apply approximately 6 – 12 months before the Procedures. The intention is for the new timetabling process to be in place for 2021.

The DVC (Education) advised that the Policy and Procedures cover all coursework programs, but do not currently extend to non-award teaching. They are intended to provide equitable and efficient timetabling across the institution; to foster teaching excellence; to optimise faculty and school teaching resources; and to try to minimise cross-campus travel time for both staff and students. A Timetabling Committee will be responsible for the production of timetables. The overall aim of the Policy is to produce a timetable that keeps class clashes to a minimum, with the flexibility for students to switch classes where possible.

With reference to the membership of the Timetabling Committee (per Schedule 1 of the Policy), the Chair suggested that it would be beneficial to include a number of teaching academics. The DVC (Education) took the suggestion on notice.

Members provided feedback on the following points:

- There are a substantial number of international students receiving late offers for programs, which often do not mesh well with existing timetabling cut-off dates. Faculties
and schools attempt to anticipate the number of incoming students and this often leads to the overbooking of classrooms, which then go unused.

- The DVC (Education) acknowledged that within the Sydney Student system, students often do not have thorough information on their classes until after they have enrolled. Future practice will attempt to remedy this.

- A member flagged that because of the current practice of permitting lectures to clash, students interpret this as an indication that attending lectures is optional and prioritise tutorials and labs. This is pedagogically unsound and the double-booking of lectures should be eliminated as far as possible by the future system.

The President, SRC agreed with the above, but noted that clashes were often unavoidable for double-degree students. Of issue to the latter is clashes that occur between compulsory units.

The nominee of the President, SUPRA noted that the Policy makes provision for resolution of clashes, however she expressed the utility for postgraduate students to be able to switch classes by preference in order to better consolidate their timetable to fit in internships, which are also integral to their overall study and employability outcomes. The DVC (Education) advised that this will be an active area of consideration in the drafting of the accompanying Procedures, where a mechanism of applying to be on a waiting list to switch classes is planned.

- A member noted that under Part 5, Section 15, Clause 1, timetabling staff are enabled to manage staff lists, which is difficult in many instances as they are not ‘on the ground’ in the classroom.

- A member noted that under Part 4, Section 12, Clause 2 re: the provision of the timetable to ‘relevant university systems’, currently, the timetable is not integrated with Canvas, which is a significant drawback.

- The University Policy Manager noted the risk posed by overcrowding in teaching spaces as a significant WHS issue.

- A member raised the issue of growing class sizes; the DVC (Education) advised that this is a consideration that falls outside the project scope of the Policy and Procedures.

- A member raised the issue of the efficiency of room allocation within the new system per Part 2, Section 7, Clause 3 (b)(i): ‘optimising – the match of teaching spaces to scheduled class requirements (such as size of class, type of class, teaching facilities needed)’. The DVC (Education) noted that the system will be able to capture the characteristics of all teaching spaces on campus (for example, whether they are purpose-built laboratories), and will be able to automatically allocate them to units as appropriate.

- A member enquired whether there will be trouble-shooting experts permanently active and available behind the timetabling system. The DVC (Education) advised that the University was purchasing a vendor packaged system, which is intended to automate the timetabling process. The system will allow manual inputs, where necessary.

The DVC (Education) invited members to provide further feedback to her directly.

Resolution ASPC19/2-7
The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the draft Curriculum Timetabling Policy 2019 from the Provost Steering Committee of the Sydney Operating Model Program.

6 OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 Any Other Business

There being no other business, the meeting concluded at 3:50pm.

Next meeting: 2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 7 May 2019
Level 5 Function Room, F23 Administration Building
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 12 March 2019 and:

- noted the Committee's review and endorsement in principle of the recommendations arising from the Academic Board Thematic Review of Student Safety and Wellbeing;
- noted the Committee's approval the proposed changes to the Assessment Working Group’s Terms of Reference to become a permanent advisory committee to Academic Board and UE, and to be known as Assessment Advisory Committee; and
- noted the Committee's discussion about whether there was merit to the development a shared understanding of grading standards and agreed to refer discussion of this matter to the Assessment Advisory Committee for further consideration.

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 19 March 2019;

- reviewed and endorsed proposed changes to the Academic Promotions Policy 2015; and
- approved the Academic Board Annual Report 2018 and agreed that it be presented to Senate.

Items related to the Graduate Studies Committee
The Academic Board noted the report from meeting of the Graduate Studies Committee held on 26 March 2019 and:

- approved the proposal from the Education Portfolio and Board of Interdisciplinary Studies to introduce the Sydney Professional Certificate, agreed to recommend that Senate approve the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate for the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies, 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 Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Education, Graduate Diploma in Educational Studies and Graduate Certificate in Educational Studies and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from January 1, 2020;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Master of Exercise Physiology, agreed to recommend that Senate approve the amendment of Senate Resolutions for the Faculty of Health Sciences arising from the proposal, 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 and Health to amend the Master of Surgery, Graduate Diploma in Surgery, Graduate Certificate in Surgery, Graduate Certificate in Surgical Sciences and Graduate Certificate in Advanced Clinical Skills (Surgical Anatomy), agreed to recommend that Senate approve the amendment of the Senate Resolutions for the Faculty of Medicine, 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 and Health to introduce the Master of Advanced Surgery, Graduate Diploma in Advanced Surgery and Graduate Certificate in Advanced Surgery, agreed to recommend that Senate approve the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate for the Faculty of Medicine, and approved the introduction 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 and Health to amend the Master of Medicine, agreed to recommend that Senate approve the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate for the Faculty of Medicine, and approved the introduction of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from the School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Master of Design (single specialisation), Master of Design (double specialisation) and Graduate Diploma in Design and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from the School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Master of Urbanism and Graduate Diploma in Urbanism 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 Arts and Social Sciences to suspend new admissions to the Master of Contemporary Art and Graduate Diploma in Contemporary Art and agreed to recommend that Senate approve the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate for the Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to suspend new admissions to the Master of International Studies, Graduate Diploma of International Studies and Graduate Certificate of International Studies and agreed to recommend that Senate approve the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate for the Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Teaching 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 and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Professional Engineering, Master of Professional Engineering (Accelerated) and Master of Engineering Biomedical streams and approved the amendment of units of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January, 2020;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Information Technology and the Master of Information Technology / Master of Information Technology Management, 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 and Information Technologies to amend the Graduate Diploma in 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 Sydney Conservatorium of Music to amend the Master of Music (Composition) and the Master of Music (Performance) and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from the Business School to amend the Master of Commerce and embedded courses 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 Business School to amend the Master of Management 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 Business School to amend the Master of Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations and embedded courses 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 Director, Education Policy and Quality to change the Assessment Working Group’s Terms of Reference to establish the Assessment Advisory Committee; and

- noted the Committee’s discussion of an update on the implementation of coursework in Higher Degrees by Research.
Items related to the Undergraduate Studies Committee
The Academic Board note the report from the meeting of the Undergraduate Studies Committee held on 19 March 2019, and:

• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Arts / Bachelor of Advanced Studies and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Arts / Bachelor of Advanced Studies and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from January 1, 2020;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Arts / Bachelor of Advanced Studies and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from January 1, 2020;
• approved the proposal from the Conservatorium of Music to amend the Bachelor of Music and Bachelor of Music (Honours) and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;
• approved the proposal from the Sydney Conservatorium of Music to amend the Bachelor of Music (Music Education) and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;
• approved the proposal from the Sydney Conservatorium of Music to amend the Bachelor of Music and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;
• approved the proposal from the Sydney Conservatorium of Music to amend the Diploma of Music and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;
• approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering (Honours) 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 Science to introduce the tables of units of study for the Honours pathways and the Advanced Coursework pathway for the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, approved the tables of units of study for the Advanced Coursework pathway as recommendations for students in the areas of science that correspond to Science Table A, and approved the implementation of these tables, with effect from 1 January 2020;
• approved the proposal from Education Strategy to amend the Bachelor of Advanced Studies and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020; and
• approved the proposal from Education Strategy to amend the Assessment Working Group’s Terms of Reference to establish the Assessment Advisory Committee.

Other matters
The Academic Board also:

• participated in a student-led discussion of possible changes to the Student Code of Conduct;
• participated in a discussion of Open Access facilitated by the Senior Manager, Copyright & Information Policy, University Library;
• received and noted the Reports of the Chair and of the Vice-Chancellor; and
• endorsed the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate for the Faculty of Medicine and Health, Faculty of Science and Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and agreed to their presentation to Senate.

The agenda pack for this meeting is available from: sydney.edu.au/secretariat/pdfs/academic-board-committees/AB/2019/20190416-AB-Agenda-Pack.pdf

Associate Professor Tony Masters
Chair, Academic Board
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards & Policy Committee note the report of the meeting of the Admissions Sub-Committee held on 9 April 2019 and:

(1) endorse the proposal from Education Strategy and Indigenous Strategy and Services for the Cadigal Early Conditional Offer Scheme for submission to Academic Board; and

(2) endorse the proposed changes to the UE Schedule (Malaysia) for submission to Academic Board.

ITEMS FOR ACTION

7.1 DVC (Indigenous Strategy and Services): Cadigal Early Conditional Offer Scheme

The Committee endorsed the proposal for the Cadigal Early Conditional Offer Scheme, for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students currently finishing year 12. In an aggressive market place unconditional offers cannot be made until late in the UAC offer process. It is proposed to make offers earlier than current practice for a period of time and review the process.

The paper is provided in the agenda at item 4.3

7.2 Global Student Recruitment and Mobility: Advice on UE Schedule (Malaysia)

The Committee endorsed the proposal to expand the UE Schedule to show ranks.

OTHER BUSINESS

The Admissions Sub-committee endorsed for submission to the Undergraduate Studies Committee:

- the 2020 Mathematics Prerequisite NRSL Impact & Processing Discussion paper from the Admission Office;
- the Bachelor of Psychology Course Resolutions amendment from the Faculty of Science.

The Admissions Sub-Committee noted:

- the new UAC Timeline 2019-2020, and the University’s Participation Strategy Semester 2 2019 and Semester 1 2020 from the Admissions Office;
- the report from the Admissions Office on Semester 1 2019 admissions.

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

1. UEC Schedule Update proposal
RECOMMENDATION

That the Admissions Sub-committee recommend that the Academic Standards and Policy Committee endorse the proposed changes to the UE Schedule (Malaysia) for submission to Academic Board.

CURRENT SCHEDULE

Below schedule was approved by Academic Board in April 2015 – from one of our diversity market (Malaysia).

Applicants with UEC qualification will be considered based on an overall average of the best 5 subjects (excluding vocational subjects) out of 9 subjects.

Admissions would take the numerical value of the grades, eg A1 = 1, A2 = 2, B3 = 3, B4 = 4, C8 = 8 etc, as listed on the transcript and add them up.

Current schedule - according to our assessment of UEC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UEC sum of 5 Grades</th>
<th>Course required rank</th>
<th>UEC Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>90-99.95</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>80-89.95</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>70-79.95</td>
<td>B3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above schedule does not differentiate between applicants who would potentially eligible for scholarship consideration and or Dalyell. MEDH has agreed for Combined medicine they will interview those with 9 x A1.

PROPOSE UPDATE

Admissions is proposing to have below schedule added to differentiate applicants’ quality in more granular level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UEC result</th>
<th>ATAR equivalent</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 x A1</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>Eligible for Dalyell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 x A1</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>Eligible for Dalyell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 x A1</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>Eligible for Dalyell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 x A1</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>Eligible for Dalyell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 x A1</td>
<td>99.95</td>
<td>Eligible for Dalyell and combined Medicine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assessment process would still be the same as per previous approved schedule, but to allow Admissions to identify applicants’ eligibility for ranking and or Dalyell, admissions would then look into applicants' transcript for further assessment of all 9 subjects.
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That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee endorse the necessary changes to the  Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013.  

CONTEXT  
In August 2018, Universities Australia (UA) with the National Tertiary Education Union (NTEU), Council of Australian Postgraduate Associations (CAPA) and the Australian Council of Graduate Research (ACGR) released the ‘Principles for Respectful Supervisory Relationships’. This set of Principles was an outcome of the “Respect.Now.Always” initiative from UA, which itself was a response to community concern about the safety of students in the context of sexual violence. The UA report recognised that whilst the student-supervisor relationship was fundamental to the success of HDR candidatures, the nature of the work and the significant power asymmetry meant that HDR supervision was vulnerable to the development of inappropriate sexual or romantic relationships and ultimately the potential for non-consensual sexual interactions between student and supervisor. In developing the principles, the authors of the report drew on the analogy of medical and psychology practitioner-patient interactions, in which any sexualised/romantic relationships are expressly forbidden by codes of conduct.  

The Principles for Respectful Supervisory Relationships sets out a series of expectations of an institution engaged in research supervision. The University has existing policies and codes of conduct that lay out our standards for behaviours in HDR supervision.  

At the November 2018 meeting, the AB Academic Standards and Policy Committee endorsed the following changes to the  Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013:  

At each of 14(3) and 15(1) of the  Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013, the statement that “that sexual/romantic relationships between an HDR student and his/her supervisor(s) are never appropriate” be inserted [Resolution UE RE 18/8-4]. Subsequent advice from the Office of General Counsel is that this text be followed by a statement that “such relationships constitute a conflict of interest that can only be managed by a change in supervisor”. The attached policy shows these changes, together with changes arising from the move of the HDRAC from the Registrar Portfolio to the VP (Ops) Portfolio.  

The UE RE meeting in September 2018 also noted the possibility of inserting text into the Essential Interests policy 2010 to identify that sexual and/or romantic relationships between an HDR student and his/her supervisor represented a conflict of interest. Detailed analysis of the Essential Interests Policy 2010 revealed  

---

that no other types of conflict of interest are identified in the policy and so, it would not make sense just to note this one conflict of interest scenario and ignore any others. The suggestion is that the intent of the UA report can be met through the required change to the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013.
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1 Name of policy

This is the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013.

2 Commencement

This policy commences on 22 February 2013

3 Policy is binding

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

This policy:

(a) ensures that higher degree by research students are supported to produce research of the highest national and international quality;
(b) enables students involved in a higher degree by research to be part of an intellectually stimulating academic environment and receive effective supervision during their studies;
(c) provides for a positive and proactive approach to research supervision; and
(d) requires provision of foundational guidance, support, recognition, development and leadership opportunities for supervisors; and
(e) supports the conduct of research training in a safe manner which is conducive to student wellbeing.

5 Application

This policy applies to:

(a) staff, students and affiliates; and
(b) any formal research supervision program provided to students in either of the following degrees:
   (i) Doctorate by research; or
   (ii) Master’s by research.

6 Definitions and interpretation

(1) In this policy:

   academic dishonesty means seeking to obtain or obtaining academic advantage (including in the assessment or publication of work) by dishonest or unfair means or knowingly assisting another to do so.

   Note: See also Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015

   affiliate has the meaning provided in the Code of Conduct – Staff and Affiliates, which at the date of this policy is:
   clinical title holders; adjunct, conjoint and honorary appointees; consultants and contractors to the University; holders of offices in University entities, members of Boards of University Foundations, members of University Committees; and any other persons appointed or engaged by the University to perform duties or functions on its behalf.

   AQF means the Australian Qualifications Framework (http://www.aqf.edu.au/)

   associate dean means the associate dean with authority for overseeing higher degrees by research in the relevant faculty.
auxiliary supervisor has the meaning provided in clause 8 of this policy.

candidature means the period commencing when a person is enrolled in an award course, in accordance with University and government requirements as amended from time to time, and ending when the degree is conferred or the candidature otherwise ceases.

co-ordinating supervisor means the research supervisor in a supervisory team who has designated academic delegations and responsibility for administrative requirements.

co-supervision means the situation where two or more research supervisors are appointed to supervise a student.

dean means the dean of the relevant faculty or the Head of School and Dean of the relevant University school.

delegate means a person authorised by the Senate to act on behalf of the University in specified situations, as provided in the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule 2016 or the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016.

doctorate by research has the meaning provided in the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (as amended) which at the date of this policy is:

   a degree with the word ‘Doctor’ in the title comprising a minimum of two-thirds research that is approved by the Academic Board.

   Note: The Academic Board will not approve a Doctorate by research unless it complies with the Australian Qualifications Framework at AQF level 10.

Educational Innovation means the Educational Innovation unit within the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) portfolio.

ESOS National Code means the standards governing the protection of overseas students and the delivery of courses to such students, established under the Education Services for Overseas Students (ESOS) Act 2000 (Cth).

faculty means a faculty or University school, and refers to the student’s faculty or University school of enrolment.

Graduate Studies Committee means the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board.

HDR Administrative Centre means the Higher Degree by Research Administrative Centre within the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) portfolio Vice Principal (Operations) portfolio.

international student advisers means staff within the International Student Office who provide support to international students on issues related to student visa, scholarship and general academic progression.
master’s by research has the meaning provided in the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research Rule) 2011 (as amended) which at the date of this policy is:

a degree with the word ‘Master’ in the title comprising a minimum of two thirds research that is approved by the Academic Board.

Note: The Academic Board will not approve a Master’s by research unless it complies with the Australian Qualifications Framework at AQF Level 9.

plagiarism means presenting another person's work as one’s own work by presenting, copying or reproducing it without appropriate acknowledgement of the source. Plagiarism is a form of academic dishonesty.

Note: See also Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015

postgraduate coordinator means the academic staff member with overall responsibility for the planning and coordination of postgraduate research students within a faculty, University school or school.

probationary period has the meaning as described in clauses 2.05, 3.05, and 4.04 of the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011

progress review means a progress review conducted in accordance with Part 3 of the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015.

research supervisor has the meaning provided in clause 8 of this policy.

school means the academic unit responsible for a student’s higher degree by research candidature.

student means a person who is currently enrolled in a higher degree by research award course at the University.

supervisor means, in relation to a higher degree by research student, a person appointed to discharge the responsibilities set out in clause 14 of this policy. For the purpose of this policy, the generic term supervisor(s) will be used to include research supervisors, co-ordinating supervisors, and auxiliary supervisors.

Supervisor Register means the University-wide register of individuals approved as supervisors for higher degree by research students, established under clause 13 of this policy.

supervisory team means a group team of supervisors appointed to supervise a student in accordance with the provisions of clause 13 of this policy.
7 Principles of supervision

(1) Roles and responsibilities

(a) Higher degree by research students are ultimately responsible for their own work.

(b) Supervisors are responsible for offering tailored guidance and constructive feedback.

(c) Supervisors and students must discuss their respective roles, and the expectations and requirements of the degree. They must reach a common understanding of:
   (i) key project aims;
   (ii) key milestones;
   (iii) proposed timetable; and
   (iv) methods of working together,

and must revisit these regularly to ensure that the project stays on track.

(2) Quality of relationships

(a) Supervisors and students must establish and maintain clear communication, which means actively clarifying any misunderstandings or divergent expectations as they arise.

(b) Giving and receiving critical feedback, and learning how to use it effectively, are integral aspects of the research process. Supervisors and students should undertake these activities with a spirit of goodwill and a common focus on producing quality learning as well as quality work.

(c) Supervisors should be responsive to students’ changing needs at different stages of the degree.

(3) Diversity

(a) Supervisors and students must treat each other fairly and reasonably and should respect the social and intellectual diversity of the University community.

(b) Supervisors and students must not engage in, or tolerate, harassment and discrimination.

Note See also: Code of Conduct – Staff and Affiliates; Code of Conduct for Students Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Policy 2015 Student Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Policy 2018.

(c) Supervisors and students must recognise that every supervisory relationship is unique and will reflect the particular needs, preferences and work styles of those involved.

(d) Supervisors and students must recognise that intellectual and practical input from other supervisors is necessary and desirable, and is to be encouraged.

(e) Supervisors and students must exercise professional discretion in their relationship, maintaining confidentiality where appropriate.
(4) **Life-long learning**

(a) Students are encouraged to take part in opportunities at the University to develop skills and knowledge that complement their research.

(b) The University recognises its responsibility to foster research communities that welcome and engage research students as active participants.

**Note:** See also Learning and Teaching Policy 2015

8 **Supervisors**

(1) All supervisors must be current staff or affiliates of the University and will be categorised as either:

(a) research supervisors; or

(b) auxiliary supervisors.

(2) Supervisors may come from the same faculty or department as the one in which the student is enrolled or from different faculties or departments as appropriate to the research project.

(3) Supervisors are appointed to a particular candidature by the relevant postgraduate coordinator.

(4) Research supervisors:

(a) have the primary responsibility for the conduct of the candidature in accordance with guidelines determined by the Academic Board;

(b) are responsible for monitoring the provision of appropriate support, resources, information and guidance to the student; and

(c) are responsible for reporting the progress of the candidature to the relevant head of department and the relevant dean or associate dean.

(5) Auxiliary supervisors are appointed to assist in the supervision of the candidature.

(6) The practice of auxiliary supervision is flexible to allow for a variety of models as may be appropriate for individual candidatures. Appropriate models include:

(a) a person with considerable experience as a research supervisor serving as an advisor or mentor to a research supervisor who is new to that role;

(b) a person with the appropriate knowledge required for part of the student’s candidature;

(c) a person whose links with industry enable a student to have access to specialised equipment and facilities; or

(d) a person in an external institution or university who is an expert on the subject matter.

9 **Supervisory teams**

(1) All higher degree by research students will be supervised by a supervisory team consisting of at least two supervisors, of whom at least one will be a research supervisor.

(2) The relevant postgraduate coordinator must determine appropriate supervisory arrangements for each student based on skills, experience, workload, projected
availability of staff and other requirements appropriate to the candidate, degree and research project.

(3) The postgraduate coordinator may review and change supervisory arrangements as required throughout the course of the candidature.

(4) Supervisory teams must include at least one member of the academic staff with the requisite skills, knowledge and experience for supervision of the particular student.

(5) Each individual member of a supervisory team must:
(a) be eligible to supervise higher degree by research students;
(b) be familiar with the University’s policies, procedures and resources, and applicable faculty requirements.

(6) Together the team must:
(a) have content expertise in the area of the student’s research;
(b) be structured in such a way that no individual supervisor is a research supervisor for more than 5 full time candidates except as permitted according to Clause 13 of this policy; and
(c) be able to provide continuous supervision for the likely duration of the student’s candidature, allowing for changes in any individual supervisor’s availability.

(7) One research supervisor in the team must be nominated as the co-ordinating supervisor.
(a) The co-ordinating supervisor is responsible for:
   (i) meeting administrative requirements; and
   (ii) reporting the aggregated views of team members to the postgraduate coordinator or dean or associate dean.
(b) An auxiliary supervisor may not act as co-ordinating supervisor except when appointed in the temporary absence of a research supervisor as set out in clause 14(10)(c) of this policy.

(8) Supervision of higher degree by research students must follow one of the models specified below.

(9) Default model of supervision
(a) For an individual student the relevant postgraduate coordinator will appoint:
   (i) one research supervisor; and
   (ii) one auxiliary supervisor.
(b) The research supervisor will be the co-ordinating supervisor.

(10) Co-supervision model
(a) The relevant postgraduate coordinator will appoint two research supervisors to supervise an individual student, each of whom will have equal responsibility for the candidature.
(b) The relevant postgraduate coordinator will designate one research supervisor to be the co-ordinating supervisor. Where a student is being supervised by supervisors from different faculties, the co-ordinating supervisor will normally be from the faculty in which the student is enrolled.
(c) The academic workload for each supervisor will be determined by the associate dean of the supervisors’ faculties.
(11) **Supervisory panel model**

(a) The relevant postgraduate coordinator may decide that any individual candidature requires the appointment of a supervisory panel of more than two supervisors.

(b) Such panels will consist of a mix of research and auxiliary supervisors, according to the requirements of individual candidatures.

(c) The relevant postgraduate coordinator will nominate one research supervisor as co-ordinating supervisor. Where a student is being supervised by supervisors from different faculties, this will normally be a research supervisor from the faculty in which the student is enrolled.

(d) The academic workload for each supervisor will be determined by the associate dean of the supervisors’ faculties.

10 **Supervisor development**

(1) All academic staff with supervisory responsibilities must undertake development activities relating to the supervision of higher degree by research students. This may involve taking part in formal and informal opportunities for exchanging expertise on research supervision, research learning and research processes - whether at a department, faculty, or University-wide level.

(2) Academic staff new to supervision should undertake University staff development programs for research supervision.

(3) If a potential supervisor has already undertaken an equivalent course or has substantial suitable experience in supervising students to completion, the relevant associate dean may exempt them from taking the Educational Innovation course. However, it is strongly recommended that such staff participate in the Educational Innovation development course or other workshops to ensure familiarity with current supervisory practices and expectations.

11 **Supervisor eligibility**

(1) Subject to clause 10(2) above, to be eligible to be approved as a supervisor, a person will:

(a) be a member of the academic staff at Level B or above; or

(b) have a current affiliation with the University approved by the relevant faculty or school; and

(c) have participated in ongoing and appropriate development activities including but not limited to:

(i) the Foundations of Research Supervision course run by Educational Innovation; or

(ii) other relevant workshops and programs; or

(iii) demonstrated experience at supervising at another university; and

(d) be research active; and
Note: Standards for research activity are set by each faculty and are available through Career Path.

See also: Performance Planning and Development Policy 2012; Academic Planning and Development Guidelines

(e) be qualified to undertake research supervision appropriate to the discipline by:
   (i) holding a qualification at AQF Level 10; or
   (ii) having equivalent professional or research experience.

Note: This may include a higher doctorate other than a PhD; a research Masters plus experience in research and research training supervision; or a significant publishing record in peer-reviewed journals. See TEQSA Higher Education Standards panel on technical amendments to Provider Course Accreditation Standards.

12 The Supervisor Register

(1) The HDR Administrative Centre will maintain a register of all individuals approved as supervisors for higher degree by research students.

(2) The register will distinguish between those people who are approved to act as:
   (a) research or auxiliary supervisors; and
   (b) auxiliary supervisors only.

(3) Academic staff at Level B or above who have completed the Foundations of Research Supervision course run by Educational Innovation will automatically be approved and registered as a research supervisor.

(4) Affiliates and academic staff below Level B who have completed the Foundations of Research Supervision course run by Educational Innovation will automatically be approved and registered as an auxiliary supervisor.

(5) Academic staff and affiliates who have not completed the Foundations of Research Supervision course run by Educational Innovation require approval for registration from the dean or associate dean of the relevant faculty.

(6) Routine deregistration
   (a) A person will be routinely removed from the Supervisor Register when that person:
      (i) is no longer actively affiliated with the University;
      (ii) no longer meets the supervision criteria as specified in clause 11 of this policy; or
      (iii) has not supervised an enrolled student for a period of three continuous years.

(7) Performance related deregistration
   (a) The relevant dean must request removal of an approved supervisor from the Supervisor Register when that person is identified in their academic performance and development review as failing to perform their duties to a satisfactory standard.

Note: See Performance Planning and Development Policy 2012 and Academic Planning and Development Guidelines.
(b) The relevant dean must notify any person who is deregistered on this basis, in writing.

(c) The relevant dean, or academic advisor may recommend suitable development activities for such people.

(8) Misconduct related deregistration

(a) When a person is found to have committed research misconduct or other professional misconduct, the Provost, in consultation with the relevant delegate (or their designated nominee) responsible for managing the misconduct proceedings and the dean of the relevant faculty, may request removal of the person from the Supervisor Register.

(b) The Provost must notify any person who is deregistered on this basis, in writing.

Note: See:
Research Code of Conduct 2013

(9) Appeals against deregistration

(a) A person may appeal against routine deregistration to the HDR Administrative Centre.

(b) A person may appeal against performance related deregistration to the relevant dean.

(10) Reactivating registration

(a) The relevant associate dean may request the re-registration of supervisors who have been previously deregistered.

(11) Reporting

(a) The HDR Administrative Centre will report annually to the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board on issues relating to the Supervisor Register.

(b) Reports must include a summary of actions taken and any recommendations relating to operation of the Supervisor Register.

13 Supervisor workload

(1) A research supervisor will not normally supervise more than 5 full-time equivalent postgraduate research students at one time, or pro rata for a supervisor employed on a fractional basis.

(2) A research supervisor may only exceed the normal load with approval from the relevant associate dean, which may only be provided after consideration of a recommendation, including reasons, from the relevant head of school or postgraduate coordinator.

(3) The relevant associate dean must report all such approvals to the HDR Administrative Centre as soon as possible after they are given.

(4) The associate dean may assign a student to an auxiliary supervisor if the associate dean is satisfied that the auxiliary supervisor can provide the necessary skills and expertise, without compromising their existing students’ candidatures. Academic workload should also be taken into consideration.

Note: See the Enterprise Agreement 2018-2021, Section G.
14 Responsibilities of supervisors

(1) Unless otherwise specified, the responsibilities described in this clause apply equally to each supervisor of a student.

(2) Where the supervisory team contains more than one research supervisor, each research supervisor must fulfil all of the responsibilities of research supervisors described in this clause.

(3) Supervisors must maintain a professional relationship with their students, other supervisors and other University staff. Sexual or romantic relationships between a student and their supervisor(s) are never appropriate and such relationships constitute a conflict of interest that can only be managed by a change in supervisor.

(4) The supervisor’s primary role is to provide academic support and guidance throughout a candidature with the objective of enabling the student to achieve a high standard of research activity and output.

(5) In agreeing to registration on the Supervisor Register, the supervisor accepts the responsibilities set out in this clause.

(6) Selection of student and or project

(a) The research supervisor will consider a prospective student’s relevant research background, interests and abilities to complete a proposed research project, and decide whether the proposed topic is manageable. If the supervisor is not confident at the application stage that the research proposal is likely to be manageable and consistent with the aims of the doctoral degree, they must raise their concerns with the postgraduate coordinator.

(b) The supervisor will ensure that they have the ability, capacity and related research interest in the project to carry out the supervision. If a supervisor has any doubts about their capacity to supervise a student for any reason, they must raise their concerns with the postgraduate coordinator.

(7) Conflicts of interests

(a) Where the supervisor becomes aware of an actual, potential or perceived conflict of interests in relation to a particular project or student, the supervisor must immediately declare the conflict of interests in accordance with the External Interests Policy 2010.

(b) The postgraduate coordinator may vary the supervisory arrangements as a result of a conflict of interests declaration.

(8) At the commencement of the candidature

(a) The research supervisor will:

(i) notify the student about orientation and induction events run by the University, faculty or school;

(ii) ensure that the student participates in induction programs and workshops as directed by the faculty or school;

(iii) ensure that the student participates in programs and workshops in accordance with University, faculty or school work health and safety requirements.

(b) The research supervisor must be aware of the qualities that the University expects its graduates to have and, in consultation with the student, prepare a plan for future skill acquisition as the student proceeds through their degree program.
Note: See Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 and Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015

(c) The research supervisor is responsible for identifying, with the student, the most appropriate data-gathering and analysing techniques.

(d) All supervisors must familiarise themselves with the Essential Resources for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2016, and use it to inform their discussions with the student and the school about the resources that may be available to support each particular candidature.

(e) The research supervisor is responsible for ensuring that the facilities which are identified as necessary for the project to succeed are available.

(f) If the research supervisor is not confident that the required facilities are or will be available they must raise this with the postgraduate coordinator or faculty.

(g) The research supervisor may be expected to help their student develop a research budget, and advise them on how to acquire information about relevant research funding schemes.

(9) During the candidature: supervisory teams and relationships

(a) The composition of a supervisory team will depend on faculty arrangements, the interdisciplinary nature of the research project, or other criteria as determined by the faculty, project, and as appropriate to the project, the candidate and the degree.

Note: See clause 9 of this policy for models for supervisory teams.

(b) The postgraduate coordinator must approve all supervisory arrangements.

(c) Members of a supervisory team should clarify the responsibilities of each person in the team, and coordinate advice and guidance appropriately. The research supervisor, or where there is more than one research supervisor, the co-ordinating supervisor, is responsible for advising the student of these arrangements.

(d) All supervisors must:

(i) build and maintain supervisory relationships with their students;

(ii) clarify with their students what is expected of each other within this relationship;

(iii) establish agreed methods of working with their students; and

(iv) fulfil their side of any agreement.

(e) The research supervisor should be available to meet with their student at least once per fortnight during the probationary period.

(f) After the completion of the probationary period, the research supervisor and their student are jointly responsible for negotiating ongoing and appropriate contact arrangements. This may include face to face or electronic forms of communication.

(g) Supervisory arrangements should be adapted according to the nature of the candidature (full-time or part-time) and make due allowance for approved absences by the student.

(h) If it is not possible for the supervisor and student to meet regularly, then the postgraduate coordinator should be consulted by either the student or the supervisor regarding appropriate alternative arrangements.
(i) The auxiliary supervisor should negotiate ongoing and appropriate contact arrangements with their student.

(j) Where a change in research direction occurs, appropriate supervisory arrangements should be negotiated by the student, supervisor, and postgraduate coordinator as required. Changes in supervision as a result of these negotiations must be approved by the postgraduate coordinator.

(10) **During the candidature: administrative requirements**

(a) The research supervisor must identify applicable degree and other administrative requirements and advise the student as necessary, although the student is responsible for ensuring that these requirements are met. This includes but is not limited to planned leave or time away, re-enrolment, and progress reviews.

(b) Where there are two supervisors with equal responsibility for the candidature, the co-ordinating supervisor is responsible for ensuring that all administrative requirements are met. This includes but is not limited to: re-enrolment advice, progress review reporting, and leave arrangements.

(11) **During the candidature: absence of supervisor**

(a) Supervision must be provided for the duration of a candidature. It is not acceptable for a student to have their candidature disrupted by supervisor absence.

(b) The research supervisor who is intending an absence of one month or more must ensure that the postgraduate coordinator is informed so that appropriate alternative supervisory arrangements should be put in place.

(c) Alternate supervisory arrangements may comprise remote supervision (e.g. email, phone, video link), or increased direct supervision from another member of the supervisory team (e.g. the auxiliary supervisor).

(d) If the supervisor appointed to cover a research supervisor’s absence has not previously been involved in the supervision of the student, it is the responsibility of the current research supervisor to inform the acting supervisor about the progress of the candidature.

(e) Where an absence is foreseeable, the supervisor must notify the postgraduate coordinator, the student and any other supervisor at least one month before the intended departure date so that appropriate supervisory arrangements can be put in place.

(f) If the supervisor is leaving the University, the postgraduate coordinator must notify the student as soon as is practical. In that event:

   (i) the departing supervisor must discuss ongoing supervisory arrangements with the student and the postgraduate coordinator; and

   (ii) the postgraduate coordinator may vary the supervision arrangements, including appointing a new research supervisor, as required.

(12) **During the candidature: managing progress**

(a) The research supervisor should ensure that the student works within a planned framework which marks out the milestones expected to be completed at various stages.

(b) Planning and time management should begin at an early stage and the research supervisor must encourage the student to make productive use of their time.
(c) Where the supervisory team consists of a research supervisor and an external auxiliary supervisor, the research supervisor must ensure that the direction of the work is entirely under the control of the University and the student.

(d) The research supervisor is responsible for reaching agreement with the student about:
   (i) indicators of progress being made; and
   (ii) submission of appropriate written work, interim reports or research results.

(e) The supervisor must return written work to the student, with constructive feedback, in a timely fashion. Unless other time frames are agreed between the supervisor and the student:
   (i) written work up to the equivalent in length to a chapter must be returned within one month; and
   (ii) written work up to the equivalent in length to two chapters must be returned within two months.

(f) The research supervisor must provide feedback on progress to the student and make progress reports to the faculty and any scholarship authority.

(g) The research supervisor must monitor progress within the context of the overall research plan, ensuring that sufficient time is left for writing up the thesis and, if necessary, that the scope of the project is reduced to meet the time available.

(h) The research supervisor must inform the student about inadequate progress or standards of work that are below that generally expected, identify problems and suggest ways of addressing them.

(i) The research supervisor should work with the student to ensure that, by the end of the probationary period, the student’s research topic and aims are clearly defined.

(j) At the end of the probationary period, the research supervisor must determine whether the student is able to identify, access, organise and communicate knowledge in both written and oral English to a standard generally acceptable to the discipline. If necessary, the supervisor will direct the student to relevant courses available at the University.

**Note:** See Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 and Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015.

(k) The research supervisor must advise the student in writing when progress is unsatisfactory and identify improvements which are necessary for continuation of the candidature.

**Note:** See University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 and Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015 for further requirements relating to progress and progress reviews.

(13) **During the candidature: duty of care**

(a) The research supervisor must be aware of, and inform the student about, the range of support services which exist to help them while they are studying at the University, including University Health Services, Counselling and Psychological Services, other student support services, and SUPRA.

**Note:** see Student Support services website for a list of available services http://sydney.edu.au/current_students/student_services/index.shtml
Note: Students can seek professional advice through the University Health Service (http://sydney.edu.au/health-service/services/index.php) and the Counselling and Psychological services (http://sydney.edu.au/current_students/counselling/).

(b) Supervisors must recognise and respond to varying student circumstances such as illness or personal issues which may arise and be able to establish processes to manage these issues.

(c) The research supervisor must encourage a student with health concerns to seek professional assistance and must be prepared to discuss the various candidature options available, such as sick leave, approved leave of absence or a move to part time study.

(d) The research supervisor must ensure that the postgraduate coordinator and the dean are informed in writing if concerns regarding the candidature arise.

(e) The research supervisor must be aware of the particular challenges that may be faced by an international student and be sensitive to the social, academic and intellectual transition issues that an international student moving to Australia for the first time may experience.

(f) The supervisor should be aware of the services available to an international student, particularly in relation to the provisions of the ESOS National Code, and refer the student to appropriate sources of information as required.

Note: Information relevant to the support of international students is available from the International Services, international student advisors and SUPRA.

14. The research community

(a) The research supervisor must arrange for the student to participate in the work of the school, including attendance and presentation at school seminars.

(b) The supervisor must encourage the student to extend their contacts within the academic community e.g. in the school, faculty, University and external to the University. This may include academic staff, postgraduate fellows, and other higher degree by research students.

(c) The supervisor must encourage the student to take the opportunity to discuss their research with other staff and students in the relevant subject area and to communicate their research findings to others in the wider academic community.

15. Thesis content, writing and submission

(a) The research supervisor must give appropriate and timely advice on the requirements regarding content, style, presentation and production of theses.

(b) As far as possible, the research supervisor should ensure that the work submitted is the student’s own and that data are valid.

(c) When required by the course resolutions of the degree, the research supervisor will:

(i) consider the suitability and availability of potential examiners; and

(ii) make recommendations to the postgraduate coordinator regarding potential examiners

in good time before the thesis is submitted.
(d) The coordinating supervisor is responsible for certifying that a thesis is in a form suitable for examination at the time of submission.

(16) Compliance requirements

(a) The research supervisor must ensure that students are aware of, and abide by, all applicable laws, University policies and procedures, including those applicable to research integrity.

Note: All current University policies and procedures are available from the Policy Register.

(b) The research supervisor must advise the student of the requirement to obtain ethics approval for studies on animal and human subjects (including the use of questionnaires) prior to undertaking research to which such requirements may apply.

(c) As chief investigators on student ethics applications, the research supervisor is responsible for submission of the application, including review of content and accuracy.

Note: Ethics approval cannot be provided retrospectively.

(d) The research supervisor must advise the student about academic honesty, and in particular the avoidance of plagiarism.

(e) The research supervisor must ensure that the student is aware of their rights with respect to intellectual property and encourage, where appropriate, the exploitation of such intellectual property through the University. The student may be encouraged to seek independent advice regarding their intellectual property.

Note: See Intellectual Property Policy 2016

(f) The research supervisor must reach agreement with the student concerning authorship of publications and acknowledgement of contributions during and after the candidature. It is recommended that, wherever necessary, the agreement be re-evaluated just prior to publication in case of any significant shifts to workload allocations and intellectual input since the agreement was initially made.

Note: See Research Code of Conduct 2013.

(g) There should be open and mutual recognition of the student’s and the supervisor’s contributions on all published works arising from the project.

(h) A research supervisor must ensure that student is aware of all applicable requirements for retention of data, and requirements for members of staff to complete a statement of authorship for each paper submitted for publication.

(i) The supervisor must ensure that safe working practices are developed and maintained at all times. This includes:

(i) ensuring that the student is aware of the University’s work and health safety requirements; and

(ii) recommending that the student participates in appropriate work health and safety training.

Note: See Work Health and Safety Policy 2016.

(j) Supervisors must be aware of, and abide by, their obligations under the Autonomous Sanctions Act 2011 (Cth).
The research supervisor is responsible for ensuring that the student is aware that a copy of their thesis will be lodged with the University Librarian, and should guide the writing of the thesis to ensure that they fulfil the necessary requirements.

**Note:** See *University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research Rule) 2011*.

### 15 Responsibilities of students

1. It is the responsibility of students to maintain a professional relationship at all times with supervisors and other University staff. *Sexual or romantic relationships between a student and their supervisor(s) are never appropriate.*

2. **At the commencement of the candidature**
   - Students must play an informed part in the process of the selection and appointment of supervisors.
     **Note:** See *University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011*
   - Students must ensure that they are correctly enrolled according to faculty and University requirements prior to commencing their degree program and throughout their candidature.
   - Students must comply with the requirements of any scholarship, external funding, sponsorship or other monetary provisions.
   - Students should take part in University or faculty or school orientation programs, and must take part in induction programs and workshops if directed by the supervisor, faculty or school. This may include attendance at workshops on safety and health procedures.
     **Note:** See also *Essential Resources for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2016*
   - Students should familiarise themselves with the qualities and skills the University expects its graduates to have and must, with the assistance of their supervisors, prepare a plan for future skill acquisition as they proceed through their degree program. This will include developing a progress plan at the beginning of, and during, their candidature, to identify specific areas in which development is required.
     **Note:** See *Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 and Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015*
   - Students must undertake any coursework or other activities required by the University.
   - Students must familiarise themselves with the *Essential Resources for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2016* to inform their discussions with their supervisors, school, faculty and the University about the resources that may be available to support their candidature.
   - Students may be expected to develop a research budget in consultation with their supervisors, and to seek information about relevant research funding schemes.
(3) **During the candidature**

(a) Students are responsible for meeting the administrative requirements of their candidature. This includes but is not limited to planned leave, time away and re-enrolment.

(b) Students must ensure that all administrative requirements of the faculty and the University, such as re-enrolment and progress reviews are met.

(c) Students must notify and negotiate any planned leave, time away or change in enrolment status with their supervisors, and follow appropriate faculty or University approval processes.

(d) Students should make every effort to build and maintain satisfactory supervisory relationships. This includes:

(i) establishing with their supervisors agreed methods of working;

(ii) fulfilling their side of any agreement; and

(iii) meeting regularly with their supervisors. In the probationary period of their candidature this should be at least fortnightly. As the candidature progresses different contact arrangements may be negotiated as appropriate.

(e) Students must devote sufficient time to their research. Full time candidature requires at least the same time commitment as would full time professional employment in Australia.

(f) Students should plan and execute the project within the time limits defined, taking into account the nature of the program (full time or part-time) and the milestones agreed with supervisors.

(g) Students are expected to attend as agreed for consultation and provide evidence of progress made.

(4) **The research community**

(a) Students should be aware of opportunities for meeting other researchers in the field and attend internal and external seminars, meetings and conferences.

(b) Students should participate in the opportunities offered by the school to be part of that intellectual community. This includes taking part in activities of the faculty or school such as presentation of research at University seminars and conferences.

(5) **Compliance requirements**

(a) Students must be aware of, and abide by, all applicable laws, University policies and procedures including those applicable to research integrity. 

Note: All current University policies and procedures are available from the [Policy Register](#).

(b) Students must familiarise themselves with the resolutions governing the degree course in which they are enrolled.

(c) Students must consult their supervisors about applications for ethics approval where their project involves the study of animal or human subjects (including the use of questionnaires).

(d) Ethics approval must be applied for prior to the commencement of the project and cannot be provided retrospectively.
(e) Students must ensure that they avoid all forms of academic dishonesty, including plagiarism.

(f) Students must familiarise themselves with the requirements of the Research Code of Conduct 2013.
   (i) If students are concerned about possible research misconduct, they should seek advice from their supervisors.
   (ii) If a student does not feel comfortable doing this, or if the supervisor is involved in the issue of concern, the student should approach the postgraduate co-ordinator or associate dean for the faculty.

(g) Students should read the Intellectual Property Policy 2016 and explore with their supervisor and the University the possible exploitation of any invention or other intellectual property arising from their research.

(h) Students must at all times adopt safe working practices relevant to the field of research and comply with the University’s work health and requirements.

(i) Students must attend any workshops on safety and health procedures required by the faculty or school in which the student is undertaking research.

Note: See Work Health and Safety Policy 2016

(6) Grievances

(a) Students are encouraged to take the initiative in raising problems or difficulties and seeking solutions to them as soon as possible. Problems may be raised during the progress review process or at any other time.

(b) Students are encouraged to inform supervisors or postgraduate co-ordinators about difficulties being experienced as soon as possible.

(c) In the first instance, locally negotiated solutions should be sought before recourse to formal processes.

(d) Students must be aware of, and implement as required, the University’s grievance resolution policies and procedures, including:
   (i) Research Code of Conduct 2013;
   (ii) Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Policy 2015;
   (iii) Reporting Wrongdoing Policy 2012;
   (iv) Resolution of Complaints Policy 2015;
   (v) Student Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Policy 2018

(e) Students are encouraged to familiarise themselves with the mechanisms available for helping with supervisor-student difficulties and to take advantage of them if necessary.

(f) Students may seek independent advice or representation, including from the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association (SUPRA).
16 Responsibilities of schools

(1) School responsibilities for higher degree by research students will be discharged by the postgraduate coordinators.

(2) Schools are responsible for:

(a) determining appropriate supervisory arrangements for each student based on skills, experience, workload, projected availability and other requirements appropriate to the candidate, degree and research project;

(b) varying supervisory arrangements as required;

(c) requiring, when necessary, all supervisors to participate in University supervision development courses and workshops;

(d) explaining their respective roles to all members of a supervisory team;

(e) making recommendations to the associate dean for approval of proposed increases in the supervisory workload of research supervisors;

   (i) A normal supervisory workload is the equivalent of supervising five full time higher degree by research students.

   (ii) The associate dean is responsible for approving all such arrangements.

(f) determining appropriate alternative supervision arrangements if a research supervisor is absent for one month or more, and is unable to adequately supervise their students remotely;

(g) notifying all affected students as soon as practical if a supervisor is leaving the University and discussing ongoing supervisory arrangements with both the student and the departing supervisor;

(h) clearly defining the duties and responsibilities of postgraduate co-ordinators providing adequate resources to assist in the performance of those duties and properly recognising the workload these duties entail;

(i) determining coursework or alternative development activities required by individual students, after consultation with the relevant research supervisors and consideration of the applicable progress plan;

(j) ensuring that review procedures, including progress reviews, are carried out in accordance with University policies and procedures;

(k) ensuring that necessary approvals for conditions of candidatures are obtained from the faculty, and that scholarship reporting requirements are met;

(l) determining, in consultation with the research supervisors, the facilities likely to be required for any particular candidature, and ascertaining their availability;

(m) advising applicants and students about the availability of facilities, including access to physical space and other resources, and the financial support that is likely to be available to them;

(n) reporting to the associate dean if the required facilities are not available;

(o) encouraging interaction and the development of beneficial intellectual relationships amongst students and staff and encouraging students to participate in appropriate departmental or faculty activities;

(p) providing students with the names of individuals to whom they can turn to for advice;
(q) the proper and expeditious conduct of the examination process, including
the timely selection of appropriate examiners in accordance with University
policies and procedures; and
(r) informing students and supervisors of the University’s policies and
procedures with respect to ethics, intellectual property, academic dishonesty
and plagiarism, research integrity, and grievance procedures.

17 Responsibilities of faculties

(1) Faculty responsibilities for higher degree by research students will be discharged
by the relevant associate dean.

(2) Faculties are responsible for:

(a) ensuring that applicants for admission to candidature meet the minimum
requirements for admission to the relevant degree and the proposed course
of study;
(b) ensuring that all supervisors in their faculty are included in the Supervisor
Register;
(c) establishing and explaining appropriate review mechanisms, including the
progress reviews, within departments;
(d) explaining students’ rights and obligations;
(e) providing necessary resources in accordance with the Essential Resources
for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2016, and discussing the
availability of necessary resources, appropriate to the candidature, with
students and their supervisors as required;
(f) monitoring students during their candidature through reports from
departments, and intervening where necessary;
(g) providing students with the names of individuals to whom they can turn to for
advice;
(h) ensuring that examiners recommended are appropriately qualified and that
the examination process maintains the standards required for the degree
concerned; and
(i) lodging of an awarded thesis to the University Library. This is to ensure that
the Library receives the properly awarded thesis and an assurance that all
compliance requirements under the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by
Research Rule) 2011 have been met.

18 Responsibilities of the University

(1) The University will ensure that higher degree by research students are provided
with an acceptable level of access to physical space and other facilities, including
library facilities, and that schools are required to advise applicants about the
facilities that are available.

(2) The University is responsible for maintaining the Supervisor Register and
providing:

(a) support services in areas such as learning assistance;
(b) development activities for supervisors of postgraduate students;
(c) effective reporting and review mechanisms throughout the candidature;
(d) procedures which allow students to seek assistance in the resolving difficulties; and
(e) appropriate appeal mechanisms.

19 Rescissions

This policy replaces the Code of Practice for Supervision of Postgraduate Research Students, the Postgraduate Research Higher Degree Training Supervision at the University of Sydney Policy, and the Probationary candidature and English expression policy, all of which are rescinded as from the effective date of this policy.
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To propose policy amendments to accommodate the offer of the Sydney Professional Certificate, changes to terminology in relation to the Summer and Winter School, and corrections to the formatting of degree titles in relation to embedded honours in the Bachelor of Advanced Studies.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Policy and Standards Committee:

- endorse amendments to the Coursework Policy 2014 and Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 to accommodate the offer of the Sydney Professional Certificate, changed terminology in relation to Summer and Winter School, establish requirements pertaining to teaching periods and corrections to degree titles for honours degrees in the Bachelor of Advanced Studies;
- endorse administrative changes to the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016; and
- recommend these amendments to the Academic Board for approval.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper is an update to the amendments to the Coursework Policy 2014 considered by the Academic Standards and Policy Committee on 12 February 2019. It sets out adjusted amendments to accommodate the offer of the micro-credential course, the Sydney Professional Certificate, at the University of Sydney. These amendments include:

- a description of the framework and title for a new category of post-bachelor award courses, accredited micro-credentials; and
- the award course requirements for the proposed Sydney Professional Certificate, including a description of its structure and governance arrangements.

The Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 will be amended simultaneously to update references to award course requirements to include the proposed micro-credential, the Sydney Professional Certificate. Also to add sub- clauses to clarify that the curriculum framework outlined in Clause 17 does not refer to the Sydney Professional Certificate.

The paper also introduces amendments to the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015, the Coursework Policy 2014, and the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016 to change terminology (teaching period comprising six-month period, including a semester), definitions and enrolment and progression requirements relating to changes to the Summer and Winter School implemented by the Provost's Office.

The paper also incorporates corrections to the Coursework Policy 2014 to the way embedded honours awards in the Bachelor of Advanced Studies are expressed.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

In 2018 the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) circulated a discussion paper, Post-Bachelor coursework programs at the University of Sydney, recommending among other things, that the University develop the
capacity to accredit award courses outside the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF), including courses for 12 credit points. Upon approval by the University Senate an amendment was made to the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014 adding qualifications approved by the Academic Board which fall outside the AQF to the list of coursework qualifications conferred or awarded by the University (clause 1.3(h)). At the 5 February 2019 meeting of the Graduate Studies Committee, the discussion paper Approval of micro-credentials at the University of Sydney was considered. This paper set out the governance and approval processes for accredited micro-credentials and proposed the establishment of the Sydney Professional Certificate.

The Sydney Professional Certificate will be the first accredited micro-credential that the University will offer. It has been designed as a 12 credit point qualification allowing faculties and University schools to develop courses in areas where they have disciplinary expertise. Courses will be targeted at graduates seeking to acquire additional specific professional skills and knowledge, particularly in emerging areas. The learning outcomes for the Sydney Professional Certificate make a partial contribution in a specific area to the learning outcomes for level 8 AQF award but do not achieve level 8 outcomes in full, particularly with respect to breadth of learning. The Sydney Professional Certificate will sit outside the AQF though it may contribute to achievement of a Graduate Certificate, Graduate Diploma or Masters via credit arrangements subject to the award resolutions of those qualifications. The overall award will be governed by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies (BIS) with individual courses to be administered by their faculty of offer.

Under changes implemented by the Provost’s Office, units previously offered in the Summer and Winter School will be offered as intensive units associated with a teaching period. Enrolment will be via Sydney Student and are funded through HECS-HELP for students in a Commonwealth Supported Place. This change necessitates changes to the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015, the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016 and the Coursework Policy 2014 as set out below

ISSUES

Changes to the Coursework Policy 2014
The intention to add clause 89A to the Coursework Policy 2014, setting out the curriculum framework for the 12 credit point Sydney Professional Certificate was noted at the 12 February 2019 meeting of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee, and are proposed here. These amendments will include:

- a description of the framework and title for a new category of post-bachelor award courses, accredited micro-credentials; and
- the award course requirements for the proposed micro-credential, the Sydney Professional Certificate including a description of its structure and governance arrangements.

Once approved, the following clause will be inserted into the Coursework Policy 2014:

89A Award course requirements for the Sydney Professional Certificate

(1) The Sydney Professional Certificate is an advanced program of postgraduate study building on:
   a. prior undergraduate study; or
   b. where approved by the faculty, prior experience that is considered by the faculty to
demonstrate knowledge and aptitude to undertake the required units of study.

(2) Candidates for the Sydney Professional Certificate must complete multiple 12 credit points of units
   of study at 4000-level or above.

(3) The title of the Sydney Professional Certificate shall by Sydney Professional Certificate in
   (disciplinary stream).

(4) The Sydney Professional Certificate shall be under the governance of the Board of Interdisciplinary
   Studies.

(5) Professional streams within the Sydney Professional Certificate shall be under the governance and
   management of a faculty.
Additionally, changes pertaining to teaching periods and the Summer and Winter School are included in this round of changes to the Coursework Policy. These changes will include replacing the reference to ‘summer school’ and ‘winter school’ with the introduction of a teaching period which includes a semester, and other areas of teaching availability approved by the Academic Board. Two teaching periods per year are established, each comprising a six-month period and including a semester. Enrolment requirements are adapted to the new terminology, whereby students may enrol in a maximum of 30 credit points of study or 36 credit points with the approval of the Associate Dean in any one teaching period. Progression requirements (Part 15) are also adapted to the new terminology and progression triggers (Clause 75) are expressed in terms of teaching periods rather than semesters.

Moreover, an administrative edit is proposed in 97A(10) to correct naming conventions relating to embedded honours programs in combined degrees with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies.

Changes to the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015

The Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 does not reference the Sydney Professional Certificate. Amendments are needed to clarify how the curriculum framework provisions in the policy will be applied to the new Sydney Professional Certificate. The proposed amendments are:

- updating of references to award course requirements to include the micro-credential, the Sydney Professional Certificate, such as in clause 6: definitions;
- the addition of sub-clauses to Clause 17: Curriculum framework for postgraduate coursework education that will clarify that this clause does not apply to the Sydney Professional Certificate.

The Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 is also amended to accommodate changes to the Summer and Winter School implemented by the Provost’s Office. The changes establishes two teaching periods per year, each comprising a six-month period including a semester. Definitions of standard mode (teaching delivered each week over a thirteen week semester) and intensive mode (teaching delivered more intensely over a shorter period) are given. Dates of teaching periods, semester, periods of intensive mode availability and special teaching calendars offered by individual faculties must be approved by the Academic Board as is currently the case.

Changes to the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016

The Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016 is amended in relation to information on transcripts to reflect the new terminology relating to changes to the Summer and Winter Schools.

IMPLEMENTATION

If endorsed by the Committee, the proposed changes will be provided to the Academic Board for approval at its 4 June 2019 meeting. If approved, they will come into effect from 1 January 2020.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Coursework Policy 2014
Attachment 2 – Learning and Teaching Policy 2015
Attachment 3 – Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016
COURSEWORK POLICY 2014

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

Dated: 3 December 2014

Last amended: 27 November 2018 (commencing 1 January 2019)

24 March 2019

[Insert date]

Signature: 

Position: Chair, Academic Board
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Coursework Policy 2014
PART 1 PRELIMINARY

1 Name of policy
This is the Coursework Policy 2014.

2 Commencement
This policy commences on the day after the day on which it is registered.

3 Statement of intent
This policy governs all coursework award courses leading to the following qualifications:

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

Note: 'Masters Degrees' includes the following exceptions endorsed under the Issuance Policy of the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) relating to AQF level 9 qualifications that contain the word 'doctor' rather than 'master' in their title: Juris Doctor, Doctor of Dental Medicine, Doctor of Medicine and Doctor of Veterinary Medicine.

(h) Sydney Professional Certificate.

Note: The Sydney Professional Certificate is a qualification outside the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF).

Note: These are the only coursework qualifications awarded or conferred by the University. See clause 1.3(2) of the Coursework Rule.

4 Application

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

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

5 Definitions

(1) In this policy:

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

   academic progression register means the record of all students whose academic progression is being monitored by a faculty in accordance with this policy.
academic progression requirements means the requirements for academic progression in an award course, set out in faculty resolutions, award course resolutions or this policy.

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

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

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

appended honours course means a course that leads to an award of a degree with honours where the honours component is undertaken after the student has met the course requirements for the degree (without honours).

applicant means an applicant for admission to a coursework award course at the University.

assessment means the process of measuring the performance of students (as in examinations, assignments and other assessable work) that enables students to monitor their progress and contributes to their academic results in a unit of study.

Associate Dean means the Associate Dean of a faculty or University school with responsibility for coursework award courses at the relevant level, or the deputy chairperson of a board of studies or a person appointed by the Dean to have responsibility for coursework award courses at the relevant level.

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

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

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

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

Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) means the national framework for recognition and endorsement of education qualifications.
authentic assessment means assessment tasks that relate the application of knowledge to problems, skills and performances that are found in general or disciplinary practices or professional contexts. It includes but is not limited to projects, investigations and report writing.

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

award course resolutions means the resolutions setting out the requirements for the award approved by the Academic Board and tabled at a meeting of the Senate.

Note: See clause 2.3 of the Coursework Rule.

Bachelor degree means an undergraduate degree that:

- achieves at least the outcome specified for level seven of the AQF;
- is a program of liberal, professional or specialist learning and education; and
- builds on prior secondary or tertiary study.

The University offers two types of Bachelor degrees:

- Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees; and
- Professional or Specialist Bachelor Degrees

Note: See clause 83A.

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

Note: See clause 83C.

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

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

capstone experience means a unit of study that provides students with an opportunity to draw together the learning that has taken place during the course, synthesise it with their own learning and experience, and draw conclusions that form the basis for further investigation, and intellectual and professional growth.
census date means the date on which a student’s enrolment in a unit of study becomes final.

combined degree course means a combination of two degree programs structured to enable students to count a specified number of credit points towards the requirements for both award courses, resulting in a lower volume of learning than if the two degrees were taken separately. See also double degree course and vertically integrated combined degree course.

Commonwealth supported place means a place in an award course in respect of which the student and the Commonwealth government both contribute towards the cost of the student’s education.

compulsory unit of study means a unit of study that must be completed before the award of a degree, but which does not constitute a barrier unit of study.

course means a planned and structured sequence of learning and teaching primarily aimed at the acquisition of knowledge, skills and understanding.

course requirements means the requirements for an award course set out in any relevant faculty resolutions and the award course resolutions.

coursework award course means a course approved by the Academic Board and endorsed by the Senate, that leads to a degree, diploma or certificate and is undertaken predominantly by coursework. While the program of study in a coursework award course may include a component of original, supervised research, other forms of instruction and learning normally will be dominant. All undergraduate award courses, and Sydney Professional Certificates, graduate certificates, graduate diplomas and those Masters degrees that comprise less than 66% research are coursework award courses.

Coursework Rule means the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014.

credit means advanced standing based on previous attainment in another award course at the University or at another institution, or in a non-award course approved by the Academic Board. The advanced standing is expressed as credit points granted towards the award course. Credit may be granted as specific credit or non-specific credit.

credit point means a measure of value indicating the contribution that each unit of study provides towards meeting award course completion requirements, stated as a total credit point value.

criteria means statements that identify the key characteristics or qualities of student performance in an assessment task.

cross-credited unit of study means a unit of study that, on completion, is credited towards the requirements of two awards, or two component parts of a combined award.
cross-institutional study means enrolment by a student in a unit or units of study at another university or institution.

Dean means, as appropriate, the Dean of the relevant faculty or the Head of School and Dean of the relevant University school.

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

department means an academic disciplinary grouping established within a school.

disability has the meaning prescribed in Section 4 of the Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Cth). At the date of this policy the definition is:

disability, in relation to a person, means:

(a) total or partial loss of the person’s bodily or mental functions; or
(b) total or partial loss of a part of the body; or
(c) the presence in the body of organisms causing disease or illness; or
(d) the presence in the body of organisms capable of causing disease or illness; or
(e) the malfunction, malformation or disfigurement of a part of the person’s body; or
(f) a disorder or malfunction that results in the person learning differently from a person without the disorder or malfunction; or
(g) a disorder, illness or disease that affects a person’s thought processes, perception of reality, emotions or judgment or that results in disturbed behaviour;

and includes a disability that:

(a) presently exists; or
(b) previously existed but no longer exists; or
(c) may exist in the future (including because of a genetic predisposition to that disability); or
(d) is imputed to a person.

To avoid doubt, a disability that is otherwise covered by this definition includes behaviour that is a symptom or manifestation of the disability.

domestic applicant means an applicant who is:

- an Australian citizen;
- a permanent resident of Australia; or
- a New Zealand citizen.
domestic student means a student who is:

- an Australian citizen;
- a permanent resident of Australia; or
- a New Zealand citizen.

double degree course means a course in which a student completes two AQF qualifications under one set of award course resolutions with no cross-crediting of units of study between the qualifications.

early intervention strategy means a study plan to support students who identify themselves as being at risk of not meeting progression requirements, as provided in clause 73A.

educational access scheme means an entry scheme approved by the Academic Board in accordance Part 7 of this policy.

embedded program means a sequence of linked courses in closely related academic or professional areas that:

- allows for consequential and incrementally higher levels of academic achievement;
- specifies in the award course resolutions conditions for transfer from one linked award to a higher linked award; and
- allows credit points for a unit of study to count towards more than one of the linked awards.

English Language Proficiency Standards means the Admissions Standards – English Language Proficiency, as determined by the Academic Board from time to time.

enrolment means enrolment in a coursework award course at the University. A person is not enrolled until the person has completed, to the satisfaction of the University, all requirements for enrolment or re-enrolment in the award course concerned.

exchange student means a person who is:

- not an Australian citizen;
- not admitted to an award course at the University;
- admitted to a formally approved program of study at an overseas institution with which the University has an exchange agreement; and
- enrolled in one or more units of study at the University under the terms of the exchange agreement.

exemption means an exemption given by a faculty to a student from the requirement to complete parts of the prescribed work for a particular unit of study within a course, including attendance at prescribed lectures, seminars, tutorials and practical work.

faculty means a faculty, University school or a board of studies and in this policy refers to the faculties or University schools responsible for the relevant award course.
feedback means information provided to students on the quality of their learning in relation to an assessment activity, which forms the basis of improved student learning.

flexible entry scheme means an entry scheme for Australian recent school leavers, approved by the Academic Board in accordance with clause 26 of this policy.

Graduate Certificate means an advanced program of study that builds on prior undergraduate study or, where approved by the faculty, prior experience that is considered by the faculty to demonstrate the required knowledge and aptitude.

Graduate Diploma means an advanced program of study that builds on either or both of prior undergraduate or postgraduate study.

graduate qualities means the qualities demonstrated by all graduates of award courses on completion of the requirements of the award course. At the date of this policy, for undergraduate award courses, Part 2 of Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 details these as:

(a) depth of disciplinary expertise;
(b) broader skills:
   (i) critical thinking and problem solving;
   (ii) oral and written communication;
   (iii) information and digital literacy;
   (iv) inventiveness;
(c) cultural competence;
(d) interdisciplinary effectiveness;
(e) an integrated professional, ethical and personal identity;
(f) influence;
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group work means a formally established project to be carried out by a number of students working together that results in a single piece of assessment or a number of associated pieces of assessment.

Higher School Certificate (HSC) means a Higher School Certificate granted by the NSW Board of Studies under the Education Act 1990.

International English Language Testing System (IELTS) means the test jointly administered by British Council, IDP Education Pty Ltd and the University of Cambridge.

integrated honours course means a course that leads to the award of a degree with honours that is not an appended honours course. The honours component of the course is integrated within the overall course without extending the time for completion of the course.

international applicant means an applicant who is not:

• an Australian citizen;
• a permanent resident of Australia; or
• a New Zealand citizen.

**International Baccalaureate** means the diploma awarded to a person who successfully completes the International Baccalaureate program, developed and administered by the International Baccalaureate Organisation.

**international student** means a student who is not:
• an Australian citizen;
• a permanent resident of Australia; or
• a New Zealand citizen.

**learning outcomes** means statements of what students know, understand and are able to do on completion of a unit of study, a major, program, stream, award course, or other curriculum component.

**Liberal Studies Bachelor degree** means a degree of study at Bachelor level of three years duration (or part-time equivalent) that provides students with a broad multi-disciplinary education that develops disciplinary expertise and graduate qualities.

**major** means a defined sequence of units of study taken by a student which develops depth of expertise in a field of study.

**Note:** See clause 83B.

Note: See Part 3 of the *Learning and Teaching Policy 2015*
Masters degree by coursework means a program of advanced learning and professional training that builds on undergraduate study, achieves at least the learning outcomes specified for level 9 of the AQF and normally leads to a capstone experience. The University offers four types of Masters degree by coursework:

- **Advanced Learning Masters**: a minimum one year full-time advanced study course that builds on prior undergraduate study in the same discipline or in a relevant discipline;
- **Professional Masters degree**: a Masters degree that prepares the student for accreditation or recognition in a specific profession, building either on prior undergraduate study in the discipline or on undergraduate study in another appropriate discipline;
- **Research Pathway Masters degree**: a Masters degree that develops advanced knowledge and research skills in a discipline to prepare a student to undertake a Doctor of Philosophy;
- **Masters Degree (Extended)**: a Professional Masters Degree of extended duration, typically three or four years full-time. The degree of Doctor of Dental Medicine, Juris Doctor, Doctor of Medicine and Doctor of Veterinary Medicine are referred to in the AQF as ‘Masters Degree (Extended)’.

**Minor** means a defined sequence of units of study taken by a student which develops expertise in a field of study.

**Note**: See Part 3 of the *Learning and Teaching Policy 2015*

**Misadventure** means an unforeseen accident, mishap or personal misfortune.

**Moderation** means the process by which the validity and reliability of assessment marks are verified.

**Non-award student** means a person who is not admitted to an award course at the University, and who is not an exchange student or study abroad student, but is enrolled in a unit of study at the University.

**Non-specific credit** means a ‘block credit’ for a specified number of credit points at a particular level. These credit points may be in a particular subject area but are not linked to a specific unit of study.

**New Zealand Qualifications framework (NZQF)** means the New Zealand national framework for recognition and endorsement of education qualifications.

**Open learning environment** means a shared pool of units of study which are:

- of zero, two or six credit points value;
- approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies; and
- available to all students according to the award course resolutions applicable to the award course in which they are
postgraduate award course means an award course leading to the award of a Graduate Certificate, Graduate Diploma, Masters degree or a Doctorate. Normally, a postgraduate award course requires the prior completion of a relevant undergraduate degree or diploma.

principal examiner means the designated person responsible for the assignment of final marks and grades in a unit of study.

Program or Specialist Bachelor degree means a degree that develops disciplinary or professional expertise for a specific profession or career specialisation, and graduate qualities.

Note: See clause 83C.

Program director means the person responsible at a stream, program, major or degree level for managing the curriculum and providing coordination and advice to staff and students.

Progression profile means the record of all relevant documentation relating to a student’s academic progression, including correspondence and interview records.

Progression rate means the rate at which a student accrues credit in their award course over a defined period, measured as a credit point progression rate and a unit of study progression rate.

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

Recent school leaver means a person who completed the HSC or equivalent in the year immediately prior to admission or proposed admission to an award course, or who completed their HSC in the year immediately prior to that if the person has not undertaken any tertiary study.

Semester means the main (longest) block of teaching of each teaching period, as defined in Part 3 of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2019.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester average mark</td>
<td>means the average mark obtained by a student for all units of study attempted in a semester, weighted according to credit point value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple extension</td>
<td>means an informal arrangement between a student and a unit of study co-ordinator to permit late submission of work, as provided in clause 66A of this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special admission program</td>
<td>means a flexible entry scheme or an educational access scheme approved by the Academic Board and listed in Part 7 of this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialisation</td>
<td>has the meaning given in the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015, which at the date of this policy is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the disciplinary or professional expertise developed for a profession or career in a Professional or Specialist Bachelor degree or postgraduate degree; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the research specialisation developed in a Research Pathway Masters degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific credit</td>
<td>means the recognition of previously completed studies as directly equivalent to specific units of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying on Track information session</td>
<td>means an information session held intensively, for a full week in each semester, to assist students who are failing to meet academic progression requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying on Track survey</td>
<td>means a self-reflective survey designed to assist students to identify why they are having difficulties meeting academic progression requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>means a version of a degree that can be conceptualised as a separate degree for admission purposes but that is linked to a set of other streams of the degree through shared nomenclature, shared course components and shared rules. In degree nomenclature, streams may be indicated in parentheses following the name of the main degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>means a person who is currently admitted to candidature in an award course of the University and, where relevant, an exchange student or non-award student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad student</td>
<td>means a person who is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• not an Australian citizen;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• not admitted to an award course at the University;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• admitted to a formally approved program of study at an overseas institution; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• enrolled in units of study at the University but not under the terms of an exchange agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Professional Certificate</td>
<td>means a qualification outside the AQF, obtained upon completion of an advanced program of postgraduate study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**teaching period** means one of two periods each year, each consisting of a six-month period and including a semester, during which teaching is delivered in coursework courses, as defined in Part 3 of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2019.

**Technical and Further Education college (TAFE)** means a college operated by TAFE NSW.

**testamur** means a certificate or award provided to a graduate, usually at a graduation ceremony.

**Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL)** means the test administered by Educational Testing Service or its licensees.

**undergraduate award course** means a coursework award course leading to the award of an Associate Diploma, Diploma, Advanced Diploma or Bachelor degree or Bachelor (Honours) degree.

**undergraduate degree** means an undergraduate award course at Bachelor level that achieves at a minimum the learning outcomes specified for AQF level 7.

**unit of study** means the smallest stand-alone component of an award course that is recordable on a student's transcript. Units of study have an integer credit point value, normally six credit points, except where approved by the Academic Board.

**unit of study co-ordinator** means the academic staff member with overall responsibility for the planning and delivery of a unit of study.

**Universities Admission Centre (UAC)** means the Universities Admissions Centre (NSW & ACT) Pty Limited, which processes applications for admission to most undergraduate courses at the University of Sydney and other participating institutions.

**university** means a body that is established as a university or recognised as a university, by or under a law of the Commonwealth or a State or Territory, and meets nationally agreed criteria for a university.

**University** means the University of Sydney, established under the University of Sydney Act 1989.

**vertically-integrated combined degree** means a combined degree across two AQF levels, for example Bachelor and Masters, or Masters and Doctorate.

**waiver** means an exemption given by a faculty to a student from the requirement to complete a prescribed unit of study.
working day means a day on which the University is usually open for business. This does not include any Saturday, Sunday, public holiday or any day designated as part of the University’s Christmas shutdown period.

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

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

PART 2 ADMISSION TO AWARD COURSES

6 Quotas

On the recommendation of the Dean, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) may determine:

(a) the maximum number of applicants who may be admitted to a specified award course in a specified academic year;

(b) the maximum number of applicants who may be admitted to a specified award course under a special admission program in a specified academic year;

(c) the maximum number of students who may enrol in a specified unit of study in a specified academic year; and

(d) the maximum number of continuing students who may enrol in a specified unit of study in a specified academic year.

7 Admission by Dean

Note: The Dean is responsible for the admission of candidates to courses within their faculty. See clause 2.5 of the Coursework Rule and Part 8 of this policy.

(1) Subject to and in accordance with the Coursework Rule and this policy, the relevant program director may permit any person to enrol as a non-award student in a specified unit of study within that Faculty.

(2) Subject to anti-discrimination legislation, the Dean may decline to admit an applicant, or to offer to admit an applicant, to an award course if, in the opinion of the Dean, appropriate and satisfactory provision cannot be made for the applicant.

8 General requirements

A person is eligible for admission to an award course only if:

(a) the person meets the requirements in the Coursework Rule, this policy and the relevant award course resolutions for admission to the award course;
(b) the person has not made a material misrepresentation in applying for admission to the award course; and

(c) if the person is an international applicant who will study in Australia, the person holds a visa enabling them to undertake courses of study in Australia.

9 Admission and candidature

(1) The admissions process commences when an applicant accepts the University's offer of admission to an award course.

(2) A person is admitted to candidature on the date on which they complete the admissions process.

(a) Domestic students are admitted to candidature on the date of their first enrolment.

(b) International students are admitted to candidature on the date on which they:

(i) complete their acceptance online, or complete their acceptance of offer form;

(ii) pay the applicable fees to the University; and

(iii) enrol for the first time.

(3) Enrolment may be deferred in accordance with clause 38 of this policy.

(4) Candidature ceases when an award is conferred or candidature is otherwise terminated by the University.

9A Admission standards

Except as determined by the Academic Board, the admission standards set by the Academic Board will apply to all applicants for an award course from 2020.

PART 3 ELIGIBILITY FOR ADMISSION TO UNDERGRADUATE COURSES

10 Domestic applicants – secondary studies

(1) To be eligible for admission to candidature in an undergraduate award course on the basis of secondary studies, a domestic applicant must have successfully completed:

(a) a NSW Higher School Certificate examination, leading to the calculation of an ATAR, in accordance with procedures prescribed by the NSW Vice-Chancellor’s Conference from time to time;

(b) a State or Territory leaving examination considered by the Academic Board to be equivalent to the HSC; or
(c) any other school leaving examination, provided that the program of study and the standard of the examination are considered by the Academic Board to be equivalent to the program and the standard required of candidates for the HSC.

(2) The University will convert interstate or overseas school-leaving results in the manner determined by the Academic Board from time to time.

Note: The University will convert interstate and New Zealand results in accordance with the Interstate Transfer Index endorsed by the New South Wales Vice-Chancellors’ Conference.

(3) The University will use the better of either the most recent ATAR or any other accepted secondary qualification.

(4) If, following any offer of admission, the results of an applicant are found to be incorrect, the University:

(a) if the applicant achieved a higher ATAR or equivalent than originally awarded, will endeavour to admit the applicant to the award course to which the correct ATAR or equivalent would have earned admission;

(b) if the applicant achieved a lower ATAR or equivalent than originally awarded:

(i) reserves its right to withdraw its offer of admission at any time within the first four weeks of the student’s first semester; and

(ii) will endeavour to admit the applicant to a course for which the applicant would have qualified with the lower ATAR.

(5) No offer of admission to an award course will be made or withdrawn pursuant to subclause (4) without the approval of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).

Note: In giving approval under subclause (5), the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) will take into account whether it is too late in the year for the student to commence studies in a new course effectively.

11 Domestic applicants – tertiary studies

(1) To be eligible for admission to candidature in an undergraduate award course on the basis of tertiary studies, a domestic applicant must have successfully completed the equivalent of at least one full-time year of tertiary study at Bachelor level or higher.

Note: For subclause (1), one full-time year of tertiary study means 48 credit points of study at the University, or the part-time equivalent.

(2) Subject to the award course resolutions, consideration will be given to the applicant’s record of both tertiary and secondary studies, with the better of either record being used to determine their eligibility for admission.

(3) Where the applicant does not have recognised secondary qualifications, only the tertiary record will be considered.

(4) Where the applicant has made more than one attempt at tertiary study, only the best attempt at tertiary study will be considered.

(5) Subject to clause 81, an applicant who:
(a) has been excluded from a diploma or degree program for failure to meet progression requirements; and
(b) following the exclusion, passes at least one semester of study at degree level; or
(c) provides to the Associate Dean a satisfactory explanation of the circumstances for the exclusion;

is eligible for admission on the basis of tertiary studies.

(6) Subject to clause 81, an applicant who:
(a) has a record of failure and exclusion from tertiary study; and
(b) believes that their studies have been affected by circumstances beyond their control;

may apply for special consideration for admission by the relevant faculty.

Note: For information on the Special Consideration for Admission Scheme see clause 34.

Note: Clause 81 deals with applications for readmission to a course following exclusion from the same course due to failure to meet progression requirements.

12 Domestic applicants – other qualifications

To be eligible for admission to candidature in an undergraduate award course on the basis of other qualifications, a domestic applicant must have successfully completed:

(a) a preparation program approved by the Academic Board in accordance with clause 15 that was commenced by the applicant as an international student;
(b) the Diploma of Tertiary Preparation offered through the University’s Centre for Continuing Education provided that applicants under the age of 21 at the date of commencement of the course to which they seek admission also have an HSC or equivalent;
(c) an AQF diploma that provides appropriate academic preparation approved by the faculty provided that applicants under the age of 21 at the date of commencement of the course to which they seek admission also have an HSC or equivalent;
(d) another preparation program determined by the Academic Board to have a program of study and standard required of applicants equivalent to the HSC; or
(e) some other form of prior learning approved by the Academic Board.

12A Domestic applicants – transitional provisions

(1) A domestic applicant who commenced an AQF diploma between 1 January and 25 March 2015 is eligible for admission to candidature in an award course on the basis of that diploma.

(2) Other applicants with an AQF diploma completed during 2015 are eligible for admission to candidature in an award course on the basis of that diploma only with
approval of the Chair of the Admissions Committee, the Chair of the Academic Board and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).

13 International applicants

(1) To be eligible for admission to candidature in an undergraduate award course, an international applicant must have:
   (a) met one or more of the requirements for admission to an undergraduate award course in clauses 10-12 above; or
   (b) successfully completed a preparation program approved by the Academic Board in accordance with clause 15.5.

(2) Subject to approval by the Academic Board, international applicants may be admitted on the basis of forecast scores.

(3) International applicants, other than exchange students, will be considered for admission on a fee-paying basis only. Local student quotas will not apply.

14 Domestic and international applicants – special entry requirements

(1) Faculties may, with the approval of the Academic Board, impose special entry requirements.

(2) Domestic and international applicants for admission to an undergraduate award course must meet any special entry requirements approved by the Academic Board and prescribed in the award course resolutions.

14A Domestic and international applicants – admission prerequisites

(1) The Academic Board may determine standards which set prerequisites for admission to particular award courses.

(2) Such standards will be published on the Academic Board standards website.

15 Approved preparation programs

(1) The preparation programs approved by the Academic Board for international students are:
   (a) foundation programs offered by public higher education providers in Australia who are authorised to self-accredit their courses under the AQF;
   (b) foundation programs offered by public higher education providers in New Zealand who are authorised to self-accredit their courses under the New Zealand Qualifications Framework; and
   (c) the Advanced International Certificate of Education, University of Cambridge.
(2) The Academic Board may approve foundation and preparation programs offered by private higher education providers in Australia and New Zealand for international students, provided that:

(a) the courses offered in Australia are accredited under the AQF at Certificate IV level or above; and

(b) the courses offered in New Zealand are accredited under the NZQF at Certificate IV level or above.

(3) The Academic Board may approve foundation and preparation programs offered by overseas higher education providers for international students on a case-by-case basis.

(4) The preparation program approved by the Academic Board for domestic students is the Diploma of Tertiary Preparation offered through the University’s Centre for Continuing Education (see also clause 12(b) above).

(5) Unless otherwise specified in a particular course resolution, admission standards for foundation and preparation programs that are recognised for admission by the Academic Board will be set in accordance with the relevant UAC schedule.

PART 4 ELIGIBILITY FOR ADMISSION TO POSTGRADUATE COURSES

15A Sydney Professional Certificate

To be eligible for admission to a Sydney Professional Certificate, an applicant must:

(a) have a Bachelor degree or higher award from the University in a relevant discipline, as determined by the program director; or

(b) have a Bachelor degree or higher award from another university or institution that the program director determines to be equivalent to a degree or award mentioned in subclause (a); or

(c) where specified in the course resolutions, qualifications and documented relevant professional experience and achievement sufficient to successfully undertake the award; or

(d) meet other requirements specified in the faculty resolutions and award course resolutions.

16 Graduate Certificate

To be eligible for admission to a Graduate Certificate, an applicant must:

(a) have a Bachelor degree or higher award from the University in a relevant discipline, as determined by the program director; or

(b) where specified in the course resolutions, qualifications and documented relevant professional experience and achievement sufficient to successfully undertake the award; or
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17 Graduate Diploma

To be eligible for admission to a Graduate Diploma, an applicant must:

(a) have a Bachelor degree or higher award from the University in a relevant discipline, as determined by the program director; or

(b) have a Graduate Certificate from the University in a relevant discipline, as determined by the program director;

(c) have a Bachelor degree or higher award from another university or institution that the program director determines to be equivalent to a degree, award or certificate mentioned in subclause (a); and

(d) if the applicant does not satisfy subclauses (a) - (c), have completed the requirements for an award course leading to:
   (i) an embedded graduate certificate in the appropriate discipline at the University, as determined by the program director; or
   (ii) a program at another tertiary institution that the program director determines to be the equivalent of such a course;

without graduating from the course; and

(e) meet other requirements specified in the faculty resolutions and relevant award course resolutions.

18 Masters Degree (Advanced Learning Masters degree)

To be eligible for admission to an Advanced Learning Masters degree, an applicant must:

(a) have a Masters degree, a Graduate Diploma, a Bachelor degree (Honours), or a Bachelor degree (Pass) with a credit average, from the University in a relevant discipline, as determined by the program director;

(b) have a degree, diploma or award from another university or institution that the program director determines to be equivalent to a degree or diploma mentioned in subclause (a); or

(c) if the applicant does not satisfy subclauses (a) or (b), have completed:
   (i) the requirements for an award course leading to an embedded Graduate Diploma or Graduate Certificate in the appropriate discipline at the University of Sydney, as determined by the program director; or
(ii) a program at another tertiary education institution, being a program that the program director determines to be the equivalent of an embedded course mentioned in subclause (i); without graduating from the course; and

(d) meet other requirements specified in the faculty resolutions and relevant award course resolutions.

19 Masters degree (Professional Masters degree)

To be eligible for admission to a Professional Masters degree, an applicant must:

(a) have a Masters degree, a Bachelor degree, or a Graduate Diploma from the University in a relevant discipline, as determined by the program director;

(b) have a degree from another university or institution that the program director determines to be equivalent to a degree or award mentioned in subclause (a); or

(c) if the applicant does not satisfy subclause (a) or (b), have completed:

(i) the requirements for an award course leading to an embedded Graduate Diploma or Graduate Certificate in the appropriate discipline at the University of Sydney, as determined by the program director; or

(ii) a program at another tertiary education institution that the program director determines to be the equivalent of an embedded course mentioned in subclause (i); without graduating from the course; and

(d) meet other requirements specified in the faculty resolutions and relevant award course resolutions.

Note: The Masters Degree (Extended) is a form of Professional Masters degree – see the definition of Masters degree by coursework.

20 Exemption from eligibility requirements in exceptional circumstances

(1) Subject to subclause (2) below, a Dean may, in writing, grant an exemption from the eligibility requirements in clauses 16, 17 and 19 for an applicant for admission to:

(a) a Graduate Certificate;

(b) a Graduate Diploma; or

(c) a Professional Masters degree.

(2) A Dean may only grant an exemption from the eligibility requirements in clauses 16, 17 and 19 if satisfied that the applicant:

(a) has qualifications and experience equivalent to those eligibility requirements; and
(b) has provided evidence of experience and achievement sufficient to demonstrate mastery of the subject matter and graduate qualities equivalent to those gained by applicants who meet the eligibility requirements.

**Note:** For subclause (2)(b), evidence of experience and achievement could be provided through publications or authorship of official documents.

## PART 5  ENGLISH LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS – UNDERGRADUATE COURSES

### 21 All applicants whose first language is English

1. All applicants whose first language is English must provide evidence of:
   a. citizenship or permanent residency of an English speaking country; and
   b. completion of secondary or tertiary study in English at a recognised institution of an English speaking country listed in the English Language Proficiency Standards.

   **Note:** The English Language Proficiency Standards are available from the Academic Board website.

### 21A All applicants whose first language is not English

1. All applicants whose first language is not English must meet the University’s English language requirements to be eligible for admission to an undergraduate award course.

2. Any applicant for admission to an undergraduate award course whose first language is not English, must meet the requirements of the English Language Proficiency Standards.

3. If the Academic Board has prescribed qualifications accepted as proof of English language proficiency for applicants who have undertaken study in specified countries, an applicant who holds the prescribed qualifications will be considered to have met the minimum English language requirements for all undergraduate courses.

   **Note:** A conversion table for English Language Skills Tests is set out in the English Language Proficiency Standards available on the Academic Board website.

### 21B Exceptional circumstances

1. A Dean may exempt a student from the requirements of the English Language Proficiency Standards:
   a. if they are satisfied that exceptional circumstances apply; and
   b. on the bases specified in the English Language Proficiency Standards.
The Dean must record any exemption in writing on the student file, including:

(a) the proof of proficiency in English provided; and
(b) the Dean’s reasons for granting the exemption.

Note: See Recordkeeping Policy 2017.

22 International applicants whose first language is not English

Where an international applicant:

(a) is required by the Commonwealth government to provide IELTS or TOEFL results in order to obtain a student visa; and
(b) does not have a record of satisfactory achievement in secondary or tertiary studies in an English speaking country;

the University will use the IELTS or TOEFL results as the primary tool for assessing whether the applicant has satisfied English language requirements.

PART 6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS – POSTGRADUATE COURSES

23 All applicants whose first language is English

(1) All applicants whose first language is English must provide evidence of:

(a) citizenship or permanent residency of an English speaking country; and
(b) completion of secondary or tertiary study in English at a recognised institution of an English speaking country listed in the English Language Proficiency Standards.

Note: The English Language Proficiency Standards are available from the Academic Board website.

23A All applicants whose first language is not English

(1) All applicants whose first language is not English must meet the University’s English language requirements to be eligible for admission to a postgraduate award course.

(2) Subject to this Part, any applicant for admission to a postgraduate award course whose first language is not English, must meet the requirements of the English Language Proficiency Standards.

24 Exceptional circumstances

(1) A Dean may exempt a student from the requirements of the English Language Proficiency Standards:
(a) if they are satisfied that exceptional circumstances apply; and
(b) on the bases specified in the English Language Proficiency Standards.

(2) The Dean must record any exemption in writing on the student file, including:
(a) the proof of proficiency in English provided; and
(b) the Dean’s reasons for granting the exemption.

Note: See Recordkeeping Policy 2017.

PART 7  SPECIAL ADMISSION PROGRAMS

25 Application for a special admission program

(1) While eligibility for admission to the University is based on academic merit, the University recognises that, for many reasons, some domestic applicants are unable to demonstrate their full potential for success at tertiary level study through the normal qualifying processes. The University has established flexible entry schemes and educational access schemes to assist these domestic applicants to gain admission to undergraduate courses.

(2) Special admission programs may be faculty or course specific and must be approved by the Academic Board. All approved special admission programs must be set out in the relevant faculty resolutions or award course resolutions.

(3) Domestic applicants may apply for admission under more than one flexible entry scheme and educational access scheme, provided that their ATAR or equivalent lies within the approved eligibility band for each scheme. Except for Conditional Early Offers Schemes, the Cadigal Program and the Future Leaders Scheme, no such applicant will be admitted to a course if their ATAR or equivalent is more than five rank points below the relevant cut-off for the course. For the Future Leaders Scheme, no applicant will be admitted to a course if their ATAR is below the Minimum Eligibility Score for that course.

(4) Despite anything in this Part, flexible entry schemes and educational access schemes are subject to any quota set in accordance with clause 6 of this policy.

26 Flexible entry schemes

(1) The Academic Board may by resolution, on the recommendation of a faculty, establish or amend a flexible entry scheme for an undergraduate award course.

(2) A flexible entry scheme must set a flexible entry band for ATARs, and otherwise be consistent with this clause.

(3) Flexible entry schemes for specified courses are available to domestic applicants who:
(a) are eligible Australian recent school leavers, including applicants who hold an International Baccalaureate;
(b) have an ATAR or ATAR equivalent that lies below the ATAR cut-off for that course; and
(c) do not have a tertiary record.

(4) Flexible entry schemes comprise two components:

(a) a flexible entry ATAR band, lying between the ATAR cut-off and a lower limit that is not more than 5 rank points below the ATAR cut-off; and

(b) a flexible entry criterion or criteria, selected from the list approved by the Academic Board in clause 26(5), that allows admission of eligible applicants whose ATAR lies within the flexible entry band.

(5) The Academic Board approved flexible entry criteria are:

(a) satisfactory performance in the HSC, or HSC equivalent, in subjects relevant to the course;

(b) satisfactory performance in extra-curricular academic activities relevant to the course;

Note: For subclause (5)(b), extra-curricular activities might, for example, include Science Olympiads.

(c) aptitude for the award course, demonstrated by:

(i) relevant work or other experience;

(ii) submission of a portfolio; or

(iii) submission of a statement of interest in the course.

Note: For subclause (5)(c), faculties may use written submissions, interviews or other methods to obtain information about aptitude.

(6) A flexible entry scheme in force at the commencement of this policy continues in force. It may be terminated by resolution of the Academic Board, but must not be amended if the scheme, as amended, would be inconsistent with this clause.

26A Future Leaders Scheme

(1) The University recognises that appointment to certain school leadership roles indicates abilities in a student, beyond those identified by their ATAR, that are also relevant to the university environment. In recognition of this, school leaders may be admitted to a course with an ATAR below that required for normal admission to that course.

(2) The Future Leaders Scheme is available, for specified courses, to domestic and international applicants who:

(a) are eligible current school leavers attending a secondary school registered with the relevant state or territory Department of Education, including applicants who hold an International Baccalaureate;

(b) are nominated by their school principal or nominee as dux or captain of the school;

(c) have an ATAR or ATAR equivalent that lies between the previous year’s ATAR cut-off for that course and a lower limit determined by the faculty for that course; and;

(d) meet all other applicable course entry requirements.
27 Broadway Scheme

(1) The purpose of the Broadway Scheme is to help domestic applicants who have experienced educational disadvantage to gain admission to undergraduate award courses.

(2) Domestic applicants who are eligible for admission under the Broadway Scheme are permitted to compete for admission with an ATAR or equivalent of up to five rank points below the ATAR cut-off for the award course, or equivalent.

(3) The Broadway Scheme is available to domestic applicants who:
   (a) have successfully completed Year 12 or equivalent interstate or overseas secondary education (including at a high school or a technical and further education college, or an equivalent education institution); and
   (b) have suffered:
      (i) long-term educational disadvantage; or
      (ii) severe disadvantage during the final two years of their secondary education.

(4) The Broadway Scheme is not available to applicants who have a record of tertiary study.

(5) For the purposes of determining whether an applicant has suffered educational disadvantage, the Associate Dean of the relevant faculty may consider:
   (a) whether the home environment or conditions for study for the applicant were adverse;
   (b) any chronic illness, disability or personal trauma, the applicant suffered;
   (c) whether the applicant’s schooling or family life has been disrupted;
   (d) whether the applicant has English language difficulties;
   (e) whether the applicant’s family responsibilities are or were excessive;
   (f) any financial hardship affecting the applicant;
   (g) whether the applicant was in a remote or isolated location;
   (h) whether the applicant has suffered physical or psychological abuse.

28 Cadigal Program

(1) The purpose of the Cadigal Program is to address the educational disadvantage experienced by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, by facilitating and supporting their participation in University courses. It comprises:
   (a) provision of preparatory studies for Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people who want to undertake degree courses at the University;
   (b) provision for reduced academic eligibility requirements for admission to courses for Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander applicants;
   (c) provision for a reduced first year load for Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander students; and
   (d) a continuing support program for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students.
(2) The Cadigal Program involves a commitment by the University that up to 5% of student places will be available to Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander applicants.

(3) The Cadigal Program is available to applicants of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent.

(4) An applicant will be taken to be of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent only if they comply with the Confirmation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Identity Policy 2015.

(5) Selection of applicants for admission under the Cadigal Program will be on the basis of application and academic assessment.

(6) The Associate Dean of a faculty may admit an applicant to an undergraduate award course under the Cadigal Program only if:

   (a) where the applicant will be under 21 years old on 31 March in the academic year after the year in which the application is made:

      (i) the applicant has an ATAR of equal to or higher than the rank determined jointly for the award course by the faculty and the administrator of the Cadigal Program; or

      (ii) the applicant has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Associate Dean their capacity to succeed in coursework at a university level;

   (b) where the applicant will be over 21 years old on 31 March in the academic year after the year in which the application is made:

      (i) the applicant has successfully completed a tertiary education preparation course that the Associate Dean determines to be relevant to the course;

      (ii) the applicant has successfully completed, or has partly completed, an accredited course at diploma level or above; or

      (iii) the applicant has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Associate Dean their capacity to succeed in coursework at a university level.

(7) An Associate Dean may, for a maximum period of one year, place requirements and restrictions on the enrolment of a student who is offered admission to an undergraduate award course under the Cadigal Program, including:

   (a) requiring a student to complete a unit or units of study within a specified time;

   (b) prohibiting enrolment by the student in a unit or units of study;

   (c) restricting the maximum unit of study load in which a student can enrol.

Note: For subclause 6(a)(i): the minimum ATAR will be lower than that required for mainstream entry.

29 Conditional Early Offers Schemes

(1) The purpose of a Conditional Early Offers Scheme is to enable the University to identify, prior to completion of the HSC or equivalent, domestic students with academic promise who have suffered educational disadvantage and would benefit from additional support and early engagement with the University.
The Associate Dean of a faculty may, under a Conditional Early Offers Scheme, make a prospective domestic student a conditional offer of admission to an undergraduate award course at the end of Year 10, or during year 11 or 12.

The Associate Dean of a faculty may admit a domestic applicant to candidature in an undergraduate award course under the Conditional Early Offers Scheme only if:

(3) the applicant has an ATAR of equal to or higher than the rank determined jointly for the award course by the faculty and the administrator of the Conditional Early Offers Scheme; and

(4) the student maintains the level of academic performance demonstrated in accordance with subclause (5) below.

For the purposes of determining whether an applicant has suffered educational disadvantage, the Associate Dean of the relevant faculty may consider:

(a) whether the home environment or conditions for study for the applicant were adverse;
(b) any chronic illness, disability or personal trauma, the applicant suffered;
(c) whether the applicant’s schooling or family life has been disrupted;
(d) whether the applicant has English language difficulties;
(e) whether the applicant’s family responsibilities are or were excessive;
(f) any financial hardship affecting the applicant;
(g) whether the applicant was in a remote or isolated location;
(h) whether the applicant has suffered physical or psychological abuse.

For the purposes of determining whether an applicant has demonstrated early academic promise, the Associate Dean may, with the approval of the Academic Board, consider:

(a) evidence provided by the Principal of the applicant’s school;
(b) performance in the Record of School Achievement;
(c) performance in a test approved by the Academic Board;
(d) other measures of promise approved by the Academic Board, including an interview or portfolio.

Note: For subclause 3(a): the minimum ATAR will be lower than that required for mainstream entry.

30 Principal’s Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme (E12)

The purpose of the Principal’s Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme is to enable the University to identify, prior to completion of the HSC or equivalent, domestic students from low socio-economic backgrounds who are motivated and demonstrate potential to successfully undertake studies at the University.

The Associate Dean of a faculty may, under the Principal’s Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme, make a prospective domestic student a conditional offer of admission to an undergraduate award course before the end of Year 12.

Domestic applicants are eligible for the Principal’s Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme if:
(a) they have a written recommendation from their Principal; and
(b) they are completing their HSC in the year immediately prior to the year in which admission to an undergraduate award course at the University is sought; and
(c) they attend a school that is identified by the State or Commonwealth government as disadvantaged; or
(d) they are from a low socio-economic status background, as determined by the Academic Board from time to time.

(4) For their application for admission under the Principal’s Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme to be considered, applicants must complete the application form, including a statement of motivation demonstrating:
(a) their interest in and motivation for applying for one of the undergraduate award courses offered by the University; and
(b) their reasons for applying to the University.

(5) Applicants may be required to attend an interview.

(6) Applicants will be assessed against the following criteria:
(a) demonstrated interest in and motivation for the course of study;
(b) ability to set and meet long term goals;
(c) undertaking any prerequisite subjects;
(d) likelihood of meeting the required ATAR cut off score and succeeding in their studies at the University; and
(e) demonstrated leadership or citizenship skills.

(7) An assessment panel with at least two representatives from each participating faculty will evaluate all applications against the eligibility and selection criteria, and make a recommendation to the relevant Associate Dean.

(8) On receipt of a recommendation from the assessment panel, the Associate Dean may authorise a conditional offer of admission to an award course to be made to an applicant.

(9) The Associate Dean may admit an applicant to an undergraduate award course under the Principal’s Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme only if the applicant has an ATAR of equal to or higher than the rank specified by the faculty for admission to the award course under the Scheme.

Note: The minimum ATAR will be lower than that required for mainstream entry.

(10) Applicants who are admitted under the Principal’s Recommendation Conditional Offer Scheme will receive academic and other support.

**31 Mature Age Applicants Scheme**

(1) The purpose of the Mature Age Applicants Scheme is to help domestic applicants who are over 21 years of age, and who would not normally meet the academic eligibility requirements, to gain admission to undergraduate courses.

(2) The Dean of the relevant faculty may determine that the Mature Age Applicants Scheme does not apply to a specified undergraduate course.
(3) Domestic applicants who are eligible for admission under the Mature Age Applicants Scheme are permitted to compete for admission, provided that they meet the minimum level of academic merit set by the faculty for the relevant undergraduate award course.

(4) Applicants are eligible for admission under the Mature Age Applicants Scheme if:
   (a) they are at least 21 years old on 1 March of the year of admission to the University;
   (b) they do not have an ATAR or equivalent that would enable them to compete for mainstream admission;
   (c) they have not completed at least one year of study (or part-time equivalent) in a Bachelor degree or higher level qualification at a recognised tertiary institution; and
   (d) they have, within the previous two years, completed one of the following approved preparation courses:
      (i) a preparation course offered by the University's Centre for Continuing Education;
      (ii) the Tertiary Preparation Certificate Course offered at a NSW TAFE college;
      (iii) an HSC that does not lead to an ATAR;
      (iv) the Open Foundation Course or NEWSTEP Program offered by the University of Newcastle;
      (v) the University Preparation Program offered by the University of New South Wales; or
      (e) for admission to the Bachelor of Nursing, they have completed enrolled nursing qualifications; or
      (f) they have completed an AQF Diploma or Advanced Diploma at a recognised tertiary institution that satisfied the University's requirements for admission, or at least one year of study (or part-time equivalent) in an approved Associate Diploma or Diploma at a recognised tertiary institution that satisfied the University's requirements for admission.

(5) Deans will determine the minimum level of academic merit required for admission to an undergraduate course under the Mature Age Applicants Scheme.

(6) Applicants may be required to:
   (a) attend an interview;
   (b) provide a work portfolio; or
   (c) successfully complete a practical examination.

(7) When deciding whether to make an offer of admission under the Mature Age Applicants Scheme, the relevant Associate Dean may take into account:
   (a) the applicant's personal qualities;
   (b) whether the applicant is likely to complete the course successfully;
   (c) the applicant's work experience;
(d) any relevant TAFE or AQF courses successfully completed by the applicant.

(8) Levels of assumed knowledge specified for each award course or equivalent are normally considered as prerequisites for applicants for admission through the Mature Age Applicants Scheme.

32 Elite Athletes or Performers Scheme

(1) The training that elite athletes and performers have to undertake, and their competitive and performance commitments, can detrimentally affect their secondary school studies. The purpose of the Elite Athletes and Performers Scheme is to address that detriment.

(2) Domestic applicants who are eligible for admission under the Elite Athletes and Performers Scheme are permitted to compete for admission with an ATAR or equivalent of up to five rank points below the ATAR cut-off for the award course, or equivalent.

(3) The Elite Athletes and Performers Scheme is available to domestic applicants who:
   (a) have been assessed by the Elite Athletes Assessment Panel or the Elite Performers Assessment Panel, as relevant, as being elite; and
   (b) can demonstrate that their sporting or performance commitments have impeded their HSC performance.

(4) For their application for admission under the Elite Athletes and Performers Scheme to be considered, applicants must complete and submit an application form prior to the last day of business in October of each year.

(5) The Elite Athletes Assessment Panel or the Elite Performers Assessment Panel, as relevant, will assess whether an applicant is an elite athlete or performer, normally prior to the publication of HSC results.

(6) The Elite Athletes Assessment Panel will set and follow standard criteria for determining whether an applicant is an elite athlete, and will seek advice about each applicant from referees and appropriate experts.

(7) The Elite Performers Assessment Panel will set and follow standard criteria for determining whether an applicant is an elite performer, and will seek advice about each applicant from referees and appropriate experts.

(8) The Elite Athletes and Performers Selection Committee will review assessments made by the Elite Athletes Assessment Panel and the Elite Performers Assessment Panel.

(9) Where the Elite Athletes and Performers Selection Committee endorses an assessment of an applicant, the Committee will forward the application to the relevant faculty for consideration.

34 Special Consideration for Admission Scheme

(1) The purpose of the Special Consideration for Admission Scheme is to help applicants who have experienced serious disadvantage during secondary study, or a previous attempt at tertiary study, to gain admission to undergraduate courses.
(2) Applicants who are eligible for admission under the Special Consideration for Admission Scheme are permitted to compete for admission with an ATAR or equivalent of up to five rank points below the relevant cut-off for the award course.

(3) The Special Consideration for Admission Scheme is available to applicants who:
   (a) have successfully completed Year 12 or equivalent secondary education (including at a high school or a technical and further education college, or an equivalent educational institution); or
   (b) have a record of previous tertiary study; and
   (c) have suffered serious disadvantage during the course of those studies.

PART 8  ADMISSION DECISIONS AND OFFERS

35 Basis for admission decisions

(1) Admission decisions must be made in accordance with the Coursework Rule and this policy.

(2) Subject to this policy, when deciding whether to make an offer of admission to an award course to an applicant, the Dean must adopt the principle that offers are to be made on the basis of the applicant’s academic merit.

(3) For admission to undergraduate award courses, applicants’ academic merit is to be measured principally by their secondary or tertiary results.

(4) The University may make more than one round of offers to applicants for an award course. The ATAR cut off points may be different for different rounds of offers.

Note: See also clause 2.5 of the Coursework Rule and clause 7 of this policy.

36 Conditional offers

(1) An offer of admission to an award course may be made subject to specified conditions.

(2) Examples of conditions that might be imposed include conditions relating to:
   (a) health screening of the applicant;
   (b) criminal record checks;
   (c) child protection checks;
   (d) verification of the applicant’s academic record;
   (e) visa requirements;
   (f) English language requirements; and
   (g) completion of prior study.
37 Accepting an offer

(1) An offer of admission to an award course can be accepted only in the manner described in the offer.

(2) An applicant is not considered to be admitted to an award course at the University until they have completed, to the satisfaction of the University, all requirements for enrolment in the course.

(3) An applicant who has accepted an offer of admission to an undergraduate award course and, prior to commencing that course, wishes to transfer to a different award course, may apply for and be admitted to the new course, provided that:

   (a) the applicant has met the minimum admission requirements for the new course at a standard equal to or higher than applicants who were offered admission to the course in the main round of offers made by the UAC;

   (b) a place is available in the course;

   (c) all available places are offered on the basis of merit; and

   (d) the offer is made and accepted before the commencement of teaching in the new course.

PART 9 DEFERRAL

38 Deferred admission by commencing undergraduate applicants

(1) An applicant offered a place in an award course may defer admission to that course, but only as provided in this Part.

(2) The University may permit an applicant to defer admission provided that the offer of admission has not lapsed or been withdrawn by the University due to the applicant’s actions prior or subsequent to the offer being made.

(3) Subject to subclause (4) below, the maximum period of deferral is one year.

(4) The Associate Dean of the relevant faculty may extend the period of deferral for an individual applicant to a maximum of two years.

(5) Applicants who are offered a place in an undergraduate award course at the Sydney Conservatorium of Music must undertake a further satisfactory audition prior to admission.

(6) The Associate Dean of the relevant faculty may decline to allow deferral for a particular course.
PART 10  CHANGE OF RESIDENCY

39  International applicants and students changing from international to domestic status

(1) If an international undergraduate applicant changes from international to domestic status prior to enrolling in their course and:
   (a) their ATAR or equivalent is equal to or higher than the ATAR required for domestic applicants to be admitted to the same course; and
   (b) there are places available in the course;
       the applicant will be transferred to a Commonwealth supported place.

(2) If an international undergraduate applicant changes from international to domestic status prior to enrolling in their course and either or both of the requirements in subclauses 39(1)(a) and (b) are not met, the applicant's offer of admission will be cancelled and withdrawn.

(3) If an international undergraduate student changes from international to domestic status prior to the census date for their course and:
   (a) their ATAR or equivalent is equal to or higher than the ATAR required for domestic applicants to be admitted to the same course; and
   (b) there are places available in the course;
       the applicant will be transferred to a Commonwealth supported place.

(4) If an international undergraduate student changes from international to domestic status prior to the census date for their course and either or both of the requirements in clauses 39(3)(a) and (b) are not met, the applicant will be transferred to a domestic fee-paying place.

(5) If an international undergraduate student changes from international to domestic status after the census date for their course and:
   (a) their ATAR or equivalent is equal to or higher than the ATAR required for domestic applicants to be admitted to the same course; and
   (b) there are places available in the course;
       the applicant will continue as an international fee paying student for that semester and transfer to a Commonwealth supported place in the subsequent semester.

(6) If an international undergraduate student changes from international to domestic status after the census date for their course and either or both of the requirements in clauses 39(5)(a) and (b) are not met, the applicant will continue as an international fee paying student for that semester and transfer to a domestic fee-paying place in the subsequent semester.

(7) Subject to this clause, if an international postgraduate applicant changes from international to domestic status prior to enrolling in their course, the applicant will be transferred to a domestic fee-paying place.

(8) If an international postgraduate student changes from international to domestic status before the census date for their course, the student will be transferred to a domestic fee-paying place.
If an international postgraduate student changes from international to domestic status after the census date for their course, the student will continue as an international fee paying student for that semester and transfer to a domestic fee-paying place in the subsequent semester.

International students who are transferred to a domestic fee-paying place are permitted to compete for any available Commonwealth supported places in subsequent semesters.

International applicants for the Doctor of Medicine will not be transferred to a domestic fee-paying place in accordance with subclause (7).

PART 11 RECOGNITION OF PRIOR LEARNING

40 Forms of recognition of prior learning

(1) The University recognises that students commence courses with different levels, areas and forms or prior learning.

(2) The University may recognise prior learning by granting:

   (a) credit, which may take the form of:

      (i) specific credit;

      (ii) non-specific credit;

      (iii) reduced volume of learning for an award course; or

   (b) a waiver of a requirement to undertake a compulsory or a pre-requisite unit of study.

41 Specific credit, non-specific credit and reduced volume of learning

(1) Specific credit is the recognition of previously completed studies as directly equivalent to specific units of study offered by the University.

(2) Subject to this policy and the award course resolutions, specific credit may be granted for a unit of study where there is a substantial overlap of skills, knowledge and experience at a level deemed by the Associate Dean to be equivalent to a specific University of Sydney unit of study.

(3) Non-specific credit is ‘block credit’ given for a specified number of credit points at a particular level, in accordance with the award course resolutions. These credit points may be in a particular subject area but are not linked to a specific unit of study.

(4) Reduced volume of learning is a reduction in the number of credit points required for a student to complete their award course, in recognition of the student’s:

   (a) level and subject area of qualifications completed prior to admission; or

   (b) equivalent professional experience.
Note: An example of specific credit is credit given for Physics 1 [PHYS1001] at the University of Sydney for Physics 1 undertaken at the University of Adelaide.

Note: Examples of non-specific credit are: the University of Sydney does not teach Russian but a student may be granted credit for a full first year of study in Russian undertaken at the University of New South Wales, as 12 junior credit points; a student may be granted 48 junior credit points for the first year of an Arts degree completed at another Australian university.

Note: Where possible, the University will assess credit before making an offer of admission. Where possible, the University will make an offer of credit to an applicant concurrently with their offer of admission. If accepted, credit offered to an applicant prior to enrolment will be granted at the time they are admitted to the award course. See the Coursework Credit Procedures 2015.

42 Awarding specific credit and non-specific credit for previous studies

(1) An Associate Dean may, in accordance with this policy, the faculty resolutions and the award course resolutions, grant specific credit or non-specific credit to an undergraduate or postgraduate student for study undertaken:

(a) in another award course at the University;
(b) in an award course at another Australian tertiary institution;
(c) at a recognised overseas tertiary institution;
(d) in an accredited higher education course offered by a registered private provider;
(e) in a course offered by the Vocational Education and Training Sector;
(f) in another award program approved by the Dean following an evaluation process; or
(g) in a non-award program approved by the Academic Board.

(2) Factors to be taken into account by an Associate Dean when evaluating a program for the purposes of subclause (1) include:

(a) the general educational practices and standards of the institution or system;
(b) the objectives of the particular course and the methods adopted to achieve those objectives;
(c) the duration of the course;
(d) the breadth, depth and balance of the course material;
(e) the methods of assessment in the course;
(f) the teaching staff conducting the course, including the numbers of teachers, and their professional qualifications, experience and educational expertise; and
(g) the accommodation and facilities offered to students undertaking the course, including equipment, library, laboratories, workshops and other instructional or research resources.

(3) Entry to the University's courses is competitive and eligibility for credit does not guarantee an applicant a place in a course.
(4) Credit will not be granted:
   (a) for units of study completed more than:
      (i) 10 years ago; or
      (ii) if the faculty resolutions prescribe a shorter period, the prescribed period;
      prior to admission to candidature in the course that the credit is applied to;
   (b) for units of study in an uncompleted course, unless the student provides evidence that he or she has abandoned credit in respect of that course;
   (c) except with the permission of the Associate Dean, for units of study undertaken at another tertiary institution from which the student has been excluded;
   (d) except with the permission of the Associate Dean, for units of study or non-specific credit listed in an offer of credit made by the University prior to enrolment or during candidature, and declined by the applicant or student in accordance with subclause 43A(2); or
   (e) except with the permission of the Associate Dean, to reinstate specific credit or non-specific credit that has previously been rescinded, on request by the student in accordance with clause 43B.

(5) When granting credit, an Associate Dean may impose requirements on a student with respect to:
   (a) progression to more advanced units of study within a particular course; and
   (b) time limits for completion of the course.

(6) Regardless of any credit granted, a student must meet any pre-requisite or co-requisite requirements for an award course, unless the unit of study co-ordinator gives the student a waiver for those requirements.

(7) Regardless of any credit granted, a student must achieve and demonstrate the learning outcomes for the award course.

Note: See clause 46 regarding waivers.

43 Awarding reduced volume of learning

(1) A program director may, in accordance with this policy and the award course resolutions, and on request by a student, approve a reduction in the volume of learning required for the student to complete their award course, in recognition of:
   (a) a prior qualification in the same discipline as the award course;
   (b) a prior qualification in a cognate discipline deemed by the program director to provide comparable preparation to subclause (a);
   (c) relevant professional experience deemed by the program director to provide comparable preparation to subclause (a); or
   (d) a prior qualification in an appropriate discipline at AQF level 8 or above.

(2) Factors to be taken into account for the purposes of subclause (1) include:
   (a) the factors set out in subclause 42(2) above;
whether the student’s experience is documented;
(c) whether any documentation provided by the student demonstrates skills, knowledge or understanding that are equivalent to those that would be gained in relevant University studies.

(3) The onus will be on the student to provide appropriate documentation or other evidence.

(4) Reduced volume of learning will not be granted, except with the permission of the program director:
(a) where the reduced volume of learning was previously listed in an offer of credit made by the University prior to enrolment or during candidature, and declined by the applicant or student in accordance with subclause 43A(2); or
(b) to reinstate reduced volume of learning that has previously been rescinded, on request by the student in accordance with clause 43B.

43A Accepting and declining offers of specific credit, non-specific credit and reduced volume of learning

(1) The University may make offers to grant specific credit, non-specific credit and reduced volume of learning prior to enrolment or during candidature.

(2) An applicant or student must accept or decline (in whole or in part) any offer of credit made by the University:
(a) prior to enrolment, on or before the date of their first enrolment in the award course for which credit is being offered;
(b) during candidature, within twelve months of the date of the offer of credit.

(3) If an applicant or student does not accept or decline the offer of credit within the timeframe specified in subclause (2), the credit will not be processed and the University will regard the offer as having lapsed.

(4) The University may vary any offer to grant credit made to an applicant prior to enrolment, if the Associate Dean has authorised a period of deferral of greater than one year.

Note: See clause 38 regarding deferral.

43B Rescinding specific credit, non-specific credit and reduced volume of learning

(1) A program director may, in accordance with this policy and the award course resolutions, and on request by a student, rescind any specific credit, non-specific credit or reduced volume of learning previously granted to the student in accordance with this policy.

(2) Except with the permission of the program director, once any specific credit, non-specific credit or reduced volume of learning has been rescinded in accordance with this clause, a student may not seek to have it reinstated.
44 Limits on credit and reduced volume of learning

(1) Subject to this clause, and notwithstanding any credit or reduced volume of learning granted in order to qualify for an award:

(a) an undergraduate student must complete a minimum of:

(i) one year (or part-time equivalent) of the award course at the University; and

(ii) 48 credit points of the award course at the University;

(b) a postgraduate student must complete at least 50 per cent of the course requirements at the University; and

(c) a student enrolled in a Masters degree must complete a minimum of 48 credit points of postgraduate study (including any postgraduate study at another university) in order to qualify for the award.

(2) The Associate Dean may vary the requirements in subclause (1) where the work was completed:

(a) as part of an embedded program at the University;

(b) as part of another award course undertaken at the University; or

(c) as part of an award course approved by the University as part of an approved conjoint venture with another institution.

(3) Except with the approval of the Academic Board at course level, credit granted on the basis of work completed at an institution other than a university will not exceed one third of the course requirements.

(4) Except as provided for in subclause (6), credit towards postgraduate awards will not be granted for undergraduate units of study.

(5) Except as provided for in subclause (6), credit towards postgraduate awards will not be granted for previously completed postgraduate awards, except:

(a) for a Sydney Professional Certificate;

(b) in an embedded program at the University; or

(c) in a program completed at another university or institution deemed by the relevant Associate Dean to be the equivalent of a University of Sydney embedded program.

(6) Despite subclauses (4) and (5), a program director may grant credit in the form of a reduced volume of learning in recognition of completed undergraduate and postgraduate award courses in accordance with clause 43 and the award course resolutions.

(7) A program director may grant a graduate a limited amount of credit for a completed undergraduate course. Subject to this policy and the award course resolutions, a graduate who is admitted to candidature for the degree of Bachelor with credit for units of study in the completed course must complete a minimum of two years (or part-time equivalent) in the award course, unless additional credit from an uncompleted course or courses has also been granted.

Note: The provisions for granting credit in an award course offered as part of an approved conjoint venture are prescribed in the award course resolutions and the relevant faculty resolutions.
45 Credit in embedded programs, including embedded honours

Note: Faculties have authority to establish embedded programs in closely related academic or professional areas, to establish incrementally higher levels of attainment at Graduate Certificate, Graduate Diploma and Masters level. Faculties may specify in the award course resolutions or faculty resolutions conditions for transfer from one award in the embedded program to another.

(1) Students enrolled in an embedded program who have met the conditions for, and elect to, transfer to a longer award course in that embedded program:
   (a) may transfer their enrolment to the longer award course; and
   (b) will receive credit for all of the units of study completed in the shorter award course, provided that the units of study are approved as a requirement for the longer award course; and
   (c) will not be permitted to graduate from the shorter award course.

(2) Subject to the relevant course requirements, graduates of a course in an embedded program who subsequently become candidates for a longer award course in the same embedded program may be granted credit for units of study completed in the shorter award course.

(3) Students enrolled in an embedded program who have completed the requirements for any award course in that embedded program may elect to discontinue their enrolment and graduate from that award course.

(4) A student who has met the requirements for a Bachelor degree at pass level may, subject to the award course resolutions:
   (a) receive credit for completed units of study; and
   (b) enrol in the same Bachelor degree award course at honours level.

Note: For information on admission to a Bachelor degree award course at honours level, see clause 93.

46 Awarding waivers

(1) A program director may, having regard to a student’s previous learning or experience, waive the requirement that the student undertake a compulsory unit of study.

(2) A program director may waive the requirement that a student meet a prerequisite requirement or a co-requisite requirement for a unit of study.

(3) A waiver given under subclause (1) or (2) may be subject to conditions set out in the waiver.

Note: For subclause (1): as the student will not have passed the compulsory unit of study, the student will have to make up the credit points by undertaking other units of study.
PART 12  ENROLMENT IN AND UNDERTAKING UNITS OF STUDY

47  Units of study
(1) In this Part, 'table of units' means a table of the units of study, as set out in the award course resolutions.
(2) Each unit of study is assigned a specified number of credit points by the faculty responsible for the unit of study.
(3) A student must pass a unit of study to acquire the credit points for that unit of study.
(4) The total number of credit points required for completion of an award course, including a combined degree or double degree course, is specified in the Senate resolutions and the award course resolutions.
(5) Subject to this policy, a student completes a unit of study if the student:
   (a) participates in the learning experiences for the unit of study;
   (b) meets the standards required by the University for academic honesty;
   (c) meets all examination, assessment and attendance requirements for the unit of study; and
   (d) demonstrates learning outcomes for the unit of study to a standard equivalent to a pass level or higher.
(6) A program director may, subject to the award course resolutions and with the approval of the relevant program director in the faculty in which the unit of study is offered, permit a student to enrol in and obtain credit for a unit of study that is not listed in the table of units for the course.

48  Students must enrol in units of study
(1) Subject to this policy, each student must, for each teaching period, enrol in units of study offered in their award course.
(2) The enrolments must be consistent with the requirements of this policy, the faculty resolutions and the award course resolutions.
   Note: See also Part 13.

49  Assumed knowledge
(1) The University assumes that students enrolling in some first year units of study have successfully acquired a certain level of knowledge, expressed in terms of program studies and performance achieved in the HSC or equivalent.
(2) The Academic Board may, on the recommendation of the relevant faculty, specify assumed knowledge and recommended study areas for undergraduate courses.
(3) Students who have not acquired the assumed knowledge may enrol in any unit of study in their award course, but should undertake any recommended supplementary work before the unit of study commences.

Note: For the current list of assumed knowledge and recommended study areas for undergraduate courses, see the Academic Board standards website.

50 Prerequisite and co-requisite requirements

(1) Faculties may determine prerequisite and co-requisite requirements for enrolment in a unit of study.

(2) Subject to subclause 46(2), a student may not enrol in a unit of study unless they have met the prerequisite requirements for the unit of study.

(3) Subject to subclause 46(2), a student may not enrol in a unit of study for which there is a co-requisite requirement unless he or she also enrols in or has already completed the co-requisite unit of study.

Note: For details of prerequisite and co-requisite requirements for courses, see the relevant faculty handbook.

51 Enrolment restrictions

(1) Except with the permission of the Associate Dean or in accordance with the award course resolutions, a student may not:

(a) enrol in a unit of study that they have already completed towards the requirements for an award course;

(b) enrol in any unit of study that overlaps substantially in content with a unit of study that has already been completed by the student, or for which credit or a waiver or exemption has been granted;

(c) enrol in units of study additional to award course requirements;

(d) enrol in units of study with a total credit point value exceeding:

(i) for enrolments in any one teaching period – 30 credit points

(ii) with the approval of the Associate Dean – 36 credit points.

Note: The award course resolutions may prescribe a lower credit point value limit.

Note: The Associate Dean will specify prohibited units of study in the table of units.

(2) A student who is permitted, in accordance with subclause (1)(a), to re-enrol in a unit of study may receive a higher or lower grade, but not additional credit points.

52 Repeating a unit of study

(1) Unless granted an exemption by the unit of study co-ordinator, a student who repeats a unit of study must:

(a) participate in the learning experiences provided for the unit of study; and
(b) meet all the examination, assessment and attendance requirements for the unit of study.

(2) Except with the permission of the unit of study co-ordinator, a student who presents for reassessment in any unit of study is not eligible for any prize or scholarship awarded in connection with that unit of study.

53 Concurrent enrolment

(1) A student may not enrol in more than one award course at any level, except:
   (a) with the permission of the relevant Associate Deans; or
   (b) as part of an approved combined degree or double degree program.
   
   **Note:** This includes courses offered by other institutions.

(2) The same unit of study cannot be counted towards the requirements for two different courses, except:
   (a) for combined degrees;
   (b) for the purpose of satisfying prerequisite, co-requisite and admission requirements; and
   (c) where a student is permitted to enrol in two postgraduate programs simultaneously, faculties may allow a maximum of two units of study to be cross-credited towards requirements for a maximum of two degrees as set out in clause 90.

54 Cross-institutional study

(1) A student may, with the permission of the program director, enrol in a unit or units of study at another university or institution and have those units of study credited to the student’s award course.

(2) The program director may impose conditions on any cross-institutional study approved in accordance with subclause (1).

55 Attendance

(1) A faculty may specify the attendance and participation requirements for its courses and units of study.

(2) A student enrolled in a unit of study must comply with the requirements set out in the faculty resolutions, award course resolutions or unit of study outline about undertaking the unit of study, including on matters such as:
   (a) attendance at and participation in lectures, seminars and tutorials; and
   (b) participation in practical work.

(3) A program director may specify the circumstances under which a student who does not satisfy attendance requirements may be deemed not to have completed a unit of study or award course.
PART 13  DISCONTINUATION AND SUSPENSION OF ENROLMENT

56 Discontinuation of enrolment

(1) Subject to this clause, a student may discontinue their enrolment in an award course or in one or more units of study.

(2) A student’s enrolment in the course or the relevant units of study will be treated as discontinued from the date of discontinuation, unless they produce evidence that there was good reason why the application could not be made at an earlier time.

(3) A student who discontinues enrolment in a course during their first year of enrolment in the course will not be permitted to re-enrol in that course unless:
   a. the Associate Dean granted prior permission to re-enrol; or
   b. the student is later re-selected for admission to the course.

(4) A student may not discontinue enrolment in a course or a unit of study after the end of classes in that course or unit of study, except in accordance with subclause (2).

(5) A student who discontinues enrolment in a unit of study is to be awarded a grade set out in Schedule 1.

57 Suspension of enrolment by student

(1) All provisions of this clause are subject to restrictions imposed by the Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 on student visa holders.

(2) An undergraduate student may suspend their enrolment in a course:
   a. on up to two separate occasions during their candidature; and
   b. for a maximum period of one year.

(3) A postgraduate student may suspend their enrolment in a course for a maximum period of one year on each occasion.

(4) The suspension must be notified to the University in a manner approved or accepted by the faculty.

(5) The Associate Dean must approve:
   a. a third or subsequent period of suspension for an undergraduate student; or
   b. a suspension of more than one year by any student.

(6) At the end of the suspension period, the student must comply with any requirements notified by the Associate Dean for completing the course. Those requirements apply to the student despite anything to the contrary in the award course resolutions.
58 Suspension and termination of candidature for failure to enrol

(1) If a student is not enrolled in any unit of study by the last of the census dates for that semester, and the student has not discontinued or suspended enrolment, the student’s candidature is automatically suspended.

(2) If a student’s candidature is automatically suspended, then, despite any contrary provision in this policy, the procedures for the student to re-enrol in the course are to be as the relevant Associate Dean determines.

(3) If a student fails to re-enrol in that and the subsequent semester, their candidature will be terminated automatically.

59 Return to candidature

(1) If a student returns to candidature after a discontinuation or suspension, the course requirements in force at the time of the student’s return to candidature apply to the student’s candidature.

(2) Despite subclause (1), the Associate Dean may, in writing, modify the application of the course requirements in a particular case.

PART 14 ASSESSMENT

60 Statement of intent

(1) The purpose of this Part is to:
   (a) set out the principles that underpin the University’s approach to assessment;
   (b) support students’ development and progressive demonstration of graduate qualities;
   (c) inform curriculum and teaching quality assurance programs; and
   (d) underpin accountability for achievement of graduate outcomes.

(2) Assessments should be designed to provide feedback on performance or to establish that students have achieved an adequate standard to proceed or to graduate.

(3) This part applies to any coursework unit of study undertaken by a higher degree by research student.

61 Assessment principles and their implementation

(1) The following principles apply to assessment at the University.
   (a) Assessment practices must advance student learning.
   (b) Assessment practices must be communicated clearly to students and staff.
   (c) Assessment practices must be valid and fair.
   (d) Assessment practices must be continuously improved and updated.
(2) The University’s assessment principles will be implemented in accordance with the implementation statements set out in this policy.

(3) The procedures for operation of the implementation statements are set out in the Assessment Procedures 2011.

62 Principle 1 - Assessment practices must advance student learning

This principle requires that:

(1) Assessment practices align with goals, context, learning activities and learning outcomes.

(2) A variety of assessment tasks are used while ensuring that student and staff workloads are considered.

(3) Assessment tasks reflect increasing levels of complexity across a program and foster enquiry-based learning.

(4) Constructive, timely and respectful feedback develops students’ skills of self and peer evaluation and guides the development of future student work.

63 Principle 2 - Assessment practices must be communicated clearly to students and staff

This principle requires that:

(1) Unit of study outlines are available in the first week of any offering of the unit and communicate the purposes, timing, weighting and extent of assessment in sufficient detail to allow students to plan their approach to assessment.

(2) Unit of study outlines explain the rationale for the selection of assessment tasks (e.g. group task) in relation to learning outcomes.

(3) Procedures exist to ensure that all staff involved in teaching a unit of study share a common understanding of assessment practices.

(4) The process of marking and of combining individual task marks is explicitly explained in the unit outline.

64 Principle 3 - Assessment practices must be valid and fair

This principle requires that:

(1) Assessment tasks are authentic and appropriate to disciplinary and or professional context.

(2) Assessment incorporates rigorous academic standards related to the discipline(s) and is based on pre-determined, clearly articulated criteria with which students actively engage.

(3) Students’ assessment will be evaluated solely on the basis of students’ achievement against criteria and standards specified to align with learning outcomes.
(4) Assessment practices address issues of equity and inclusiveness to accommodate and build upon the diversity of the student body so as not to disadvantage any student.

65 Principle 4 - Assessment practices must be continuously improved and updated

This principle requires that:

(1) Assessment tasks and outcomes are moderated through academic peer review and used to inform subsequent practice.
(2) Assessments are regularly updated to ensure alignment with program learning outcomes or graduate qualities.
(3) Professional development opportunities that are related to design, implementation and moderation of assessment are provided to staff.

Note: A student does not have a right to a merits review by the Student Appeals Body under the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006, and cannot appeal against an academic decision on the ground that the student believes that the academic decision was made in a manner that was inconsistent with the Assessment Principles.

66 Common result grades

(1) The University will award common result grades as set out in Schedule 1.
(2) The grades of high distinction, distinction and credit indicate work of a standard higher than that required for a pass.
(3) A student who completes a unit of study for which only a pass or fail result is available will be recorded as having satisfied requirements.

66A Simple extensions

(1) A unit of study co-ordinator, who is satisfied that it is appropriate to do so, may permit a student to submit a non-examination task up to two working days after the due date with no penalty.
(2) Such permission is an informal arrangement between the unit of study co-ordinator and the student which does not:
   (a) affect the student’s entitlement to apply for special consideration under this policy;
   (b) alter any time limits or other requirements relating to applications for special consideration; or
   (c) constitute an academic decision for the purposes of the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

Note: Any faculty resolution or local provision forbidding the granting of simple extensions is inconsistent with this policy.
67 Special consideration due to illness, injury or misadventure

(1) Generally, an illness, injury or misadventure will be taken into account when considering a student’s performance in a course or unit of study.

(2) Special consideration is provided in circumstances where well-attested illness, injury or misadventure occurs during a semester or at the time of an examination. It is an academic judgement which depends on the nature of the illness, misadventure or injury and its impact in relation to assessment or examination.

(3) Students who bear a primary carer responsibility toward another person at the time of an assessment may also apply for special consideration on the basis of illness, injury or misadventure on the part of the person for whom they care if their ability to prepare for or perform the assessment is adversely affected.

(4) Special consideration is also available to non-award students.

(5) Students who are granted special consideration must nonetheless be required to demonstrate achievement of designated learning outcomes.

(6) Rescinded.

(7) A student who is reasonably capable of attempting an examination should do so, despite any accompanying application for special consideration.

(8) All requests for special consideration must be genuine and made in good faith.
   (a) Attempts to use special consideration as a means of gaining an unfair advantage in an assessment must be rejected.
   (b) Making a request for special consideration that is not genuine or in good faith may lead to disciplinary action against a student.

(9) A request for special consideration does not guarantee that the request will be granted.

(10) Special consideration must not be granted for:
   (a) balancing workloads from other units of study, disciplines or faculties;
   (b) information and communications technology-related problems, except where they could not have been prevented, avoided or the effects minimised by reasonable diligence by the student; or
   (c) jury service, military service, national sporting, religious or cultural commitments or other unforeseen events for which special arrangements may be provided in accordance with this policy.

(11) Special consideration granted to one or more students should not disadvantage other students.

68 Students with a disability

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

   **Note:** See the University’s Disability Services website.

(2) Disability Services will determine the student’s eligibility for adjustments and inform the student and faculty of the required reasonable adjustments.
(3) Students wishing to apply for accessible examination and assessment conditions must make their application through Disability Services within specified timeframes.

(4) Accessible examination and assessment conditions include, but are not limited to:
   (a) extra time for reading, writing, resting or toilet breaks;
   (b) use of a scribe;
   (c) examination papers in alternative formats;
   (d) use of assistive technology;
   (e) ergonomic furniture;
   (f) using a designated room and experienced supervisors;
   (g) using a separate room with a scribe or assistive technology;
   (h) rescheduling and or spacing of examinations into the deferred examination period.

69 Special arrangements for assessments

(1) The relevant delegate may make special arrangements available to any student who is unable to meet assessment requirements or attend examinations because of one or more of the following:
   (a) essential religious commitments or essential beliefs (including cultural and ceremonial commitments);
   (b) compulsory legal absence (such as jury duty or court summons);
   (c) sporting or cultural commitments, including political or union commitments, where the student is representing the University, state or nation;
   (d) birth or adoption of a child;
   (e) Australian defence force or emergency service commitments (including Army Reserve);
   (f) the relevant delegate forms the view that employment of an essential nature to the student would be jeopardised and that the student has little or no discretion with respect to the employment demand.

(2) The relevant delegate may make special arrangements for a student who is unable to meet assessment requirements or attend examinations for any other reason that is beyond the student’s reasonable control, at the delegate’s own discretion, on a case-by-case basis.

(3) Special arrangements are intended to support the University’s commitment to flexible learning. However, while every reasonable attempt is made to accommodate student needs, it may not be possible to provide such arrangements in all cases. This is particularly so where clinical placements and practicums are involved.
Responsibilities for implementation of this Part

(1) The Academic Board is responsible for:
   (a) ensuring that assessment practices comply with this policy; and
   (b) ensuring that assessment practices and procedures are monitored and reviewed at the level of faculties in accordance with this policy, and that changes to assessment practices are made where appropriate as a consequence of such review.

(2) The Executive Director, Student Administrative Services is responsible for:
   (a) overseeing the release of results to students; and
   (b) overseeing the conduct of examinations.

(3) Deans and Associate Deans are responsible for:
   (a) ensuring that this policy is contextualised and implemented in all programs and units for which the faculty is responsible;
   (b) ensuring that faculty practices and standards in relation to assessment are consistent with this policy and any associated procedures; and
   (c) appointing a responsible head where the teaching of a unit of study is shared by more than one department.

(4) Heads of Schools and Deputy Heads of Schools are responsible for:
   (a) appointing principal examiners; and
   (b) appointing program directors.

(5) Program directors are responsible for:
   (a) developing and overseeing an assessment strategy for the students’ program or major that is consistent with this policy and any associated procedures;
   (b) fostering a whole of program or major approach to assessment;
   (c) ensuring program or major learning outcomes and standards are made clear to students;
   (d) monitoring overall assessment loads for both staff and students;
   (e) ensuring program or major learning outcomes are assessed at appropriate points throughout the degree;
   (f) ensuring that assessment tasks reflect increasing levels of complexity across the program or major; and
   (g) facilitating and promoting opportunities for professional development of assessment practice for all staff teaching a program, with particular emphasis on new and less experienced teachers.

(6) Unit of study co-ordinators and or principal examiners are responsible for:
   (a) developing and implementing an assessment strategy which is consistent with this policy and any associated procedures;
   (b) managing the moderation of assessment design and marking to ensure the validity and reliability of assessment within the unit;
(c) ensuring that assessment requirements for a unit are discussed and understood by all members of staff involved in teaching and assessment, including seasonal and casual teachers; and
(d) monitoring and reflecting on student assessment outcomes and student survey data to make changes to the assessment strategy for the unit in light of the review, as appropriate.

(7) **Unit of study lecturers and tutors** are responsible for:
   (a) assessing student work fairly, consistently and in a timely manner;
   (b) providing timely feedback which enables students to further improve their learning and performance wherever possible; and
   (c) advising students in relation to expectations relevant to specific assessment tasks.

(8) **Students** are responsible for:
   (a) actively engaging with assessment tasks, including carefully reading the guidance provided, spending sufficient time on the task, ensuring their work is authentic and their own (whether individual or group work) and handing work in on time;
   (b) actively engaging in activities designed to develop assessment literacy, including taking the initiative where appropriate (e.g. asking for clarification or advice);
   (c) actively engaging with and acting on feedback provided;
   (d) providing constructive feedback on assessment processes and tasks through student feedback mechanisms (e.g. student surveys or student representation on committees); and
   (e) becoming familiar with University policy and faculty procedures and acting in accordance with those policy and procedures.

**PART 15 PROGRESSION**

71 **Progression requirements**

**Note:** A student enrolled in an award course must meet the progression requirements and all the course requirements for an award course within the time limits for the course.

See Part 4 of the [Coursework Rule](#).

Subject to this policy, a faculty will prescribe in the faculty resolutions or the award course resolutions the progression requirements for coursework award courses in that faculty.

72 **Statement of intent**

(1) The University is committed to early identification and support of students who are not meeting progression requirements, and may therefore be at risk of exclusion from their award course.
(2) Associate Deans will assist and promote the progression of students who are not meeting progression requirements by:
   (a) regularly and effectively advising students of progression requirements;
   (b) identifying and alerting students who are not meeting progression requirements;
   (c) providing assistance to students who are not meeting progression requirements; and
   (d) tracking the progress of students after they are identified as not meeting progression requirements.

(3) Associate Deans will ensure that they have clear and transparent internal processes for handling students who are not meeting progression requirements, consistent with this policy.

73 Monitoring progression

(1) Associate Deans will monitor each student’s progression, including through reports generated by the student record keeping system.

(2) When monitoring each student’s progression, the Associate Dean may take into account:
   (a) whether the student has attended compulsory teaching and assessment components of a unit of study;
   (b) whether the student has over-enrolled in an attempt to catch up on failed units of study; and
   (c) whether there are significant variations in the student’s academic performance.

(3) Where the attendance record of a student is deemed by the Associate Dean to be unsatisfactory, that information will be recorded in the student record keeping system.

73A Early intervention strategies

(1) Students who believe themselves to be at risk of not meeting progression requirements, may apply to their faculty for an early intervention strategy.

(2) A faculty may implement an early intervention strategy by developing a study plan with the student based on the student’s academic performance or personal circumstances.

(3) Study plans should specify:
   (a) a study timetable;
   (b) an enrolment pattern; and
   (c) an estimated completion date for the degree.

(4) The faculty must record in the student’s electronic file:
   (a) the application for an early intervention strategy;
   (b) evidence of the specific circumstances; and
(c) the study plan.
(5) Students with an early intervention strategy must consult with the faculty about any proposed variations to the study plan.
(6) A student who fails to follow their study plan must contact the faculty for a reassessment of the study plan.

74 Progression profile

(1) Associate Deans will establish and maintain a progression profile for each student who is identified as not meeting academic progression requirements.
(2) The progression profile will include all documents relating to a student’s academic progression, including correspondence and interview records.
(3) The progression profile will be attached to the student’s file.

75 Triggers for identifying students who are not meeting academic progression requirements

(1) At the end of each teaching period relevant Associate Deans will identify the students in courses offered by their faculty who are not meeting academic progression requirements.
(2) A student will be identified as not meeting academic progression requirements in a teaching period if:
   (a) the student received a Fail, Discontinued - Fail or Absent Fail grade in more than 50% of the total credit points allocated to the units of study in which they were enrolled for the teaching period;
   (b) the student’s average mark for the teaching period was less than 50;
   (c) the award course resolutions stipulate that:
       (i) an average mark above 50 is required in order to remain enrolled in an award course or stream; and
       (ii) alternative enrolment is available; and
   the student’s average mark for all the units of study in which they were enrolled for the semester or other specified period was less than the average mark required by the award course resolutions;
   (d) the student failed one or more barrier units of study, compulsory units of study, field work, clinical work, practicum or other professional experience specified in the award course resolutions;
   (e) the student has failed twice to pass the same unit of study;
   (f) the student’s attendance record during the teaching period was unsatisfactory; or
   (g) the student is unable to complete their award course within the maximum time limit, while carrying a normal student load.

Commented [KH8]: PM comment: Degree and faculty resolutions will need to be checked against proposed changes.
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Stage 1 - Students identified for the first time as not meeting academic progression requirements

(1) The Associate Dean will send all students identified as not meeting academic progression requirements for the first time a letter and a self-reflective Staying on Track survey.

(2) The letter will advise each student:
   (a) that they have been identified as not meeting academic progression requirements;
   (b) why they have been identified as not meeting academic progression requirements;
   (c) that they are advised to:
      (i) complete a Staying on Track survey; and
      (ii) attend a Staying on Track information session;
   (d) that all correspondence and documents relating to their academic progression status will be recorded on their progression profile; and
   (e) where the student is enrolled in an award course whose normal full-time duration is two years or less, that:
      (i) if they fail to meet progression requirements in the following semester, they may be asked to show good cause why they should be permitted to re-enrol in the award course; and
      (ii) they are recommended to consult an academic adviser in their faculty.

(3) Associate Deans may require students to consult an academic adviser.

(4) The Staying on Track survey will:
   (a) assist students to identify why they are having difficulties meeting academic progression requirements;
   (b) advise students to avail themselves of, and include details of, student support services available at the University, including:
      (i) the Counselling Service;
      (ii) the Learning Centre;
      (iii) the University Health Service; and
      (iv) the student representative bodies.

(5) The Staying on Track information session will:
   (a) provide information on study skills; and
   (b) introduce students to the student support services in subclause (4) (b).

Note: See clause 78 for information on the show cause process.

Stage 2 - Students at risk of being asked to show good cause

(1) Students who:
(a) are enrolled in an award course whose normal full-time duration is two years or less; and
(b) are identified for the second time as not meeting academic progression requirements, without an intervening period of satisfactory progress;

will be asked to show good cause why they should be permitted to re-enrol in the award course.

(2) Students who:
(a) are enrolled in an award course whose normal full-time duration is more than two years; and
(b) are identified for the second time as not meeting academic progression requirements, without an intervening period of satisfactory progress as prescribed in clause 82

will be sent a warning letter and a Staying on Track survey by the faculty.

(3) The letter will advise each student:
(a) that they have been identified as not meeting academic progression requirements;
(b) why they have been identified as not meeting academic progression requirements;
(c) that they are advised to:
(i) complete a Staying on Track survey; and
(ii) attend a Staying on Track information session, if they have not already done so;
(d) that they are required to consult an academic adviser in their faculty; and
(e) that all correspondence and documents relating to their academic progression status will be recorded on their progression profile.

(4) The Staying on Track survey will:
(a) assist students to identify and explain why they are having difficulties meeting academic progression requirements; and
(b) require students to consult with their year adviser or Associate Dean, who will ask them to provide information about any support services they have consulted or other remedial action they have taken since they were first identified as not meeting academic progression requirements.

(5) The Associate Dean will record whether the student has consulted an academic adviser.

Note: The Associate Dean will take into account whether a student has consulted an academic adviser when determining whether a student has shown good cause for the purposes of clause 78.

78 Stage 3 - Being asked to show good cause

(1) The relevant Associate Dean may require a student who has not met the progression requirements or other standards set out in applicable faculty local provisions to show good cause why they should be allowed to re-enrol.
(2) For the purposes of this policy, ‘good cause’ means:

(a) circumstances beyond the reasonable control of a student, which may include serious ill health or misadventure, but does not include demands of employers, pressure of employment or time devoted to non-University activities, unless these are relevant to serious ill health or misadventure; and

(b) reasonable prospects of meeting progression requirements in the following semester.

(3) Students will be asked to show good cause where:

(a) they are enrolled in an award course whose normal full-time duration is two years or less, and they have been identified as not meeting progression requirements for that award course twice, without an intervening period of satisfactory progress as prescribed in clause 82; or

(b) they are enrolled in an award course whose normal full-time duration is more than two years, and they have been identified as not meeting progression requirements for that award course three times, without an intervening period of satisfactory progress as prescribed in clause 82; or

(c) they have twice failed the same compulsory or barrier unit of study, field work, clinical work, practicum or other professional experience.

(4) A student may be asked to show good cause more than once.

(5) A student who is asked to show good cause will be invited to provide written reasons why they should be permitted to re-enrol in their award course.

(6) A student’s response to a request to show good cause should:

(a) outline the circumstances that have negatively affected the student’s study performance;

(b) explain the specific effects or impacts of those circumstances;

(c) outline the steps that the student has taken, or will take in the future, to address each of those circumstances, with a view to ensuring that they will not negatively affect the student’s study performance in the future;

(d) if the student has previously been asked to show good cause, explain whether previously identified factors affecting their study performance have recurred, including reasons why previous strategies to address those factors have been ineffective; and

(e) attach any relevant documentary evidence.

(7) In all cases the onus is on the student to provide the Associate Dean with satisfactory evidence to establish good cause.

(8) The Associate Dean will provide reasons for their decision, which will be recorded on the student’s progression profile.

Note: Documentary evidence for subclause (6)(e) may include medical certificates, police reports, statutory declarations or academic transcripts. The Associate Dean may take into account relevant aspects of a student’s record in other courses or units of study within the University, and relevant aspects of academic studies at other institutions, provided that the student presents this information to the Associate Dean.

Note: A response to a request to show good cause is not a substitute for a special consideration or special arrangement application, which should be lodged as appropriate in accordance with this policy.
Permission to re-enrol

(1) The Associate Dean will permit a student who has shown good cause to re-enrol.

(2) Subject to clause 82, a student who is permitted to re-enrol will remain at Stage 3 of the process set out in this Part.

Actions that may be taken where a student does not show good cause

(1) Where a student has not shown good cause why they should be allowed to re-enrol, the Associate Dean may:
   (a) exclude the student from the relevant course; or
   (b) permit the student to re-enrol in the relevant award course subject to restrictions on units of study, which may include but are not limited to:
      (i) passing a unit or units of study within a specified time;
      (ii) exclusion from a unit or units of study; and
      (iii) specification of the earliest date upon which a student may re-enrol in a unit or units of study.

(2) The Associate Dean may not exclude a student who subsequently does not meet any restrictions on enrolment imposed under subclause (1)(b) without allowing the student a further opportunity to show good cause.

Note: For information on student appeals against decisions made by an Associate Dean under this clause, see the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

Applying for re-admission after exclusion for failure to meet progression requirements

(1) A person who has been excluded from an award course may apply for re-admission to the award course after at least two years.

(2) Re-admission will not be permitted without the approval of the Associate Dean.

(3) With the written approval of the Associate Dean, a person who is re-admitted to their award course may be given credit for any work completed elsewhere in the University or at another institution during a period of exclusion.

Note: For information on student appeals against decisions made by an Associate Dean under this clause, see the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

Note: For information on applying for admission to other courses at the University after exclusion, see clause 11.

Reversion

(1) Where a student previously identified as not meeting academic progression requirements meets progression requirements for two consecutive semesters, their name will be removed from the academic progression register.
(2) If, having been removed from the academic progression register, a student who has previously been identified as not meeting academic progression requirements fails again to meet progression requirements, they will be regarded as being at Stage 1 of the process outlined in this Part. These students may, at the Associate Dean’s discretion, be required to consult an academic adviser about their progress.

PART 16  SHOW GOOD CAUSE FOLLOWING FAILURE, DISCONTINUATION OR EXCLUSION

83 Show good cause following failure, discontinuation or exclusion

(1) The Associate Dean may require a student to show good cause why they should be permitted to re-enrol in a unit of study that they have failed or discontinued more than once, whether that unit of study was failed or discontinued when the student was enrolled in an award course offered by the current faculty or by another faculty.

(2) The Associate Dean may require a student who:

(a) has had their candidature in an award course at the University, or at another institution, terminated due to failure or discontinuation; and
(b) has subsequently been admitted or re-admitted to an award course at the University;

to show good cause why they should be permitted to re-enrol in a year of candidature or a unit of study that they have failed or discontinued in the year immediately following the admission or re-admission.

(3) Where a student has not shown good cause why they should be allowed to re-enrol, the Associate Dean may:

(a) exclude the student from the relevant course; or
(b) permit the student to re-enrol in the relevant award course subject to restrictions on units of study, which may include but are not limited to:

(i) completion of a unit or units of study within a specified time;
(ii) exclusion from a unit or units of study; and
(iii) specification of the earliest date upon which a student may re-enrol in a unit or units of study.

(4) The Associate Dean may not exclude a student who subsequently does not meet any conditions on enrolment imposed under subclause (3)(b) without allowing the student a further opportunity to show good cause.

Note: For information on student appeals against decisions made by an Associate Dean under this clause, see the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.
PART 17  AWARD COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Note: To qualify for the award of a degree, diploma or certificate, a student must:
• complete the award course requirements prescribed in any relevant faculty resolutions and the award course resolutions; and
• satisfy the requirements of the Coursework Rule and any applicable policy
See clause 5.1 of the Coursework Rule.

Note: See clause 102(3) for commencement dates of clauses 83A to 83C inclusive.

Note: See also clauses 18(1)–(10) of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

83A  Award course requirements for all Bachelor degrees

(1) The Bachelor degree:
(a) offers liberal, professional or specialist learning and education; and
(b) builds on prior secondary or tertiary study.

(2) All Bachelor award courses must meet:
(a) the requirements for either:
   (i) a Liberal Studies Bachelor degree; or
   (ii) a Professional or Specialist Bachelor’s degree;
   and
(b) the applicable award course resolutions.

83B  Award course requirements for the Liberal Studies Bachelor degree

(1) Any Liberal Studies Bachelor degree will have a requirement of 144 credit points of study as specified in the award course resolutions, including the requirement to complete:
(a) core units of study as specified, to a maximum of 24 credit points;
(b) a major or a program from the list specified;
(c) a minimum of 12 credit points of elective units from the open learning environment; and
(d) a minor from a shared pool of minors common to Liberal Studies Bachelor degrees.

(2) Every Liberal Studies Bachelor degree must be designed to support the development of the graduate qualities and must require all students to demonstrate those qualities.

(3) Every Liberal Studies Bachelor degree must offer the opportunity for students to complete:
(a) a second major in place of the minor required in subclause 83B(1)(d) above from a shared pool of majors common to Liberal Studies Bachelor degrees;
(b) a program from a pool of the degree’s list of available programs;
(c) elective units of study from a shared pool of elective units common to Liberal Studies Bachelor degrees (except where the requirements for a program do not allow sufficient free credit points to take electives);
(d) elective modules from the open learning environment;
(e) in addition to the Liberal Studies Bachelor degree, the requirements for the Bachelor of Advanced Studies in a combined degree as set out in the award course resolutions.

83C Award course requirements for the Professional or Specialist Bachelor degree

(1) Any Professional or Specialist Bachelor degree must:
(a) have a requirement of not less than 144 credit points of study as specified in the award course resolutions;
(b) support the development of the graduate qualities; and
(c) require all students to demonstrate those qualities.
(2) Professional or Specialist Bachelor degrees may offer the opportunity for students to complete, in addition to the Professional or Specialist Bachelor degree, a Bachelor of Advanced Studies.

84 Masters by coursework

The Masters by coursework degree:

(a) is a program of either or both of advanced learning and professional training;
(b) builds on prior undergraduate study; and
(c) normally leads to a capstone experience, which provides an opportunity to synthesise the knowledge and experience gained.

85 The capstone experience

(1) All Advanced Learning Masters degrees and appropriate Professional or Specialist Masters degrees culminate in a capstone experience.
(2) The capstone experience:
(a) is a unit of study designed to provide students with an opportunity to:
   (i) draw together the learning that has taken place during the award course;
   (ii) synthesise the learning that has taken place during the award course with their prior learning and experience; and
(iii) draw conclusions that will form the basis for further investigation and intellectual and professional growth;

(b) will be integrative, foster student autonomy and, where appropriate, a trans-disciplinary perspective;

(c) will contribute to award course aims and graduate qualities;

(d) is taken towards the end of the award course, with the result captured in a mark or the component of a mark;

(e) may take the form of:
   (i) a long essay;
   (ii) a thesis;
   (iii) a project;
   (iv) a professional placement;
   (v) a comprehensive or oral examination;
   (vi) a portfolio with commentary;
   (vii) a performance;
   (viii) an exhibition;
   (ix) a public presentation;
   (x) a law moot; or
   (xi) another activity appropriate to the discipline.

86 Award course requirements for the Advanced Learning Masters degree

(1) The Advanced Learning Masters degree comprises a minimum of one year of full-time advanced study culminating in a capstone experience.

(2) Advanced Learning Masters degrees contain optional opportunities for interdisciplinary study and research and, where appropriate and feasible:
   (a) exchange and work-based projects; and
   (b) professional or industry experience.

(3) Advanced Learning Masters degrees carry the title Master of Arts in [discipline], Master of Science in [discipline], or a title specified in the relevant award course resolutions.

(4) Candidates for the Advanced Learning Masters degree must complete a minimum of 48 credit points of study, or such higher number as specified in the award course resolutions, including:
   (a) core advanced units of study as specified in the award course resolutions;
   (b) a capstone experience;
   (c) elective advanced units of study, including:
      (i) an optional 12 credit points of research, as prescribed in the award course resolutions;
optional units of study offered by another faculty, as prescribed in the award course resolutions or with the permission of both faculties;

(d) where specified in the award course resolutions, optional elective units designed by the faculty involving a professional or industry project; and

(e) where appropriate and specified in the award course resolutions, optional inter-institutional units of study.

87 Award course requirements for the Professional Masters degree

(1) The Professional Masters degree comprises a minimum of one year and a maximum of four years of full-time study leading to a qualification that contributes to professional accreditation or recognition.

(2) Where appropriate to professional requirements, Professional Masters degrees will include:
   (a) a capstone experience;
   (b) opportunities for interdisciplinary study;
   (c) research;
   (d) inter-institutional study; and
   (e) professional or industry experience.

(3) Candidates for Professional Masters degrees must complete the requirements set out in the award course resolutions, which will include a minimum of 48 and a maximum of 192 credit points, including:
   (a) core units of study as specified in the award course resolutions;
   (b) where appropriate, a capstone experience;
   (c) elective advanced units of study including, where appropriate and feasible:
      (i) an optional 12 credit points of research as set out in the award course resolutions;
      (ii) optional elective units of study offered by another faculty, as prescribed in the award course resolutions or with the permission of both faculties;
      (iii) where specified in the award course resolutions, optional elective units designed by the faculty involving a professional or industry project; and
      (iv) where specified in the award course resolutions, optional exchange units.

87A Award course requirements for Research Pathway Masters degree

(1) The Research Pathway Masters degree builds on a prior undergraduate degree and develops advanced knowledge and skills necessary to undertake research in a Doctor of Philosophy.
The usual Research Pathway Masters degree is the Master of Advanced Studies [specialisation].

The volume of learning in a Research Pathway Masters degree will depend on the student’s prior undergraduate and postgraduate study, but will normally be:

(a) 48 credit points, for a student who has taken a major or specialisation in a 192 credit point undergraduate degree or AGF level 8 qualification at a standard accepted by the relevant faculty and in an area of the specialisation of the Masters degree;

(b) 72 credit points, for a student who has taken a major or specialisation in a 144 credit point undergraduate degree at a standard accepted by the relevant faculty and in an area of the specialisation of the Masters degree; or

(c) 96 credit points, for a student who has not taken a major or specialisation in the area of specialisation of the Masters degree at a standard accepted by the faculty.

The course resolutions for each Research Pathway Masters degree must:

(a) require a maximum of 96 credit points; and

(b) include:

(i) a research project of 24 – 36 credit points;

(ii) advanced coursework which develops knowledge and research skills in the discipline of the specialisation at 4000- and 5000 level;

(iii) a minimum of 72 credit points at or above -4000 level;

(iv) a minimum of 36 credit points at or above -5000 level;

(v) a minimum of 6 credit points and a maximum of 12 credit points from the open learning environment at -5000 level.

The course resolutions for a Research Pathway Masters degree may also provide for a maximum of 24 credit points at or above -3000 level for students admitted without an undergraduate major or specialisation as provided in subclause 87A(3)(c).

Note: For further discussion of levels, see the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

88 Award course requirements for the Graduate Diploma

1. The Graduate Diploma is an advanced program of study building on either or both of prior undergraduate and postgraduate study.

2. A Graduate Diploma may be offered as an embedded award in an Advanced Learning or Professional Masters program, or as a stand-alone award.

3. Where it is offered as part of an embedded program, the title of a Graduate Diploma will be Graduate Diploma in [discipline], where [discipline] is:

(a) an identifier that is unique within the faculty; and

(b) is used in the title of all components of the embedded program.

4. Where the Graduate Diploma is offered as a stand-alone program, its title will be as specified in the award course resolutions.

5. Candidates for a Graduate Diploma must complete a minimum of 36 and a maximum of 48 credit points of study, including:
(a) core units of study as specified in the award course resolutions; and
(b) where appropriate, elective units of study including optional elective units of study offered by another faculty, as prescribed in the award course resolutions or with the permission of both faculties.

89 Award course requirements for the Graduate Certificate

(1) The Graduate Certificate is an advanced program of study building on:
   (a) prior undergraduate study; or
   (b) where approved by the faculty, prior experience that is considered by the faculty to demonstrate knowledge and aptitude to undertake the required units of study.

(2) A Graduate Certificate may be offered as an embedded award in an Advanced Learning program, a Professional Masters program, a Graduate Diploma, or as a stand-alone award.

(3) Where it is offered as part of an embedded program, the title of a Graduate Certificate will be Graduate Certificate in [discipline], where [discipline] is:
   (a) an identifier that is unique within the faculty; and
   (b) is used in the title of all components of the embedded program.

(4) Where the Graduate Certificate is offered as a stand-alone program, its title will be as specified in the award course resolutions.

(5) Candidates for the Graduate Certificate must complete a minimum of 24 and a maximum of 36 credit points of study, including:
   (a) core units of study as specified in the award course resolutions; and
   (b) where appropriate, elective units of study including optional elective units of study offered by another faculty, as prescribed in the award course resolutions or with the permission of both faculties.

89A Award course requirements for the Sydney Professional Certificate

(1) The Sydney Professional Certificate is an advanced program of postgraduate study outside the AQF. It builds on:
   (a) prior undergraduate study; or
   (b) with faculty approval, prior experience considered by the faculty to demonstrate knowledge and aptitude to undertake the required units of study.

(2) Candidates for the Sydney Professional Certificate must complete 12 credit points of study at 4000-level or above, comprising a disciplinary pathway.

(3) The title of the Sydney Professional Certificate is “Sydney Professional Certificate in (name of disciplinary pathway)”.

(4) The Sydney Professional Certificate is governed by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.
Disciplinary pathways within the Sydney Professional Certificate are governed and managed by faculties and University schools.

90 Award course requirements for combined postgraduate coursework degrees and double degrees

(1) Subject to this clause, faculties may establish combined degree and double degree programs involving postgraduate coursework awards allowing some units to be cross-credited to both degrees.

(2) The minimum course requirement for a double Masters degree is 96 credit points, equating to two years of full-time study.

(3) The cross-credited units of study for combined postgraduate degrees and double degrees must not exceed a value of 12 credit points in each degree.

(4) Faculties may admit candidates to two postgraduate award courses and allow a maximum of 12 credit points to be credited to both awards, provided that:
   (a) where the awards are offered by two faculties, double enrolment is with the permission of the Deans of both faculties; and
   (b) units of study to be cross-credited in both degrees are cross-credited with the written approval of the relevant program directors.

91 Award course requirements for combined degree and double degree programs for the award of a Bachelor and Masters degree

(1) Subject to this clause, faculties may establish combined degree and double degree programs for the award of a Bachelor degree and the award of a Masters degree.

(2) The minimum requirements for a double degree combining the award of a Bachelor degree and a Masters degree is 192 credit points, equating to four years of full-time study.

(3) Candidates may not proceed to units of study at the Masters level without achieving in units contributing to the Bachelor degree at:
   (a) a credit level; or
   (b) such higher level as is set out in the award course resolutions.

91A Award course requirements for vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degrees generally

(1) This section applies to vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degrees approved after 1 January 2018.

(2) All vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degrees must meet:
   (a) the applicable course resolutions for each of the integrated award courses; and
   (b) the requirements for:
(i) Research Pathway vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degrees specified in clause 91B; or

(ii) Specialist or Professional vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degrees specified in clause 91C.

91B Award course requirements for Research Pathway vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degrees

(1) The award course resolutions for a Research Pathway vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degree with a Bachelor degree of 144 credit points must require:

   (a) a total of 216 credit points;
   (b) 72 credit points from the Master of Advanced Studies (discipline) degree, as specified in subclause 91B(2);
   (c) a minimum of 72 credit points at or above -4000 level;
   (d) a minimum of 36 credit points at or above -5000 level; and
   (e) a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 12 credit points from the open learning environment at -5000 level.

(2) The Masters portion of a Research Pathway vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degree with a Bachelor degree of 144 credit points must require:

   (a) a named specialisation that develops research ability in a discipline to a sufficient standard for admission to a Doctor of Philosophy;
   (b) a research project of 24-36 credit points; and
   (c) advanced coursework developing knowledge and research skills in the discipline of the specialisation at or above -4000 level.

(3) The course resolutions for a Research Pathway vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degree with a Bachelor degree of 192 credit points must require:

   (a) a total of 240 credit points:
   (b) 48 credit points from the Master of Advanced Studies (discipline) degree, as specified in subclause 91B(4);
   (c) a minimum of 48 credit points at or above -4000 level;
   (d) a minimum of 36 credit points at or above -5000 credit point level; and
   (e) a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 12 credit points from the open learning environment at -5000 level.

(4) The Masters portion of a Research Pathway vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degree with a Bachelor degree of 192 credit points must require:

   (a) a named specialisation that develops research ability in a discipline to a sufficient standard for admission to a Doctor of Philosophy;
   (b) a research project of 24-26 credit points; and
   (c) advanced coursework developing knowledge and research skills in the discipline of the specialisation at or above -4000 level.

Note: For further discussion of levels, see the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.
91C Award course requirements for Professional or Specialist vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degrees

(1) The award course resolutions for a Professional or Specialist vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degree with a Bachelor degree of 144 credit points must require:
   (a) a total of 216 credit points;
   (b) 72 credit points from the Master of Advanced Studies (discipline) degree, including:
      (i) a project of 12-36 credit points;
      (ii) a minimum of 72 credit points at or above -4000 level;
      (iii) a minimum of 36 credit points at or above -5000 level; and
      (iv) a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 12 credit points from the open learning environment at -5000 level.

(2) The award course resolutions for a Professional or Specialist vertically-integrated Bachelor and Masters degree with a Bachelor degree of 192 credit points must require:
   (a) a total of 240 credit points;
   (b) 48 credit points from the Master of Advanced Studies (discipline) degree, including:
      (i) a project of 12-36 credit points;
      (ii) a minimum of 48 credit points at or above –4000 level; and
      (iii) a minimum of 36 credit points at or above –5000 level; and
      (iv) a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 12 credit points from the open learning environment at –5000 level.

Note: For further discussion of levels, see the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

PART 18 AWARDS

Note: An Undergraduate Diploma may be awarded at one of four grades: pass, pass with merit, pass with distinction, pass with high distinction.

A Bachelor degree may be awarded at one of two grades: pass, or pass with honours.

Degrees of Master by coursework may be conferred, and Graduate Diplomas and Graduate Certificates may be awarded, only at a pass grade.

See clause 6.1 of the Coursework Rule.

Awards outside the AQF are awarded only at pass grade.

92 Transcripts and testamurs

(1) A student who has completed an award course or a unit of study at the University will receive an academic transcript upon application and payment of any required fees.
Note: For information on the circumstances in which the University will apply sanctions for unpaid debts, see the Student Debtor Sanctions Policy 2014.

(2) Testamurs and transcripts will provide the information specified in the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 and the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016.

92A Aegrotat and posthumous awards

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) may, on the recommendation of the relevant Dean, authorise the conferral of an aegrotat or posthumous award in circumstances involving serious illness or the death of a student.

PART 19 AWARDS WITH HONOURS

93 Admission to an award course with honours

(1) On the recommendation of the relevant Head of School or program director, an Associate Dean may admit a student to an appended honours course, if the student has:
   (a) met the requirements for a pass degree in the course;
   (b) achieved a weighted average of at least 65, calculated from at least 48 credit points of undergraduate study (excluding any 1000-level units if the course is available on a full-time basis to high school graduates); and
   (c) met any additional requirements set by the faculty resolutions or award course resolutions for admission to honours in the course.

(2) On the recommendation of the relevant Head of School or program director, an Associate Dean may admit a student to an integrated honours course:
   (a) if the student has:
      (i) met the requirements for a pass degree in the course;
      (ii) achieved a weighted average of at least 65, calculated from at least 48 credit points of undergraduate units of study (excluding any 1000-level units if the course is available on a full-time basis to high school graduates); and
      (iii) met any additional requirements set out by the faculty resolutions or award course resolutions; or
   (b) from the commencement of the award course if:
      (i) the Academic Board has approved the award course as one that meets the learning outcomes of an AQF Level 8 honours qualification; and
      (ii) the award course resolutions incorporate explicit requirements for completion of the award course that are consistent with the awarding of honours as prescribed in this policy.

(3) On the recommendation of the relevant Heads of Schools or program directors of faculties that offer and administer the proposed honours courses, an Associate
Dean may admit a student to honours or double honours in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies if the student has:

(a) completed:
   (i) 144 credit points in the combined degree program;
   (ii) a Liberal Studies undergraduate degree program at the University; or
   (iii) a program of study deemed by the relevant Heads of Schools or program directors to be the equivalent of such study;

(b) achieved a weighted average mark of at least 65, as specified in the award course resolutions, in the first three years (144 credit points) of the combined degree;

(c) completed:
   (i) requirements for a major in the intended area of honours specialisations; or
   (ii) study of equivalent depth in the intended area as set out in the award course resolutions; and

(d) met any additional requirements for admission to the honours courses set by the faculty or school and approved by the Academic Board.

(4) A student who is enrolled in an appended honours course:

(a) may not graduate with the pass degree; and

(b) may not enrol part-time except in accordance with the award course resolutions.

(5) A student who fails or discontinues an appended honours year may not re-enrol in it, except with the approval of the Associate Dean.

94 Principles for the award of honours

The principles for the University's offering degrees with honours are:

(a) the award of honours is reserved to indicate special proficiency;

(b) the University offers courses leading to a degree with honours to provide research training opportunities to students who demonstrate special proficiency and the ability to undertake further study and research within a discipline;

(c) a course leading to a degree with honours is intended to attract and stimulate students of high ability;

(d) honours awards are in classes, to recognise and reward outstanding academic ability;

(e) an honours course:
   (i) will provide the foundations of research training within the relevant discipline; and
   (ii) will have an identifiable, discipline-specific individual research, scholarly or creative component that is allocated at least 12 credit points; and
(f) the assessment tasks for research units of study will comprise, at least in part, a dissertation.

95 Qualifying for an award with honours

(1) To qualify for an award with honours, a student must meet the requirements set out in the faculty resolutions and award course resolutions.

(2) The award of a degree with honours, and the grade of honours awarded, will be assessed and calculated according to two mechanisms:

(a) for appended honours and for honours taken as an embedded component in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies - by an honours mark; or

(b) for integrated honours - by a grade average calculated across at least 48 credit points of study.

(3) Each faculty will publish the grading systems and criteria for the award of honours in that faculty.

96 Determining honours awards for appended honours and integrated honours (using a 48+ credit point average)

(1) This clause applies to:

(a) an appended honours course; and

(b) an integrated honours course where, under the award course resolutions, the conferral of the degree with honours, and the class of honours, is determined using a mark calculated across units of study attracting at least 48 credit points but less than 96 credit points.

(2) A student who achieves a mark within a range set out in the following table is to be awarded honours in the class set out in the table for that range.

| Item | A student who achieves an honours mark in the range... | will be awarded honours...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>80 ≤ honours mark ≤ 100</td>
<td>First Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75 ≤ honours mark &lt; 80</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>70 ≤ honours mark &lt; 75</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>65 ≤ honours mark &lt; 70</td>
<td>Third Class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) A student who achieves a mark of less than 65 is not awarded honours.

97 Determining honours awards for integrated honours (using a 96+ credit point average)

(1) This clause applies to an integrated honours course where, under the award course resolutions, the conferral of the degree with honours, and the class of honours, is determined using an honours mark calculated across units of study that together have at least 96 credit points.
(2) A student who achieves an honours mark within a range set out in the following table is to be awarded honours in the class set out in the table for that range.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>A student who achieves an honours mark in the range ...</th>
<th>will be awarded honours ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>75 ≤ honours mark ≤ 100</td>
<td>First Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>70 ≤ honours mark &lt; 75</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>65 ≤ honours mark &lt; 70</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50 ≤ honours mark &lt; 65</td>
<td>Third Class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) The award course resolutions for a course may require a student to achieve higher honours marks for particular classes of honours.

(4) A student who achieves a mark of less than 65 may be awarded Third Class honours where this has been specified as available under the course resolutions.

97A Determining honours awards on the basis of an embedded honours component in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies

(1) This clause applies to honours taken as an embedded component in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies.

(2) Where a student is undertaking a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, the student may be awarded the combined degree with honours on the basis of completion of an honours component embedded within the combined degree.

(3) The requirements for embedded honours in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies will be specified in the combined award course resolutions, and will require the completion of an honours component comprising:

   (a) 36-48 credit points of 4000-level work at honours level, including an honours research project of 12–36 credit points included in the 4000-level work; and

   (b) honours coursework of 12-36 credit points.

(4) A student may be awarded double honours in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies on completion of a second honours component.

(5) The requirements for double honours in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies will be the completion of:

   (a) 36-48 credit points as set out in subclause 97A(3); and

   (b) the requirements for the combined degree as set out in the award course resolutions.

(6) The honours mark will be:

   (a) calculated according to a method specified in the faculty or school resolutions of the faculty or school offering the honours course; and

   (b) based on results from 36-48 credit points of work as specified in subclause 97A(3).
(7) A student who achieves an honours mark within a range set out in the following table is to be awarded honours in the class set out in the table for that range.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>A student who achieves an honours mark in the range …</th>
<th>will be awarded honours …</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>80 ≤ honours mark ≤ 100</td>
<td>First Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75 ≤ honours mark &lt; 80</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>70 ≤ honours mark &lt; 75</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>65 ≤ honours mark &lt; 70</td>
<td>Third Class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8) A student who achieves a mark of less than 65 is not awarded honours.

(9) The honours mark for a student in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies will be determined by the faculty that administers the honours course in the discipline in which it is taken. The faculty administering the student’s candidature will award honours on the basis of the mark determined by the faculty administering the honours course.

(10) Where a student enrolled in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies is admitted to and completes honours requirements, the name of the honours component would replace the major indicated in brackets next to the title of the combined degree, consistently with the following examples:

- Bachelor of Science / Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Mathematics Honours) (Philosophy);
- Bachelor of Science / Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Mathematics Honours) (Philosophy Honours);
- Bachelor of Science / Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Mathematics Honours) (Philosophy Honours).

PART 20 UNIVERSITY MEDALS

98 Qualifying for a University Medal

A student who has qualified for a Bachelor degree with honours with an outstanding academic record throughout the award course may be eligible for the award of a University Medal.

99 Awarding University Medals

(1) Faculties may signal outstanding achievement in a Bachelor degree course with honours by awarding a University Medal to one or more students.

(2) Faculties will discuss and determine the normal minimum levels of academic performance required for the award of a University Medal, using broadly comparable University-wide criteria approved by the Academic Board.
(3) Honours students entering the University with advanced standing will be assessed for University Medals in the same way as students undertaking their entire award course within the University.

(4) In the case of students who have completed the requirements for honours as an embedded component in a combined degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies:

(a) the faculty offering the embedded honours component may recommend to the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies that a University Medal be awarded to a student, after considering the student’s honours mark and academic record for the entire combined award;

(b) the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies will consider all University Medal recommendations for students in a combined award with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies and make recommendations to the relevant administering faculties for candidates for the combined award; and

(c) the administering faculties for candidates for the combined award will award the University Medal according to the recommendation of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.

PART 21 TERMINATION OF CANDIDATURE

100 Failure to complete within time limits

The candidature of a student who has not completed the course requirements for an award course within the period prescribed under clause 4.2 of the Coursework Rule, is by force of this clause, automatically terminated at the end of that period.

Note: The candidature of a student who discontinues their enrolment in a course during their first year of enrolment in the course, without prior permission from the Dean to re-enrol, is automatically terminated in accordance with subclause 56(3) of this policy.

Note: The candidature of a student who does not enrol for any unit of study for two consecutive semesters is automatically terminated in accordance with subclause 58(3) of this policy.

101 Termination of candidature where disqualifying circumstances exist

(1) Subject to this clause, the Registrar may terminate the candidature of a student if one or more of the following disqualifying circumstances exist:

(a) the student, or someone acting on the student’s behalf, made a material misrepresentation in applying for admission to an award course;

(b) the student failed to disclose to the University a fact or circumstance material to its decision to admit the person to an award course; or

(c) the student was admitted to an award course on the basis of a degree, diploma or certificate obtained wholly or partly by fraud, academic misconduct or other dishonesty.
(2) Before terminating the candidature of a student in accordance with this clause, the Registrar must give the student written notice of the proposed termination of candidature.

(3) The notice must:
   (a) set out the basis on which it is proposed that the student’s candidature be terminated;
   (b) inform the student that they may make written submissions to the Registrar on the proposed termination of candidature, and by when to make such submissions;
   (c) inform the student that the Registrar will determine, after considering any submissions from the student, whether to terminate the student’s candidature.

(4) The period for making submissions under subclause (3) must be at least 20 working days.

(5) The Registrar will:
   (a) consider the student’s submissions within 10 working days of receiving them; and
   (b) take all reasonable measures to finalise the process as soon as practicable.

(6) If the Registrar is satisfied, after considering any submissions made by the student, that:
   (a) the disqualifying circumstances specified in the notice exist; and
   (b) because of those disqualifying circumstances the student’s candidature in the award course should be terminated;

the Registrar will terminate the student’s candidature in the award course.

(7) The Registrar will notify the student of the decision in writing, including reasons, as soon as possible after it is made.

(8) If the Registrar terminates the candidature of a student in accordance with this clause:
   (a) any liability of the student to pay fees or charges to the University is not affected in relation to the course; and
   (b) the student is not entitled to a refund, repayment or set off of any fee or other amount paid in relation to the course; and
   (c) the student will not be eligible for admission to any course at the University for a period of three years from the date of termination of candidature.

Note: A decision made by the Registrar in accordance with this clause is not an ‘academic decision’ and cannot be appealed to the Student Appeals Body in accordance with the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

102 Rescissions, replacements and transitional arrangements

(1) This document replaces the following, which are rescinded as from the date of commencement of this document:
(a) Admission: Advanced Standing, Credit and Exemption Policy, which commenced on 15 April 1998;
(b) Admission to Undergraduate Courses Policy, which commenced on 16 October 2002;
(c) Assessment Policy 2011, which commenced on 9 November 2011;
(d) Academic Board Policy on Awards with Honours, which commenced on 13 August 2003;
(e) Postgraduate English Language Requirements Policy, which commenced on 24 August 2011; and
(f) Student Academic Progression Policy, which commenced on 13 December 2006.

(2) A reference in any course resolution, faculty resolution or policy to any document rescinded by this policy should be construed as a reference to this policy.

(3) Clauses 83A, 83B and 83C apply to
(a) all new courses approved after 25 July 2016; and
(b) all other courses from 1 January 2018.
Common Result Grades

(1) The Academic Board has adopted a set of grades that are common to all undergraduate and postgraduate courses that award merit grades for coursework, as set out in the following table.

(2) Learning outcomes for units of study are reported in one of two ways:
   (a) by grade and mark: the mark and grade must correspond as indicated in the Schedule below;
   (b) by grade only: the grade should be either Satisfied Requirements (SR) or Failed Requirements (FR).

(3) Learning outcomes for a unit of study must be reported in the same way for all students enrolled in the unit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mark Range</th>
<th>Use in WAM</th>
<th>Impact on Progression/at risk status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 AF</td>
<td>Absent fail</td>
<td>Range from 0 to 49</td>
<td>Included in WAM</td>
<td>To Count as Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 CA</td>
<td>Credit (Aegrotat)</td>
<td>Range from 65 to less than 75</td>
<td>Included in WAM</td>
<td>To count as Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CN</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
<td>No mark</td>
<td>Not included in WAM</td>
<td>No impact on progression or at risk status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CR</td>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>Range from 65 to less than 75</td>
<td>Included in WAM</td>
<td>To count as Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 DA</td>
<td>Distinction (Aegrotat)</td>
<td>Range from 75 to less than 85</td>
<td>Included in WAM</td>
<td>To count as Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 DF</td>
<td>Discontinue - fail</td>
<td>No mark</td>
<td>Not included in WAM</td>
<td>To count as fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be awarded to students who fail to demonstrate the learning outcomes for the unit at an acceptable standard through failure to submit or attend compulsory assessment tasks or to attend classes to the required level.

In cases where a student receives some marks but fails the unit through failure to attend or submit a compulsory task, the mark entered shall be the marks awarded by the faculty up to a maximum of 49.

This grade should not be used in cases where a student attempts all assessment tasks but fails to achieve a mandated minimum standard in one or more task. In such cases a Fail (FA) grade and a mark less than 50 should be awarded.

May only be awarded by a Dean.

To be awarded in cases where a student is too ill to complete a unit but where the Dean is satisfied the student has demonstrated (on a pro rata basis) the learning outcomes for the unit at a good standard as defined by grade descriptors or exemplars established by the faculty. May only be awarded by a Dean.

To be awarded in cases where a student is too ill to complete a unit but where the Dean is satisfied the student has demonstrated (on a pro rata basis) the learning outcomes for the unit at a very high standard as defined by grade descriptors or exemplars established by the faculty. May only be awarded by a Dean.

Recorded on external transcript. This applies in cases of discontinuation from the time DC ceases to be automatically available up to the cessation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Included in WAM</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>Range from 75 to less than 85</td>
<td>To be awarded to students who, in their performance in assessment tasks, demonstrate the learning outcomes for the unit at a very high standard as defined by grade descriptors or exemplars established by the faculty.</td>
<td>Included in WAM</td>
<td>To count as Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Discontinued not to count as failure</td>
<td>No mark</td>
<td>Recorded on external transcript. This result applies automatically where a student discontinues after the Census Date but before the end of the seventh week of the Semester (or before half of the unit of study has run in the case of units of study which are not Semester-length). A Faculty may determine that the result of DC is warranted after this date if the student has made out a special case based on illness or misadventure (see clause 14(13)(a)(v) of the Assessment Procedures 2011).</td>
<td>Not included in WAM</td>
<td>Not to count as failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Range from 0 to less than 50</td>
<td>To be awarded to students who, in their performance in assessment tasks, fail to demonstrate the learning outcomes for the unit at an acceptable standard established by the faculty. This grade, with corresponding mark, should also be used in cases where a student fails to achieve a mandated standard in a compulsory assessment, thereby failing to demonstrate the learning outcomes to a satisfactory standard. In such cases the student will receive the mark awarded by the faculty up to a maximum of 49.</td>
<td>Included in WAM</td>
<td>To count as failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FR*</td>
<td>Failed Requirements</td>
<td>No mark</td>
<td>To be awarded in units of study where student achievement is measured either as Satisfied Requirements or Failed Requirements only, without a mark to students who, in their performance in assessment tasks, fail to demonstrate the learning outcomes for the unit at an acceptable standard established by the faculty.</td>
<td>Not included in WAM</td>
<td>To count as fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>HA</td>
<td>High Distinction (Aegrotat)</td>
<td>Range from 85 to 100 inclusive</td>
<td>To be awarded in cases where a student is too ill to complete a unit but where the Dean is satisfied the student has demonstrated (on a pro rata basis) the learning outcomes for the unit at an exceptional standard as defined by grade descriptors or exemplars for the unit established by the faculty.</td>
<td>Included in WAM</td>
<td>To count as High Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>HD</td>
<td>High distinction</td>
<td>Range from 85 to 100 inclusive</td>
<td>To be awarded to students who, in their performance in assessment tasks, demonstrate the learning outcomes for the unit at an exceptional standard as defined by grade descriptors or exemplars established by the faculty.</td>
<td>Included in WAM</td>
<td>To count as High Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>No mark</td>
<td>This is a temporary result which is used when examiners have grounds (such as illness or misadventure) for seeking further information or for considering additional work from the student before confirming the final result.</td>
<td>Not included in WAM</td>
<td>No impact on progression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Except in special cases approved by the Academic Board, this result will be converted to a normal permanent passing or failing grade either: (a) by the Dean at the review of examination results pursuant to clause 15 of the Assessment Procedures; or (b) automatically to an AF grade by the third week of the immediately subsequent academic session or in the case of Semester 2, by mid-February.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>To be awarded in cases where a student is too ill to complete a unit but where the Dean is satisfied the student has demonstrated (on a pro rata basis) the learning outcomes for the unit at an acceptable standard as defined by grade descriptors or exemplars established by the faculty. May only be awarded by a Dean.</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>To count as pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Pass (Aegrotat)</td>
<td>Range from 50 to less than 65</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>To count as pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Range from 50 to less than 65</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>To count as pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SA*</td>
<td>Satisfied Requirements (Aegrotat)</td>
<td>No mark</td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>To count as pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Result incomplete</td>
<td>No mark</td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SR*</td>
<td>Satisfied requirements</td>
<td>No mark</td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>To count as pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Unit of Study Continuing</td>
<td>No mark</td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>Progression status to be assessed at the last semester of the unit of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>No mark</td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>No impact on progression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHEDULE 2

1 Grade Descriptors for Honours awards

These descriptors are intended to apply to all Honours awards at the University of Sydney. They have been designed to foster collective thinking about standards between disciplines, to assist students, supervisors, staff and disciplinary groups to calibrate their own internal, professional or disciplinary standards with those applied across the University and to promote discussion about standards among students, staff, supervisors and faculties.

2 The University medal

(1) University medal candidates will have produced an outstanding research thesis that has been awarded a Class 1 Honours. Additionally, candidates will have demonstrated an exceptional level of achievement across the whole degree program.

(2) Knowledge: A student who receives First Class Honours and the University Medal will demonstrate commanding breadth and depth of knowledge of the discipline studied, together with a strong understanding of its context and insight into problem solving and into the potential for further inquiry.

(3) Skills: A student who receives First Class Honours and the University Medal will demonstrate:
   (a) advanced skills that equip them to function and solve advanced problems within a profession or discipline under supervision and with autonomy and insight;
   (b) a thorough proficiency in the methods, techniques and subject matter appropriate to the field or fields studied and insight into their application;
   (c) strong skills and insight in the interpretation of results, data and appropriate information sources;
   (d) a capacity for illuminating critical analysis and self-evaluation;
   (e) outstanding skills in written and oral communication and in organisation and documentation;
   (f) exceptionally innovative, creative and imaginative thinking; and
   (g) cognitive and technical skills to carry out a research project with a high level of autonomy.

(4) Application of Knowledge and Skills: A student who receives First Class Honours and the University Medal will demonstrate the application of knowledge and skills by demonstrating the following characteristics:
   (a) competently defending, where appropriate, their research within the chosen academic discipline at an expert level;
   (b) autonomy in thinking and motivation;
   (c) imagination, originality and insight;
   (d) comprehensive and extensive critical analysis and synthesis at an advanced level;
(e) insightful analysis of results and the potential and limitations of their study;
(f) a high degree of intellectual consistency; and
(g) coherent and rigorous design and meticulous execution of projects.

(5) Graduates at this level will demonstrate the capacity to pursue further study, and show the capacity for independent research at doctoral level.

3 First Class Honours

(1) Knowledge: A student who receives First Class Honours will demonstrate breadth and or depth of knowledge of the discipline(s) studied at a very high level, and the ability to place their work in context, appreciating the implications and broader significance.

(2) Skills: A student who receives First Class Honours will demonstrate:

(a) advanced or professional skills that equip them to function and solve advanced problems within a profession or discipline under supervision and with autonomy;
(b) a very high level of proficiency in the methods, techniques and subject matter appropriate to the field or fields studied;
(c) a very high level of skill in the interpretation of results, data and appropriate information sources;
(d) a high degree of sophistication in critical analysis and self-evaluation;
(e) outstanding written and oral expression, organisation, format and documentation;
(f) where relevant, highly innovative, creative and imaginative thinking; and
(g) a very high level of cognitive and technical skills to carry out a research project with considerable independence.

(3) Application of knowledge and skills: A student who receives First Class Honours will demonstrate the application of knowledge and skills by demonstrating the following characteristics:

(a) significant independence in thinking and motivation;
(b) significant evidence of originality and insight;
(c) comprehensive critical analysis and synthesis at an advanced level;
(d) a skillful treatment and analysis of unexpected outcomes or inconsistent results, and or recognition of some limitation of the methodology, if relevant; and
(e) a well-developed logical approach to designing appropriate research strategies.

(4) Graduates at this level will demonstrate the capacity to pursue further study, and show the capacity for independent research at doctoral level.
4 Second Class Honours, Division I

(1) **Knowledge:** A student who receives Second Class Honours, Division I, will have advanced knowledge in the discipline of study and sound knowledge of the research principles and methodologies appropriate to the field of study.

(2) **Skills:** A student who receives Second Class Honours, Division I, will demonstrate:
   
   (a) advanced or professional skills that equip them to function and solve problems within a profession or discipline under supervision and with independence;
   
   (b) a high level of proficiency in the methods, techniques and subject matter of the field studied;
   
   (c) a high level of cognitive skills to interpret results, data and other information sources;
   
   (d) mastery of the modes of expression appropriate to the field of study, enabling fluent and succinct presentation of knowledge; and
   
   (e) technical skills to plan a solid research project under supervision and execute it with some independence.

(3) **Application of knowledge and skills:** A student who receives Second Class Honours, Division I, will demonstrate the application of knowledge and skills by demonstrating the following characteristics:
   
   (a) design and plan a solid piece of research and scholarship;
   
   (b) critically evaluate and synthesise material; and
   
   (c) contextualize their work within the broader discipline of study.

(4) Graduates at this level will demonstrate the capacity to pursue further study, and pursue independent research at postgraduate level.

5 Second Class Honours, Division II

(1) **Knowledge:** A student who receives Second Class Honours, Division II will have advanced knowledge of an area of, or a problem in, a discipline in sufficient depth to understand the range of scope of a defined topic, have a broad grasp of its theoretical underpinnings and understand the general range of principal issues facing that area of the discipline.

(2) **Skills:** A student who receives Second Class Honours, Division II will demonstrate:

   (a) advanced or professional skills that equip them to understand problems within a profession or discipline under supervision and with some independence;

   (b) a broad understanding of the methods, techniques and subject matter of the field studied and some proficiency;

   (c) advanced cognitive skills to understand the interpretation of results and data and the ability to apply this understanding with supervision;

   (d) effective skills in the modes of expression appropriate to the field of study; and

   (e) technical skills to contribute to the planning of a research project and to execute it with direct supervision.
(3) **Application of knowledge and skills**: A student who receives Second Class Honours, Division II, will demonstrate the application of knowledge and skills by demonstrating the following characteristics:

(a) understand and be able to apply methodologies relevant to complex problems in their area of investigation under supervision and have demonstrated some independence of thought and autonomy; and

(b) with the guidance of a supervisor, draw valid conclusions based on investigation, observation and/or experiment, and understand the scope and limitations of those conclusions.

(4) Graduates at this level will demonstrate the capacity to pursue further study and after further research training, demonstrate the potential for independent research.

6 **Third Class Honours**

(1) **Knowledge**: A student who receives Third Class Honours will have advanced knowledge of an area of a discipline and understand relevant theory.

(2) **Skills**: A student who receives Third Class Honours will have

(a) skills that equip them to understand problems;

(b) some understanding of the methods, techniques and subject matter of the field studied;

(c) cognitive skills to understand the interpretation of results and data with supervision;

(d) communication skills that are able to articulate a problem and an approach taken to its solution; and

(e) technical skills to participate in the planning and execution of a research project with direct supervision.

(3) **Application of knowledge and skills**: A student who receives Third Class Honours will demonstrate the application of knowledge and skills by demonstrating the following characteristics:

(a) understand and be able to apply methodologies relevant to complex problems in their area of investigation under supervision.

(b) with the guidance of a supervisor, graduates will be able to understand and draw conclusions based on investigation, observation and/or experiment.

(4) Graduates at this level, after undertaking further research training, will demonstrate the capacity to pursue further supervised study.

7 **Fail**

(1) A fail to achieve Honours indicates that the student has not demonstrated the learning outcomes for any of the classes of Honours available.

(2) Students who do not achieve Honours may be awarded a pass degree provided that they have demonstrated the learning outcomes for the degree.
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PART 1  PRELIMINARY

1  Name of policy
This is the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

2  Commencement
This policy commences on 1 January 2016.

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

4  Statement of intent
This policy:
(a) describes the nature of education at the University;
(b) sets out the manner in which curricula are structured;
(c) provides for the effective management of learning and teaching; and
(d) establishes quality assurance processes for learning and teaching.

5  Application
Except to the extent that a contrary intention is expressed this policy applies to the learning and teaching of coursework award courses.

6  Definitions
(1) In this policy:

academic unit means a faculty, board of studies, school, centre or interdisciplinary committee of the University.
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**assessment** means the process of measuring the performance of students (as in examinations, assignments and other assessable work) that enables students to monitor their progress and contributes to their academic results in a unit of study.

**Associate Dean – Education** means:

- the Associate Dean of a faculty or University school with responsibility for education at the relevant level; or
- the deputy chairperson of a board of studies; or
- a person appointed by the Dean to have responsibility within the faculty for education at the relevant level. This position may have any of a number of different titles, including Associate Dean -Education, Associate Dean -Teaching or Learning, Associate Dean -Undergraduate Students, Associate Dean -Postgraduate Coursework or equivalent. The responsibilities of the Associate Dean -Education specified in this policy may be shared between more than one Associate Dean position.

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

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

**award course resolutions** means the resolutions setting out the requirements for the award approved by the Academic Board and tabled at a meeting of the Senate.

**Bachelor degree** has the meaning given the Coursework Policy 2014, which at the date of this policy is:

- an undergraduate degree that:
  - achieves at least the outcome specified for level seven of the AQF;
  - is a program of liberal, professional or specialist learning and education; and
  - builds on prior secondary or tertiary study.

The University offers two types of Bachelor degrees.

- Liberal Studies Bachelor degrees; and
- Professional or Specialist Bachelor degrees

**Note:** See clause 83A of the Coursework Policy 2014.
 Bachelor of Advanced Studies has the meaning given in the Coursework Policy 2014, which at the date of this policy is:

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

capstone experience has the meaning given in the Coursework Policy 2014, which at the date of this policy is:

a unit of study that provides students with an opportunity to draw together the learning that has taken place during the course, synthesise it with their own learning and experience, and draw conclusions that form the basis for further investigation and intellectual and professional growth.

Note  See clause 18.

combined degree course means a combination of two degree programs structured to enable students to count a specified number of units of study towards the requirements for both award courses, resulting in a lower volume of learning than if the two degrees were taken separately. See also double degree course.

Note:  See clause 18.

core means a set of units of study that develops required knowledge and skills for an award course.

course means a planned and structured sequence of learning and teaching primarily aimed at the acquisition of knowledge, skills and understanding.

coursework award course means a course approved by the Academic Board and endorsed by the Senate that leads to a degree, diploma or certificate and is undertaken predominantly by coursework. While the program of study in a coursework award course may include a component of original, supervised research, other forms of instruction and learning normally will be dominant. All undergraduate award courses, Sydney Professional Certificates, graduate certificates, graduate diplomas and those Masters degrees that comprise less than 66% research are coursework award courses.

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

Note:  See clauses 15 - 17.
Dean means:
- in relation to a faculty, the Dean of the relevant faculty.
- in relation to a University school, the Head of School and Dean of the relevant University school.

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

double degree course means a course in which a student completes two AQF qualifications under one set of award course resolutions with no cross-crediting of units of study between the qualifications.

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

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

faculty office means the professional staff led by a faculty manager or faculty general manager that support learning and teaching within a faculty.

graduate qualities means the qualities demonstrated by all graduates of award courses on completion of the requirements of the award course. Part 2 of this policy details the qualities of graduates of undergraduate award courses.

graduation statement means a statement issued on graduation that provides information about the qualification and student attainment in addition to, or incorporating the student transcript.

Group of Eight (Go8) means the coalition of eight research-intensive Universities, comprising The University of Melbourne, The Australian National University, The University of Sydney, The University of Queensland, The University of Western Australia, The University of Adelaide, Monash University and UNSW Australia.

Note: See https://go8.edu.au/

Head of School means the head of a school within a faculty with responsibility for approving arrangements for teaching and appointment of casual staff within the school. This role may be fulfilled by a position with another title (e.g. Head of Discipline or the chair of a board of studies or interdisciplinary committee.)

honours units means advanced units of study at 4000-level specified as requirements to qualify for an award with honours as set out in clause 95 of the Coursework Policy 2014.
LMS means learning management system, which is the online learning system used by the University to host unit of study websites.

learning outcomes means statements of what students know, understand and are able to do on completion of a unit of study, a major, program, award course, or other curriculum component.

Liberal Studies Bachelor degree has the meaning given in the Coursework Policy 2014, which at the date of this policy is:

- a program of study at Bachelor level of three years duration (or part-time equivalent) that provides students with a broad multi-disciplinary education that develops disciplinary expertise and graduate qualities.

major means a defined sequence of units of study taken by a student, which develops depth of expertise in a field of study.

Note: See clause 18.

minor means a defined sequence of units of study taken by a student, which develops expertise in a field of study.

Note: See clause 18.

open learning environment has the meaning given in the Coursework Policy 2014, which at the date of this policy is:

- a shared pool of units of study which are:
  - of zero, two or six credit points value;
  - approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies; and
  - available to all students according to the award course resolutions applicable to the award course in which they are enrolled.

postgraduate award course means an award course leading to the award of a Sydney Professional Certificate, Graduate Certificate, Graduate Diploma, Masters degree or a Doctorate. Normally a postgraduate award course requires the prior completion of a relevant undergraduate degree or diploma.

program means a combination of units of study that develops expertise in a multi-disciplinary domain or professional or specialist field and includes at least one recognised major.

Note: See clause 18.

Program Director means the person responsible, at a program, major or degree level, for managing the curriculum and providing co-ordination and advice to staff and students.
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Professional or Specialist Bachelor degree has the meaning given in the Coursework Policy 2014, which at the date of this policy is:

- a degree that develops disciplinary or professional expertise for a specific profession or career specialisation and graduate qualities.

Research Pathway Masters degree has the meaning given in the Coursework Policy 2014 which at the date of this policy is:

- a Masters degree that develops advanced knowledge and research skills in a discipline to prepare a student to undertake a Doctor of Philosophy.

semester means the main (longest) block of teaching in a teaching period as defined in Part 3.

shared pool means the list of majors, minors and units of study (including units in the open learning environment or Sydney Research Seminars) that are available to students enrolled in all Liberal Studies Bachelor degrees (including combined degrees with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies).

specialisation means:

- the disciplinary or professional expertise developed for a profession or career in a Professional or Specialist Bachelor Degree or postgraduate degree; or
- the research specialisation developed in a Research Pathway Masters Degree.

stream means a version of a degree that can be conceptualised as a separate degree for admission purposes but that is linked to a set of other streams of the degree through shared nomenclature, shared course components and shared rules.

Note: See clause 18.

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

Sydney Professional Certificate means an award, outside the Australian Qualifications Framework, obtained upon completion of an advanced course of postgraduate study approved by the Academic Board under section 1.3(1)(h) of the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014.

Sydney Research Seminars means units of study involving a cross-disciplinary group of students and staff in exploration of an interdisciplinary issue, challenge or problem approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>supervisor</td>
<td>means the member of the academic staff who is appointed to supervise a dissertation, treatise or long essay component of a coursework award program or an undergraduate honours program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>means a member of the academic staff involved in any of teaching, unit of study coordination or assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| teaching mode        | means the manner by which courses and units of study are presented to students, as specified in Part 3. Methods of instruction used in any teaching mode may include:  
  - face to face classes;  
  - fully online learning;  
  - blends of face to face and online learning; and  
  - on or off campus delivery, including off shore delivery. |
| teaching period      | means one of two periods each year, each consisting of a six month period and including a semester, during which teaching is delivered in coursework courses as defined in Part 3. Note: See clause 13. |
| third party learning technologies | means web-based and mobile applications which are not managed through a contract between the University and technology suppliers. |
| undergraduate award course | means a coursework award course leading to the award of an Associate Diploma, Diploma, Advanced Diploma, Bachelor degree or Bachelor (Honours) degree. |
| undergraduate degree | means an undergraduate award course at Bachelor level that achieves at a minimum the learning outcome specified for Level seven of the AQF. |
| unit of study        | means the smallest stand-alone component of an award course that is recordable on a student’s transcript. Units of study have an integer credit point value, normally six credit points except where approved by the Academic Board. Note: See clause 18. |
PART 2

THE NATURE OF EDUCATION AT THE UNIVERSITY

7 Graduate qualities and learning outcomes

(1) All [undergraduate award courses] must be designed to develop and assess the acquisition of the graduate qualities that the University has agreed are necessary to contribute effectively to contemporary society. These are achieved through a structured program, including learning outcomes of specific relevance to the particular award or discipline.

(2) Graduate qualities consist of:

(a) depth of disciplinary expertise;
(b) broader skills:
    (i) critical thinking and problem solving;
    (ii) oral and written communication;
    (iii) information and digital literacy; and
    (iv) inventiveness;
(c) cultural competence;
(d) interdisciplinary effectiveness;
(e) an integrated professional, ethical and personal identity; and
(f) influence.

(3) These qualities should be embedded in the curriculum in a way that enables students to:

(a) excel at applying and continuing to develop disciplinary expertise;
(b) learn and respond effectively and creatively to novel problems;
(c) work productively, collaboratively and openly in diverse groups and across cultural boundaries;
(d) work effectively in interdisciplinary (including inter-professional) settings;
(e) build broader perspectives, innovative vision, and more contextualised and systemic forms of understanding;
(f) build integrity, confidence and personal resilience, and the capacities to manage challenges and uncertainty; and
(g) be effective in exercising professional and social responsibility and making a positive contribution to society.

(4) The graduate qualities adopted by the University for undergraduates, and their purposes, are set out in the following table (Table 1):
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Table 1

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

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

8 Educational excellence

(1) All award courses must be designed towards the achievement of excellence in outcomes, experience and environment.

(2) Educational programs and the management of learning and teaching must be designed and managed to ensure excellence in:
(a) educational outcomes: at the conclusion of their educational experience, students will demonstrate the graduate qualities to a high standard;
(b) educational experience, as shown through:
   (i) the impact of teachers and their capacity to engage students productively in the teaching and learning process; and
   (ii) students’ mastery of the meta-cognitive skills that form the basis for self-directed learning;

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

(3) To ensure excellent outcomes, faculties must design processes in which:
   (a) curricula provide continuous and well-co-ordinated sequences of learning experiences leading to well defined learning outcomes, involving expert guidance through well designed learning activities;
   (b) students:
      (i) are actively engaged in learning;
      (ii) are challenged, guided and supported to reach a high standard of learning; and
      (iii) become increasingly aware of, and responsible for, their learning; and
   (c) students and staff demonstrate a commitment to working together to achieve excellence in educational experience and outcomes.

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

9 Engaged enquiry

(1) Learning programs must be designed to:
   (a) enable students to acquire and apply knowledge and skills through engaged enquiry;
   (b) challenge students with novel problems; and
   (c) enable students to demonstrate increasing awareness of, and responsibility for, their learning.

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

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

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

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

(6) Research-enriched enquiry and engagement together form a core principle against which learning programs must be assessed.
10 Academic integrity

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

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

11 Collegial governance

(1) The purpose of collegial governance is to provide a vehicle for:

(a) continuous improvement and innovation;
(b) an effective framework to achieve educational excellence; and
(c) the achievement of graduate qualities and learning outcomes to a high standard by each student.

(2) All award course programs must be overseen by a course committee or standing committee of the relevant faculty or board of studies.

Note: A standing committee may have oversight of more than one award course, or of a category of award courses: for example, all undergraduate awards or all postgraduate coursework awards.

(3) All committees with responsibility for oversight of award course programs must include:

(a) representatives of the academic disciplines responsible for teaching;
(b) representatives of students enrolled in the award course program; and
(c) the relevant Associate Dean - Education.

(4) Committees responsible for award courses may:

(a) make recommendations to the faculty or Head of School and Dean on:

(i) learning outcomes;
(ii) curricula;
(iii) units of study;
(iv) assessment;
(v) educational excellence;
(vi) academic integrity; and
(vii) program review;

and

(b) take such decisions on these and other matters related to learning and teaching within award courses as delegated by the faculty,

provided that the faculty retains oversight and responsibility for the outcomes, quality and review of award courses.

(5) Faculties, or their relevant standing committees, may also establish such other program committees (including, if appropriate, unit of study committees) as are
necessary for ensuring excellence in outcomes, experience and environment. Program committees must include:

(a) representatives of teachers within the program; and
(b) students enrolled in the program.

(6) Faculties, or their relevant standing committees, must ensure that award courses receive a comprehensive review including external referencing or other benchmarking at least every seven years and must forward a report of the review to the Academic Board.

(7) Award course review committees must include:

(a) representatives of the academic disciplines responsible for teaching in the award course;
(b) students enrolled in, or recently graduated from the award course; and
(c) relevant stakeholders from professions or industry, as determined by the committee responsible for oversight of the award course.

(8) The faculty and award course committees are responsible for obtaining approval of units of study, programs and award courses consistently with Part 4.

(9) Learning programs must be developed and managed through a collegial process which must:

(a) be evidence based (using academic expertise, research, benchmarking, and, where appropriate, market appraisal); and
(b) build on consultation with stakeholders listed in subclause 11(7).

Note: See clause 23 for specific authorities, roles and responsibilities for the management of learning and teaching.

12. Equality of opportunity

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

(a) special admission schemes, which make allowance for educational disadvantage through alternative pathways;

Note: See Coursework Policy 2014

(b) support programs to assist certain students admitted under special admissions schemes to succeed;

(c) accessible examination and assessment arrangements, supported by the Disability Services unit;

(d) special consideration and special arrangements for examinations;

Note: See Coursework Policy 2014 and Assessment Procedures 2011

(e) support programs for Aboriginal and Torres Strait islander students; and

(f) counselling and psychological services.

Note: See clause 23 for specific authorities, roles and responsibilities for the management of learning and teaching.
PART 3 – TEACHING PERIODS AND MODES

13 Teaching periods

(1) There will be two teaching periods for coursework award courses each year:
   (a) Teaching Period 1; and
   (b) Teaching Period 2.

(2) Each teaching period will consist of:
   (a) a semester period (called Semester 1 or Semester 2); and
   (b) other approved periods of teaching availability, where units are delivered in intensive mode.

(3) Teaching Period 1 will commence on 1 January and end on 30 June.

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

(4) Teaching Period 2 will commence on 1 July and end on 31 December.

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

(5) Teaching and learning must take place within a semester or other approved periods of teaching availability for intensive mode teaching, or within a special calendar for a faculty or University School approved by the Academic Board.

(6) A semester comprises 13 weeks of programmed learning, one study week and one to two weeks for examination and assignment preparation.

(7) Dates for teaching periods, semesters and periods of availability for intensive mode teaching must be approved by the Academic Board.

14 Teaching modes

(1) Coursework teaching may be delivered in one of two modes:
   (a) standard mode, which:
      (i) follows a weekly pattern of learning and assessment activities spread over a semester; and
      (ii) usually requires 1.5 to 2 hours of student effort per credit point per week.
   (b) intensive mode, which:
      (i) compresses learning and assessment activities into a shorter period of time; and
      (ii) requires a higher commitment of student effort per credit point per week than is required for standard mode.
Intensive mode teaching may take place in either teaching period, and can occur within a semester or other approved period of teaching availability.

PART 4 CURRICULUM STRUCTURE

15 Statement of intent

This part:

(a) prescribes the structure of the curriculum for award courses and units of study; and

(b) articulates the components of award courses and the broad structure of undergraduate, postgraduate and combined coursework awards.

16 Learning outcomes

(1) Learning outcomes articulate the specific achievements in skill, knowledge and application necessary to demonstrate graduate qualities in a particular discipline. They must be aligned with graduate qualities and must be assessed as part of the curriculum.

(2) Learning outcomes should be specified for award courses and for each of their components, including as relevant units of study, majors, programs and specialisations.

(3) Learning outcomes specified for the components of an award course should be aligned with each other and with the learning outcomes of the award course.

17 Award courses

(1) An award course must enable students to demonstrate graduate qualities through defined learning outcomes.

(2) Titles for awards in the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) must be consistent with the AQF Issuance Policy.

(3) The title of an award course must include:

(a) the qualification type; and

Note: See section 1.3 of the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014 and section 1.03 of the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011.

(b) the discipline.

(4) The title of an award course may include one or more optional components, such as a stream.

(5) Award courses must follow an orderly and flexible program of learning experiences in a curriculum designed and approved consistently with this policy.

(6) Award courses must have defined outcomes which:

(a) specify the relevant graduate qualities;
specify the learning outcomes that must be achieved to demonstrate those graduate qualities for a particular discipline; and
demonstrate achievement, at a minimum, of the learning outcomes specified for the qualifications type and level in the AQF.

(7) Award courses must follow a curriculum which:
(a) takes a student-centred approach to the achievement and assessment of learning outcomes in a coherent fashion;
(b) is regularly reviewed (at least every seven years) by faculties consistently with this policy, in the light of student outcomes and the student experience, the growth of knowledge, changes in the learning environment and stakeholder input; and
   Note See clause 11.
(c) incorporates the components of the curriculum framework set out in clauses 15 - 20.

18 Curricula generally

(1) Curricula must enable students to achieve the graduate qualities and learning outcomes of an award course or component of an award course. A curriculum sets out, in a progressive and cumulative manner:
(a) specified knowledge and skills, expressed as learning outcomes;
(b) the learning experiences and inquiry processes by which they are acquired;
(c) how they are applied; and
(d) an orderly and methodical assessment process through which they are demonstrated to a high standard.

(2) Curricula should be designed to enable a combination of disciplinary depth and breadth of learning appropriate to the aims of the award course.
(a) Disciplinary depth enables students to achieve command and understanding of a discipline area and can be achieved through focussed study in a program, major, through the completion of components, or through the completion of a stream.
(b) Disciplinary breadth enables students to contextualise their learning in the context of related studies and other disciplines, apply it to new contexts and augment it according to their learning needs and interests. Disciplinary breadth is achieved through electives, minors, additional majors, studies in other disciplines, interdisciplinary projects and the open learning environment.

(3) A curriculum framework is a broad structure for the constituent educational experiences offered by each degree. It comprises components that are essential for every student to reach an agreed standard, and enrichment opportunities that enable students to extend learning according to individual needs and interests, but are not required or relevant for every student.
Curriculum framework for undergraduate education

(1) The curriculum framework for new and revised undergraduate awards must include the following components:
   (a) a program, major, stream or specialisation in at least one field of study;
   (b) a structured approach to the development of knowledge and skills;
   (c) collaborative and group-based learning activities and assessments;
   (d) interdisciplinary and inter-professional learning experiences;
   (e) authentic problems and assessments;
   (f) an open learning environment for the extension of knowledge and skills; and
   (g) project-based learning.

(2) If an undergraduate degree is offered exclusively as part of combined or double degree courses, the components may be in either award course and need not be in both individually.

(3) The following table (Table 2) sets out the graduate qualities associated with each of these components.

Note: The curricula for award courses developed prior to 1 January 2016 must include these components when reviewed in line with clause 11(6)

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Graduate qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A major or specialisation in at least one field of study</td>
<td>Depth of disciplinary expertise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A structured approach to the development of knowledge and skills | Depth of disciplinary expertise  
|                                                   | Broader skills                         |
|                                                   | Cultural competence                    |
|                                                   | Integrated identity                    |
| Collaborative and group-based learning activities and assessments | Broader skills                      
|                                                   | Cultural competence                    |
|                                                   | Integrated identity                    |
|                                                   | Influence                               |
| Interdisciplinary and inter-professional learning experiences | Broader skills                      
<p>|                                                   | Interdisciplinary effectiveness         |
|                                                   | Influence                               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Graduate qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authentic problems and assessments | • Depth of disciplinary expertise  
| | • Broader skills  
| | • Interdisciplinary effectiveness  
| | • Integrated identity  
| | • Influence  |
| An open learning environment for extension of knowledge and skills | • Broader skills  
| | • Interdisciplinary effectiveness  
| | • Integrated identity  
| | • Influence  |
| Project-based learning | • Depth of disciplinary expertise  
| | • Broader skills  
| | • Integrated identity  
| | • Influence  |

### 20 Curriculum framework for postgraduate coursework education other than the Sydney Professional Certificate

(1) This clause applies to graduate certificates, graduate diplomas, Masters degrees and Doctoral degrees at level 9 of the AQF. It does not apply to the Sydney Professional Certificate.

**Note:** The Sydney Professional Certificate is an award outside the AQF. See clause 89A of the Coursework Policy 2014.

(2) The curriculum framework for postgraduate coursework awards must include:

(a) advanced specialisation in a field of knowledge;

(b) research skills;

(c) a structured approach to the development of knowledge and skills;

(d) a capstone experience in research, scholarship or professional project.

(3) The curriculum framework for postgraduate coursework units may include one or more of the following:

(a) a major;

(b) a minor;

(c) interdisciplinary study;

(d) exchange and work based projects;

(e) professional or industry experience;

(f) authentic problems and assessments;

(g) elective units; and
(h) project-based learning.

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

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

Note: See Part 17 of the Coursework Policy 2014 for the requirements for different postgraduate award types.
20A Curriculum framework for the Sydney Professional Certificate

(1) This clause applies to courses offered within the Sydney Professional Certificate.

(2) The curriculum framework for courses within the Sydney Professional Certificate must include:
   (a) advanced specialisation in a field of knowledge;
   (b) a structured approach to the development of knowledge and skills to achieve the learning outcomes for the course.

(3) The curriculum framework for courses within the Sydney Professional Certificate may include one or more of the following:
   (a) interdisciplinary study;
   (b) authentic problems and assessments;
   (c) core and elective units; and
   (d) project-based learning.

21. Components of award courses

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

(1) Only faculties or the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies may offer award courses, streams, programs, majors, minors and units of study, which must be approved consistently with this policy.

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

(3) Programs:
   (a) are a combination of units of study that develop expertise in a multi-disciplinary domain or a professional or specialist field and include a recognised major in a field of study;
   (b) must have intellectual and educational coherence and specified learning outcomes as required in clause 13; and
(c) in undergraduate degrees, comprise:
   (i) a minimum of 12 and a maximum of 24 credit points at 1000-level;
   (ii) a minimum of 12 and a maximum of 24 credit points at 2000-level;
   (iii) a minimum of 18 and a maximum of 24 credit points at 3000-level units of study;

   Note: Three year programs (available in degrees of 144 credit points) must not, when combined with the requirements of the degree core, require more than 84 credit points (72+12).

(iv) in degrees and combined degrees requiring 192 credit points, up to 48 credit points at 4000 level;

   Note: Four year programs (available in degrees of 192 credit points) must not, when combined with the requirements of the degree core, require more than 132 credit points (120+12).

(v) an embedded major;

(vi) at least 12 credit points of the degree core, if a degree core is specified for the degree; and

(d) are recorded on the student’s transcript.

(4) Majors:

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

(b) must have intellectual and educational coherence and specified learning outcomes as required in clause 13;

(c) in all undergraduate degrees, must require exactly 48 credit points; as specified in this sub clause;

(d) in Liberal Studies Bachelor degrees, and undergraduate degrees of 144 credit points, must include:
   (i) exactly 12 credit points at 1000-level units of study;
   (ii) a minimum of 12 and a maximum of 18 credit points at 2000-level; and
   (iii) a minimum of 18 and a maximum of 24 credit points at 3000-level (or, higher for degrees requiring more than 144 credit points);

(e) in Professional or Specialist Bachelor degrees of 192 credit points or more, must include:
   (i) a minimum of 12 credit points at 1000- or 2000-level;
   (ii) a minimum of 18 credit points and a maximum of 36 credit points at or above 3000-level;

(f) in undergraduate degrees, must include at the 3000-level (or, for 192 credit point Professional or Specialist degrees, at the 3000 level or higher):
   (i) 1 x 6 credit point unit involving completion of a project requiring the integration and application of disciplinary knowledge and skills; and
   (ii) 1 x 6 credit point unit requiring the application of disciplinary skills and knowledge in an interdisciplinary context; and
(g) are recorded on the student transcript.

**Note:** the requirements of sub clauses (4)(f)(i) and (4)(f)(ii) may both be met through a single unit. Where a student takes two majors, and a single unit or units of study exists such that the requirement for (4)(f)(i) or (4)(f)(ii) can be met in both majors, that or those units may be used in fulfilment of requirement 4(f)(i) or 4(f)(ii) in both majors, provided that all other requirements in 18(3) are met for each major.

(h) Guidelines for majors are set out in Schedule 4 of the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2014.

(5) **Minors:**

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

(b) in undergraduate degrees, comprise units to the value of exactly 36 credit points including:

(i) exactly 12 credit points at 1000-level;

(ii) a minimum of 12 and a maximum of 18 credit points at 2000-level;

(iii) a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 12 credit points at 3000-level;

and

(c) are recorded on the student’s transcript.

(6) **A degree core:**

(a) is a set of units of study that develops required knowledge and skills for the degree and which is required to be completed by all students within an award course or a stream or specialisation within an award course;

(b) in Liberal Studies Bachelor degrees, comprises no more than 24 credit points at 1000- or 2000-level.

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

**Note:** See Coursework Policy 2014

(8) **Combined degrees and double degrees** must meet the learning outcomes of both component award courses.

(a) All Liberal Studies, and specified Specialist or Professional, Bachelor degrees may be combined with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies as set out in the applicable award course resolutions.

(9) **Award courses** may achieve depth and breadth of learning by the specification of core units and elective units.

(a) Units of study may be specified as core units if the faculty determines them to be essential to achieve the learning outcomes of the award course, stream, program, major, minor or specialisation. Core units must be completed by all students enrolled in the award course or relevant curriculum component or specialisation.

(b) Elective units are units chosen by students in order to extend their degree requirements according to their need or interests and contribute to graduate qualities. Electives are chosen from a list defined by the faculty and approved by the Academic Board.

(10) **Units of study**
(a) Units of study:

(i) follow a programmed set of coherent learning experiences and assessments that lead progressively to the achievement of the learning outcomes for the unit; and

(ii) must be completed over one or two teaching sessions.

(b) Faculties must define learning outcomes for each unit of study which are aligned with those of the award courses in which the unit of study is offered and those of other components of award courses of which it is a part.

(c) Except in the case of 'shell' units used for students undertaking study at another institution and other purposes, the learning outcomes, requirements and assessment framework and standards of a unit of study must be the same for all students taking that unit of study, regardless of the award course in which they are enrolled.

(d) Student transcripts and student record files must record a single result and a single credit point value for each unit of study attempted by a student.

(e) Units of study must be identified by an eight character alpha-numeric code, of which the first four are letters identifying the relevant school, department or discipline and the final four are integers identifying the unit of study and the level at which it is offered.

(f) The integers in the unit of study alpha-numeric code must commence with a number which indicates the level, in the generic form ****1xxx (for 1000-level units), ****2xxx (for 2000-level units) and so on.

(g) 1000-level units of study have learning outcomes of a foundational or introductory nature and are designed for students in the first year of a bachelor degree.

(h) 2000-level units of study have learning outcomes which assume prior foundational or introductory study and are designed for students who have completed the first year of a bachelor degree.

(i) 3000-level units of study have learning outcomes designed for students in the third year of a bachelor degree. In 144 credit point bachelor degrees, such units should enable students to demonstrate learning outcomes at a level expected for those completing a bachelor degree at AQF level 7.

(j) 4000-level units of study have learning outcomes at the advanced or honours level and are designed for students who have already achieved learning outcomes for a 144 credit point pass-level bachelor degree or who are completing the final year of a 192 credit point bachelor degree.

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

(11) Credit points and student workload

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

(b) The full time credit point load for undergraduate and postgraduate coursework award courses is 48 credit points per year. This will normally consist of 24 credit points per semester, and can include up to 30 credit points per teaching period or up to 36 with the approval of the Associate Dean. A full time credit point load for a year of 48 credit points equates to a
student workload of 1350-1800 hours per year including class time, private study, assessment and assessment preparation.

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

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

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

(f) Where units of study are core units in more than one award course or shared individually or as part of a major or minor in the shared pool, faculties must design units of study to meet the learning needs of students in all award courses and components for which the unit is a core unit.

(g) The relationship between the level of student effort in a unit of study and the credit point value of that unit must take account of all courses sharing that unit of study.

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

(i) 24 credit points equates to the effort expected of a full-time student, studying 36 – 48 hours per week or pro-rata for part-time students.

(ii) A single credit point should therefore equate notionally to a minimum expectation of 1.5 – 2 hours of student effort per week for units of study offered over a semester.

(iii) Flexibility between different units may be exercised in the allocation of credit point value to accommodate any tensions between the duration of core learning experiences and their perceived importance in achieving learning outcomes for the award course.

(iv) Faculties introducing new units of study with a credit point value other than six must inform the Academic Board, explaining the rationale for deviating from the standard and addressing issues of compatibility.

(12) On academic grounds, a faculty may propose to the Undergraduate or Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board units of study with zero, one or two credit points.

22 Assessment framework

(1) Assessment is the means by which students demonstrate graduate qualities and learning outcomes in a unit of study and in an award course.

(2) Learning outcomes for units of study must be assessed either within the unit of study or within an assessment framework for the award course or a component of an award course.

(3) The assessment framework of award courses and units of study must promote student learning and engaged enquiry, and be designed to ensure that key milestones in the achievement of learning outcomes are met to a standard sufficient to allow progression.

(4) Faculties must design the assessment framework of an award course to ensure that all students who successfully complete the award course demonstrate the graduate qualities and specified learning outcomes for the award.
(5) Unit of study co-ordinators must design the assessment framework of a unit of study to ensure that all students who successfully complete the unit of study demonstrate the graduate qualities and learning outcomes of the unit of study and are assessed to the same standard.

(6) The University’s policy and procedures on assessment are set out in Part 14 of the *Coursework Policy 2014* and in the *Assessment Procedures 2011*.

### 23 Academic integrity in the design of curricula

(1) Learning experiences, programs and curricula must be designed to educate students early in the first year about academic integrity, appropriate acknowledgement, academic honesty and avoiding plagiarism.

(a) This education must include an online module endorsed by the Office of Educational Integrity and should also include tutorials work and scaffolding writing tasks as appropriate.

(2) The assessment framework of award courses and the assessment matrix within each unit of study must be designed and reviewed each time the unit is offered to ensure academic integrity.

(3) Faculties must manage the risk to academic integrity within the assessment framework for each unit of study consistently with the *Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015* and associated procedures.

---

### 24 Third party learning technologies

(1) All use of third party learning technologies must be consistent with relevant University policies, including in particular:

(a) *Policy on the Use of University Information Communications Technology Resources*;

(b) *Privacy Policy 2017*; and

(c) *Recordkeeping Policy 2017*.

(2) Staff members and academic units:

(a) are responsible for identifying and managing any risks associated with third party learning technologies which they introduce and use in association with their teaching; and

(b) must register the use of such technologies with the office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).

(3) Third party learning technologies must not be used for assessment purposes without the permission of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).

(4) Where a third party learning technology is introduced by the University, the University must:

(a) develop and communicate an appropriate strategy for support of the technology; and

(b) establish and implement appropriate mechanisms for:
(i) retrieving and storing records of student activity generated by the
technology; and
(ii) trialling and evaluating the use of the technology.

(5) Where a third party learning technology is introduced by a staff member or
academic unit, the person or unit introducing it must:
(a) develop and communicate an appropriate strategy for support of the
technology; and
(b) establish and implement appropriate mechanisms for:
(i) retrieving and storing records of student activity generated by the
technology; and
(ii) trialling and evaluating the use of the technology.

PART 5 MANAGEMENT OF LEARNING AND TEACHING

25 Statement of intent

The purpose of this part of the policy is to set out the framework, and specific
responsibilities, for the management and evaluation of learning and teaching at unit of
study, degree and University level. This includes academic governance authorities, roles
and responsibilities, and quality assurance processes.

26 Roles and responsibilities in managing learning and teaching

(1) Delegations of authority for the management of learning and teaching are set out
in:
(a) University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule
2016; and
(b) University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions)
Rule 2016.

(2) The Academic Board
(a) subject to endorsement by Senate, approves the award course level
curriculum which is developed, implemented and monitored by the faculty;
(b) approves requirements and other elements of award courses as set out in
the Coursework Policy 2014, award course resolutions and tables of units of
study, including:
(i) determining the type of degree;
   Note: For Bachelor degrees, types are: Liberal Studies, or Specialist or
   Professional.
   For Masters degrees types are: Advanced Learning by coursework,
   Professional by coursework (including masters Degree (Extended)),
   Research Pathway by coursework, or research.
(ii) the inclusion of degree core, streams, programs, majors and minors in
award course requirements;
(iii) the inclusion of mandatory units, and barrier assessments;
(iv) the table of units of study for an award course;
(v) the curriculum of streams within an award course;
(c) approves faculty resolutions;
(d) approves admission requirements and pre-requisites for award courses;
(e) approves, on the recommendation of the relevant faculty or Board of Interdisciplinary Studies:
   (i) addition and deletion of award courses, streams, programs, majors, minors; and
   (ii) changes to the degree core;
(f) approves the list of majors, minors and units of study available in the shared pool for Liberal Studies degrees and the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, on the recommendation of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies;
(g) approves courses and units of study for Sydney Professional Certificates on the recommendation of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies;
(h) approves changes to the teaching mode or method of instruction of a course or unit of study;
(i) determines deadlines for submitting proposals for new, amended and deleted award courses;
(j) determines teaching periods, semesters, other periods of teaching availability, commencement and conclusion dates of the academic year and, if appropriate, variations requested by faculties;
(k) is responsible for:
   (i) aligning the range of the University’s academic programs so that all graduates demonstrate graduate qualities set out in Part 2 to a high standard;
   (ii) reviewing education programs within faculties in a seven year cycle;
   (iii) monitoring program outcomes and reports of review committees and accrediting bodies to promote educational excellence as set out in Part 2;
   (iv) monitoring processes within faculties to support the academic integrity of the University’s programs and assessment;
   (v) monitoring breaches of academic integrity, reviewing processes to minimise or eliminate them and taking appropriate action;
   (vi) considering and, if appropriate, approving the name and abbreviation used for each award course; and
   (vii) developing and maintaining quality and educational excellence as set out in Part 5.

(3) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) is responsible for strategic leadership of educational excellence and educational innovation throughout the University. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education):

(a) develops and maintains institutional systems and strategy to achieve excellence in outcomes, experience and environment. This includes curriculum frameworks, online learning, and the student experience;
(b) develops and maintains quality and educational excellence as set out in Part 5; and

(c) endorses proposals for new, amended and deleted courses for forwarding to:
   (i) the University Executive Curriculum and Course Planning Committee; and
   (ii) the Academic Board.

(4) **The Vice-Principal (External Relations)** is responsible for developing and maintaining institutional strategy to achieve excellence and innovation throughout the University.

(5) **The Vice-Principal (Operations):**
   (a) is responsible for the institutional systems and processes that support educational excellence; and
   (b) develops and maintains institutional systems and strategy in order to achieve excellence in admission, student recruitment, and administration processes.

(6) **The University Executive Curriculum and Course Planning Committee:**
   (a) reviews the business case for new course proposals from faculties; and
   (b) advises the University Executive and its relevant committees in their deliberations over whether to endorse a proposed course or change for consideration by the Academic Board.

(7) **The Board of Interdisciplinary Studies** approves:
   (a) units of study under a faculty’s direction which are included in the shared pool of units of study available across all Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees;
   (b) units of study that are not under a faculty’s direction;
   (c) the inclusion of units of study that are not under a faculty’s direction in the shared pool of units of study available across all Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees;
   (d) units of study in the open learning environment, Sydney Research Seminars, and interdisciplinary units of study offered to students in any degree; and
   (e) units of study for Sydney Professional Certificates.

(8) **Faculties**
   (a) Faculties, and their committees, are responsible for standards, assessment and quality throughout the faculty. Faculties:
      (i) establish a standing committee or committees with responsibility for excellence in outcomes and experience in award courses;
      (ii) consider and, if appropriate, approve curriculum for all units of study, minors, and majors and programs in an award course;
      (iii) approve learning outcomes for units of study, majors and programs;
      (iv) approve assessment for units of study and other curriculum components as appropriate;
      (v) approve pre-requisites and co-requisites for units of study and honours components;
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(vi) determine the curriculum and learning outcomes for streams for recommendation to the Academic Board;

(vii) determine integration between units of study to meet the learning outcomes of majors, programs, streams or award courses and to achieve graduate qualities;

(viii) determine faculty resolutions relating to award courses of the faculty;

(ix) develop and maintain alignment of curricula and the quality of learning and teaching to achieve high standards in award course outcomes;

(x) where appropriate, monitor alignment with standards set by professional and accrediting bodies;

(xi) advise the Academic Board of any changes to degree level curricula. This includes creation, variation and deletion of courses and changes to tables of units of study;

Note: Course proposal and amendment requirements can be found on the Academic Board website.

(xii) ratify assessment results;

(xiii) monitor and maintain standards in the quality of assessment practices and academic integrity;

Note: See the Coursework Policy 2014, the Assessment Procedures 2011 and the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015.

(xiv) review and act on educational quality data each semester as set out in Part 5;

(xv) monitor breaches of academic integrity within the faculty;

(xvi) review the assessment framework of units of study and other curriculum components to eliminate or minimise the possibility of such breaches;

(xvii) report breaches of academic integrity to the Academic Board as required by the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015; and

(xviii) monitor the framework for the management of learning and teaching within the faculty and the processes for ensuring educational excellence in all programs as set out in Part 5.

Note: See clause 11. Responsibilities for standards and operational matters in connection with programs may be undertaken by relevant committees.

(9) Deans

(a) Deans have overarching responsibility for standards, quality, strategic leadership and resource allocation to achieve educational excellence within faculties. Deans:

(i) exercise strategic oversight of faculties and their committees, the Associate Dean – Education and Heads of School to develop and maintain alignment with faculty strategy and operations;

(ii) consistently with the Coursework Policy 2014, set operational parameters for teaching and curricula, including teaching workloads, staff profile, fees and student numbers;
(iii) make appropriate arrangements for quality assurance of teaching and learning within the faculty as set out in Part 4 and Part 5;

(iv) direct the appropriate allocation of resources for educational excellence;

(v) direct that student representatives be elected or appointed as members of education, undergraduate, postgraduate studies committees and program committees;

(vi) direct faculty or school offices to keep current and available relevant documentation relating to the faculty’s academic programs, including documentation for units of study;

(vii) appoint an Educational Integrity Co-ordinator and, if appropriate, additional nominated academics to act as decision makers in relation to alleged breaches of academic integrity in line with the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015; and

(viii) consider and, if appropriate, approve requests by unit of study co-ordinators to opt out of the recording of lectures in University-managed lecture theatres, or delegate this authority to a Head of School.

(10) Associate Deans – Education

(a) Associate Deans – Education lead and co-ordinate strategies for educational excellence, improvement and innovation across the faculty and, on behalf of the Dean, monitor the effectiveness of processes for achieving graduate outcomes through engaged enquiry. Associate Deans – Education:

(i) co-ordinate teaching across the faculty to deliver excellent educational outcomes and experience;

(ii) review and act on data on educational quality;

(iii) monitor and direct alignment of educational standards and quality in the faculty with University policy and strategy;

(iv) implement collegial governance in the creation and review of educational programs within the faculty; and

Note: See clause 11.

(v) support quality of teaching and learning across the faculty as set out in Part 5.

(11) Supervisors

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(iii) act in relation to staff performance and effective allocation of quality resources; and

(iv) if requested to do so by the Dean, consider and, if appropriate, approve requests by unit of study co-ordinators to opt out of the recording of lectures in University-managed lecture theatres.

(v) appoint a unit of study co-ordinator for each unit of study for which the school is responsible;

(vi) make appropriate alternative arrangements if a unit of study co-ordinator is or will be absent; and

(vii) appoint a new unit of study co-ordinator when a current unit of study co-ordinator leaves.

*Note:* In faculties without a school structure, the roles and responsibilities of a Head of School may be taken by the Associate Dean – Education.

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

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

(b) The Unit of study co-ordinator:

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

(ii) should inform the relevant Head of School of any intended or foreseeable absence, at least four weeks in advance;

(iii) develops, implements and monitors unit of study curricula, learning activities and assessment, subject to approval by the faculty;

(iv) aligns learning outcomes between a unit of study and an award course, and implements, at the unit study level, strategies and policies for educational excellence;

(v) reviews unit of study curriculum design, including learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities and assessment, and, where appropriate, aligns with program learning goals and graduate qualities;

(vi) documents and communicates the unit of study curriculum as a unit of study outline in the LMS, and makes a unit description, including pre-requisites, co-requisites and assessment, available for inclusion in the faculty handbook;

(vii) reviews assessment tasks and standards in relation to policy and reports to the faculty and the program committee;
(viii) reviews the academic integrity of each assessment task and the assessment matrix of the unit of study each time it is offered to eliminate or minimise the risk of breaches of academic integrity;
(ix) designs the assessment framework for the unit of study to ensure the academic integrity of each assessment in the unit as set out in the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015;
(x) reports incidents of potential academic dishonesty or plagiarism in line with university policy;
(xi) gathers, reviews and acts on data on educational quality, in consultation with the unit of study team and the Head of School;
(xii) administers surveys of educational experience and provides reports to students and the faculty on the quality of the student experience as set out in Part 5;
(xiii) makes recommendations to the faculty, or a relevant committee of the faculty, about changes to learning outcomes, curriculum, or assessment for a unit of study; and
(xiv) manages access to lecture recordings and, where necessary, submits applications to opt out of recordings in University-managed lecture spaces to the Dean or Dean’s nominee.

(14) Individual teachers
(a) Educational excellence exists when teachers engage students in their learning. To this end, individual teachers:
   (i) support and lead student learning of the curriculum, as specified and to the agreed standards;
   (ii) prepare the educational content of units of study;
   (iii) design and prepare assessment tasks as specified in the curriculum, and consistently with relevant policy;
   (iv) monitor and act to support academic standards and academic integrity; and
   (v) where there is more than one teacher in a unit, participate as part of the unit of study team to support the unit of study co-ordinator in his or her role and responsibilities.

(15) Students
(a) An essential component of educational excellence is that students gain increasing understanding of, and take responsibility for, their learning. To this end, students must:
   (i) be familiar with the award course resolutions, relevant policies and other requirements for the course as set out in the faculty handbook, unit of study outline and other published guidelines; and
   (ii) satisfy attendance and assessment requirements.
(b) In addition, students should participate in any evaluations of their experience, so that educational excellence is monitored and improved.
27. **Documentation and communication**

(1) This part of the policy sets out appropriate standards for:
   (a) communicating with students and staff;
   (b) managing the development of units of study, curricula and award courses; and
   (c) institutional record keeping.
   
   **Note:** See Recordkeeping Policy 2017 and Recordkeeping Manual.

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

   **Note:** See clause 11 of those procedures.

(3) Unit of study outlines and the LMS website must be available to students:
   (a) for -1000 and -5000 level units of study: no later than two weeks before the commencement of the teaching session in which the unit is offered; and
   (b) for other units of study: no later than one week prior to the commencement of the teaching session in which the unit is offered.

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

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

   **Note:** See clause 9 of those procedures.

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

   **Note:** See clause 8 of those procedures.

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

(8) Upon each student’s graduation the University will provide each of the following documents, which will provide the information required by the *Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016*:
   (a) a transcript;
   (b) a certificate of graduate status; and
   (c) a testamur.

   **Note:** See clause 12 of those procedures.

(9) Information other than that specified in the *Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016* may only be included on an academic transcript with the approval of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), after consultation with:
   (a) the chair of the Academic Board or nominee;
(b) the Head of the Academic Model Team in the portfolio of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education);
(c) the Head of the Sydney Student Team in the portfolio of the Vice-Principal (Operations);

(10) In deciding whether to approve the inclusion of such information the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) must be satisfied that the additional information:
(a) appropriately represents educational achievement;
(b) can be verified by the University; and
(c) can be collected in a timely and efficient manner.

(11) Graduation statements may only be issued with the approval of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), after consultation with:
(a) the chair of the Academic Board or nominee;
(b) the Head of the Academic Model Team in the portfolio of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education);
(c) the Head of the Sydney Student Team in the portfolio of the Vice-Principal (Operations).

28 Qualifications of teachers, co-ordinators and supervisors

(1) Heads of school must appoint unit of study co-ordinators and teachers who have appropriate knowledge, skills and qualifications, including:
(a) up to date knowledge of a relevant field or discipline, which is informed by any of:
   (i) ongoing research
   (ii) scholarship; or
   (iii) contemporary professional practice; and
(b) relevant skills in learning, teaching and assessment.

(2) Individuals teaching or supervising units of study in award courses below AQF Level 10 must have:
(a) a relevant qualification at least one AQF level higher than the course being taught, co-ordinated or supervised;
(b) equivalent academic attainment;
(c) equivalent professional experience; or
(d) appropriate training, as well as guidance and oversight from a supervisor or coordinator who is an academic staff member with the qualifications, experience, knowledge and skills in 24A(1) and 24A(2) (a) to (c).

(3) Individuals appointed on the basis of subclauses 24A(2)(a) to (c) may also co-ordinate units of study in award courses below AQF Level 10.

(4) Individuals appointed on the basis of subclauses 24A(2)(d) may be appointed to teach specialised components of a course such as demonstrating or tutoring but must not be appointed to co-ordinate units of study or as the sole-teacher.
(5) Individuals teaching, co-ordinating or supervising units of study in an award course at AQF Level 10 must have:
   (a) a relevant qualification at AQF Level 10;
   (b) equivalent academic attainment;
   (c) equivalent professional experience; or
   (d) appropriate training, as well as guidance and oversight from a supervisor or coordinator who is an academic staff member with the qualifications, experience, knowledge and skills in 24A(1) and 24A(4) (a)-(c).

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

Note: Records of approval must be retained and stored consistently with the requirements of the Recordkeeping Policy 2017 and the Privacy Policy 2017

PART 6 QUALITY ASSURANCE

29. Quality assurance processes

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

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

Note: See Part 2.

(3) Excellence in educational outcomes is measured through systematic assessment which ensures that students achieve course learning outcomes at a high standard, and through the assessment of graduate qualities.
   (a) Faculties and their Associate Deans – Education must arrange for assessments to be subject to peer feedback and periodic benchmarking.

(4) Excellence in educational experience is measured through students’ reports of their experience. Feedback should be formal and informal and captured at unit of study, major, program or degree level. University, national and international surveys should be used to collect formal feedback.
(a) Unit of study co-ordinators and Associate Deans – Education must administer surveys of educational experience each time a unit of study is offered.

(b) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) must implement surveys of students’ experience of their learning at a University-wide level at least annually.

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

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

(6) At unit of study level

(a) Standards for educational outcomes must be determined by the faculty with reference to the discipline.

(i) These standards must be easily visible at faculty level, generated through scrutiny of results data, and align with awards.

(ii) The unit of study co-ordinator must assess whether educational outcomes are meeting agreed standards, including those for academic integrity.

(b) Standards for educational experience include the student experience of learning and teaching, information about which is obtained through relevant student surveys and peer observation of teaching where appropriate.

(i) The unit of study co-ordinator must provide annual reports on students’ experience in a unit of study and feedback from surveys to students and the faculty.

(c) Educational environment is measured in the provision of formal, informal and virtual learning spaces. Physical learning spaces are measured against:

(i) accepted learning space standards; and

(ii) student and teacher evaluations, including the effective use of existing resources for teaching units of study.

(7) At the curriculum level

(a) Educational outcomes must:

(i) contribute to student qualifications;

(ii) meet accreditation requirements; and

(iii) be aligned with institutional, industry, professional and community expectations.

(b) Standards and outcomes must be determined by the faculty and managed by the faculty or its relevant committee.

(i) Student survey results must be used to set standards and targets.

(ii) Benchmarking and aligning with standards across the faculty, and other comparable institutions, and with professional disciplinary and industry expectations, must be used to measure excellence.

(c) Educational experience is provided through a thematically coherent program. Evaluation methods include student surveys, benchmarking...
reports, reports from accrediting bodies, and Go8 Standards Verification reports.

(i) The Associate Dean – Education must provide annual reports on students' educational experience to the faculty.

(ii) Faculties must provide copies of formal benchmarking reports to the Academic Board.

(iii) Deans must provide copies of accreditation reports from external organisations to the Academic Board on receipt.

(iv) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) must provide Go8 Standards Verification reports to the Academic Board on receipt.

(d) The quality of the educational environment is measured by the provision of formal and informal learning spaces, where students belong to a community of scholars within discipline and degree programs. Physical learning spaces are measured against:

(i) accepted learning space standards; and

(ii) student and teacher evaluations, including the effective use of existing resources.

(8) At the University level

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

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

(c) Educational environment is measured in terms of the provision of physical spaces and equipment, and virtual learning environments. The environment should support working together to achieve excellence.

(d) The University must evaluate the quality of outcomes, experience and environment using methods which include:

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

(ii) accreditation reports;

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

(iv) Academic Board and UE faculty reviews.

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

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

(g) The Academic Board and the UE must provide reports of faculty reviews to the Senate.
30. Rescissions, replacements and transitional provisions

(1) This document replaces the following, which are rescinded as from the date of commencement of this document:
   
   (a) Academic Board Resolutions: Creation, variation and deletion of award courses and units of study which commenced on 1 January 2001
   
   (b) Academic Board Resolutions: The Management and Evaluation of Coursework Teaching which commenced on 1 June 2001
   
   (c) Academic Board Policy on Consultation with Students which commenced in 2008
   
   (d) Academic Board Resolutions: Generic Attributes of Graduates of the University of Sydney which commenced in 1997
   
   (e) Distance, Alternative and Flexible Modes of Delivery in Postgraduate Courses Policy
   
   (f) Flexible Student-Centred Learning in the University of Sydney Policy which commenced in 1999
   
   (g) Improved Learning and Teaching Through Collaboration, Benchmarking and Alliances Policy which commenced in 2005
   
   (h) Principles for First Year Orientation and Transition Policy which commenced in 2001
   
   (i) Quality Assurance and Learning Management Systems Policy which commenced in 2005
   
   (j) Research-Enhanced Learning and Teaching Policy which commenced in 2007
   
   (k) Written and Oral Communication Skills of Students Policy which commenced in 2002
   
   (l) Parallel Teaching of Postgraduate and Undergraduate Students Policy which commenced in 2004

(2) Sub clauses 18(1)-(8) apply to all undergraduate degrees approved or reviewed after 25 July 2016.

(3) For staff employed prior to 1 January 2018, Section 24A Subclause 2(a)(ii) and (2)(b)(i) take effect on 31 December 2018.
## SCHEDULE ONE

### Roles and responsibilities for curriculum (standards) and operational aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</th>
<th>Responsibility: Operational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Be familiar with legislative and other requirements of the course as set out in the faculty handbook, unit of study outline, and other published guidelines. Satisfy attendance and assessment requirements.</td>
<td>Participate in evaluations of their experience, to ensure that educational excellence is achieved. Encouraged to participate in the development and review of courses and units of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual teachers</td>
<td>Support and lead student learning of the curriculum as specified, and to the agreed standard. Design and prepare assessment tasks as specified in the curriculum and in accordance with the standards in the relevant policy. Monitor and implement academic standards. Educate students on academic integrity and report any breaches of academic integrity.</td>
<td>Participate as part of the unit of study team (if appropriate) to support the roles and responsibilities of the unit of study coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</td>
<td>Responsibility: Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit of study co-ordinators</td>
<td>Review the design of the curriculum of the unit of study, including learning outcomes, learning and teaching activities, and assessment, to ensure ongoing alignment against program learning goals and graduate qualities.</td>
<td>Lead and co-ordinate the unit of study team to deliver quality teaching and assessment, including reviewing, communicating and acting on data on educational quality in the unit of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document and communicate the unit of study curriculum as a unit of study outline in the LMS, and ensure its availability in the faculty handbook.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review assessment tasks and standards in relation to policy and report to the faculty and program committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review the academic integrity of each assessment task and the assessment matrix of the unit to eliminate or minimise the possibility of breaches of academic integrity. Unit of study co-ordinators must ensure that assessment framework in the unit of study is designed to ensure the academic integrity of each assessment in the unit as set out in the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Act on breaches of academic integrity within a unit of study, and review the assessment framework each time the unit of study is offered to eliminate or minimise the possibility of such breaches.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend student assessment tasks to the faculty and program committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In consultation with the unit of study team and the Head of School, gather, review and act on data on educational quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</td>
<td>Responsibility: Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Provide leadership, guidance and mentorship to students undertaking research projects.</td>
<td>Support the student in the research project, including providing timely feedback and advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide academic advice to students on the reporting of research findings in a dissertation, treatise or long essay.</td>
<td>Monitor progress within the context of the overall research plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educate students on, and monitor the project for compliance with, the University’s policies on research integrity, data management, ethical research practice, intellectual property, relevant health and safety procedures and other relevant matters.</td>
<td>Provide the student with the necessary skills to complete the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of school</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appoint a unit of study co-ordinator for each unit of study within the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assign teaching duties, unit of study co-ordinator tasks, and program committee membership to staff in the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In consultation with unit of study co-ordinators and program committees, review reports and data on educational quality, and act in relation to staff performance and effective allocation of quality resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</td>
<td>Responsibility: Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Associate Dean – Education | Lead and co-ordinate strategies for educational excellence, improvement and innovation across the faculty.  
On behalf of the Dean establish effective processes for achieving graduate outcomes through engaged enquiry.  
Align educational standards and quality within the faculty with the University policy and strategy. | Co-ordinate teaching across the faculty to deliver excellence in educational outcomes and experience.  
Review and act on data on educational quality.  
Establish and implement collegial governance, as set out in Clause 11, in the creation and review of educational programs within the faculty.  
Support quality of learning and teaching across the faculty as set out in Part 5. |
| Dean                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Have strategic oversight of faculties, the Associate Dean – Education and heads of school and heads of schools to ensure alignment with faculty strategy and operations (resources).  
Review and act on data relating to educational quality.  
Consistently with the Coursework Policy 2014, set operational parameters for teaching and curriculum (e.g. teaching workloads, staff profile, fees, student numbers.)  
Make arrangements for quality assurance of teaching and learning within the faculty as set out in Part 5.  
Include, where appropriate, student representatives on standard governance committees and provide them with same information as other committee members to enable effective participation.  
Ensure that faculty offices maintain and update all documentation for policy and procedures relating to the faculty’s academic programs, including documentation for units of study. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</th>
<th>Responsibility: Operational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Faculties | Plan and implement reviews of degree curriculum design, including degree learning outcomes, degree learning experiences, and degree level assessment. This will establish ongoing internal alignment and mapping coverage in relation to program goals, coherence, relevance and strategic fit.  
Advise the Academic Board of any changes to degree level curricula. This may include creation, variation or deletion of courses and changes to tables of units of study.  
Ratify assessment results with degrees and monitor and act to ensure quality of standards and quality of assessment practices. (See the Coursework Policy 2014 and the Assessment Procedures 2011).  
Review and act on data on educational quality and ensure educational excellence.  
Entrench academic integrity within the assessment framework of each award course at each stage of the program.  
Monitor breaches of academic integrity within the faculty, review the assessment framework to eliminate or minimise the possibility of such breaches, and report breaches of academic integrity each year to the Academic Board as set out in the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015. | Monitor the framework for the management of learning and teaching within the faculty and the processes for ensuring educational excellence in all programs.  
May devolve their responsibilities for standards and operational matters to degree, major and program committees and to degree co-ordinators. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</th>
<th>Responsibility: Operational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Vice-Chancellor Education</td>
<td>Establish and support institutional systems and strategy to deliver the educational mission in order to achieve excellence in outcomes, experience and environment (e.g. infrastructure, IT, curriculum frameworks, student experience). Deliver quality assurance measures as set out in Part 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Principal (External Relations)</td>
<td>Establish and support institutional strategy to deliver the educational mission in relation to admission, recruitment and administration processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Principal (Operations)</td>
<td>Establish and support institutional systems to deliver the educational mission in relation to admission, recruitment, and administration processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| University                    | Through faculties, the Academic Board and the University Executive (UE) Education Committee, review and act on: |                                                                 \[  
|                               | • reports of program committees, including curriculum review and assessment standards;               |                                                                                             |
|                               | • data on educational quality; and                                                                |                                                                                             |
|                               | • academic integrity.                                                                             |                                                                                             |
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<td>24 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24(10)(11)</td>
<td>Remove reference to Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) and replace with Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)</td>
<td>24 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24(11)(b)</td>
<td>Remove reference to Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) or nominee</td>
<td>24 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24(11)(c)</td>
<td>Remove reference to Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) and replace with reference to Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)</td>
<td>24 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24(11)(d)</td>
<td>Remove reference to Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) and replace with reference to Vice-Principal (Operations)</td>
<td>24 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch 1</td>
<td>Remove reference to Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) and replace with reference to Vice-Principal (External Relations)</td>
<td>24 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch 1</td>
<td>Add new role Vice-Principal (Operations)</td>
<td>24 March 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TO BE COMPLETED

Learning and Teaching Policy 2015
1 Purpose and application

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

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

2 Commencement

These procedures commence on 26 July 2016.

3 Interpretation

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

   Note: See clause 6 of the policy.

(2) In these procedures:

   - CCPC means the University Executive Curriculum and Course Planning Committee.
   - change in relation to an award course or unit of study, includes an amendment to, or deletion of, the award course or unit of study.
   - Group of 8 Quality Verification System means the system for benchmarking student achievement and assessment, conducted by the Group of 8 (Go8) universities.
   - Sydney Student means the University's online student administration system.
Sydney Research Seminars means units of study involving a cross-disciplinary group of students and staff in exploration of an interdisciplinary issue, challenge or problem approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.

Table A means a list, specified in award course resolutions, of units of study, majors, minors and streams available to be taken in an award course.

unit of study master file means the central computerised repository of details of all units of study offered by the University in a given year, which is compiled and maintained by the office of the Executive Director, Student Administrative Services.

USS means Unit of Study Survey.

4 Process for approving new or changed courses

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

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

Note: Meeting schedules are available on the relevant committee websites Academic Board meeting dates; Academic Board committee dates; CCPC meeting dates; UE meeting dates.

(b) Key dates include:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) The CCPC will consider the expression of interest and determine whether to recommend it to the University Executive for endorsement.
(a) The CCPC may request a faculty representative to attend at a meeting of the CCPC explain the case for the new or changed course.

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

Note: Course proposal forms are available from the staff intranet

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6 Process for approving new or changed units of study

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

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

   Note: Meeting schedules are available on the relevant committee websites. 
   Academic Board meeting dates;  
   Academic Board committee dates;  
   CCPC meeting dates;  
   UE meeting dates.

(b) Key dates include:
   (i) deadline for the publication of the faculty handbook for the subsequent year;
   (ii) finalisation date for the units of study master file for the subsequent year; and
   (iii) deadlines set by faculties for the approval of units of study.
(2) Faculties, or where relevant the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), proposing new or changed units of study must:

(a) provide advance notice of the proposed change to any faculty or school which might be affected, particularly those offering award courses in which the unit of study is listed in the unit of study table, before seeking approval; and

(b) submit proposals for approval in the relevant faculty-approved template.

(3) Proposals for new or changed units of study which are, or are proposed to be, under the faculty’s academic direction in a degree of the faculty must be:

(a) approved by the faculty; and

(b) where the changes result in a change to award course requirements or the table of units of study for an award course, approved by the Academic Board.

(4) Proposals for new or changed units of study which are, or are proposed to be, under the faculty’s academic direction in the shared pool of units of study available across all Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees must be:

(a) endorsed by the unit of study co-ordinator, or in the case of new units of study, the relevant head of school;

(b) approved in terms of rationale, curriculum, assessment and learning outcomes by the faculty; and

(c) approved for inclusion in the shared pool by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.

(5) Proposals for new or changed units of study which are not, or are proposed not to be, under a faculty’s academic direction but will be included in the shared pool of units of study available across all Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees must be:

(a) endorsed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education); and

(b) approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.

(6) Units of study which are, or are proposed to be, included in the open learning environment, Sydney Research Seminars, or interdisciplinary units of study available across all Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees, or offered to all students as specified in the degree resolutions, must be:

(a) endorsed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) or the faculty; and

(b) approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.

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

7 Award course resolutions

(1) Award course resolutions must specify, as a minimum:

(a) the course code;

(b) attendance patterns;

(c) requirements for admission to candidature;

(d) requirements for the award course including credit point values, units of study that may be taken for credit and mandatory units of study;
(e) streams available in the award course;
(f) programs available in the award course;
(g) majors available in the award course;
(h) minors available in the award course;
(i) requirements for streams, programs, majors, minors and, where appropriate, the degree core;
(j) progression rules;
(k) restrictions on enrolment;
(l) time limits, if different from those specified in the faculty resolutions or the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014;

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

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

8 Faculty resolutions

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

9 Faculty handbooks

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

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

10 Unit of study outlines

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

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

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

(1) An LMS website must contain:

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

(2) Each LMS must be designed to include the capacity for:

(a) submitting written assignments online; and
(b) for text-based assignments, checking submitted work with similarity detection software.

(3) Read-only access to the LMS site for a unit of study must be provided to:

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

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

12 Academic records on graduation

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

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

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

(4) For a Liberal Studies Bachelor Degree:
   (a) the title shown on the testamur and transcript must include:
      (i) the stream; or
      (ii) if no stream, the program; or
      (iii) if neither, the Table A major; and
   (b) any second major; and
(c) must be styled as: Bachelor of [insert title], (insert stream, program or Table A major), (insert any second major).

(5) For any degree combined with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies:
   (a) the title shown on the testamur and transcript must include:
       (i) the stream; or
       (ii) if no stream, the program; or
       (iii) if neither, the Table A major; and
   (b) the second major; and
   (c) must be styled as: Bachelor of [insert title] / Bachelor of Advanced Studies (insert stream, program or Table A major), (insert second major).

(6) Any degree combined with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies with honours must be styled as: Bachelor of [insert title] / Bachelor of Advanced Studies ([insert discipline] honours, [insert second major]).

Note: See also Part 19 of the Coursework Policy 2014.

(7) A single testamur will be issued for combined degrees, including vertically-integrated degrees, unless otherwise required by the relevant award course resolutions.

(8) Separate testamurs will be issued for each degree for double degrees, unless otherwise required by the award course resolutions.

13 Quality assurance and evaluation

(1) Excellence of the student experience is evaluated through surveys of the student experience at two levels:
   (a) the degree or program level; and
   (b) the unit of study level.

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

(3) Unit of study level feedback is captured through the Unit of Study Survey (USS).
   (a) The USS is administered online, using Sydney Student data to generate the list of units of study to be surveyed each teaching session, and to access the contact details of students enrolled in them.
   (b) The USS includes six common quantitative items, and two common qualitative items and up to four faculty specific quantitative items and one qualitative item.
(c) For each unit of study, a faculty administrator is responsible for:
   (i) checking that the unit of study co-ordinator details are correct;
   (ii) setting appropriate open and close dates for the survey; and
   (iii) indicating which faculty specific variant of the USS is to be used.

(d) Unit of study co-ordinators must check the details of the survey (sent as a pre-notification email two weeks prior to the survey open date). Changes should be requested through the faculty administrator.

(e) Students are emailed an invitation to participate in the USS on the survey open date. A reminder email will be emailed to all students who have not already completed the survey one week after the survey opens.

(f) Teachers may allow time in class for students to complete the survey on their smartphone, tablet or laptop.

(g) Unit of study co-ordinators will receive an email notification on the survey open date, and then an update one week later.

(h) Results are made available to the unit of study co-ordinators, the Dean, the Associate Dean, Education and other nominees of the Dean via the USS results portal.

(i) Results are made available to students (quantitative results only) via an email notification containing a link to their personalised survey portal. Co-ordinators can write a comment in response to the ratings and comments given by their students before results are released to students.

(j) Changes made to the unit of study as a result of student feedback and student experience from the previous time the unit of study was offered must be included in the LMS website for the unit of study.

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

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

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

   Note: Further information about faculty review visits is available from the Academic Board website.

(7) The terms of reference for review panels are set out in Schedule Two.
(8) **External reference points** will be obtained by participating in the Group of 8 Quality Verification System and through other benchmarking reports commissioned by faculties.

(9) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) must:

(a) provide Group of 8 Quality Verification System reviewer reports to the relevant unit of study coordinators, Heads of School and Associate Deans; and

(b) table the reports at the University Executive Education Committee and the Academic Board Academic Standards and Policy Committee.

(10) The Associate Dean Education in relevant faculties is responsible for responding to Go8 Quality Verification System reviewer reports by completing the template in Schedule Three and, where appropriate, implementing action to address issues identified in the report.

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

14 **Educational environments**

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

**Note:** Standards (for learning environments) are monitored by the DVC (Education) Portfolio and are set by CIS in conjunction with ICT. The Learning Space Design Standard is available [here](#).
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TO BE COMPLETED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Evaluation method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit of study</td>
<td>Educational outcomes</td>
<td>Educational outcomes</td>
<td>Educational outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Simple data</td>
<td>- Unit of study co-ordinator assesses that outcomes are meeting requirements, including academic integrity</td>
<td>- Student surveys&lt;br&gt;- University rubric to measure against graduate qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Easy visibility at faculty level</td>
<td>- Determined by faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Generated by results data</td>
<td>- Alignment with award/ standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Determined by faculty</td>
<td>- Graduate qualities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Graduate qualities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational experience</td>
<td>Student experience of learning and teaching</td>
<td>Educational experience</td>
<td>Educational experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Peer observation of teaching</td>
<td>- University sets agreed standards and targets</td>
<td>- Student surveys&lt;br&gt;- Results are included in report to students/ faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Unit of study co-ordinators are responsible for providing students with feedback through the closing the loop process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational environment</td>
<td>Learning space</td>
<td>Educational environment</td>
<td>Educational environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Virtual environment</td>
<td>- Standards for physical learning space</td>
<td>- Standards for physical learning space&lt;br&gt;- Evaluation of learning spaces&lt;br&gt;- Effective use of existing resources (to teach units of study)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal and informal</td>
<td>- Evaluation of learning spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Effective use of existing resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Evaluation method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Curriculum/ qualification | Educational outcomes  
- Qualifications  
- Meet accreditation requirements  
- Alignment with institutional, industry, professional and community expectations | Educational outcomes  
- Standards and outcomes are determined by the faculty and managed by the Academic Board | Educational outcomes  
- Student survey results are averaged over faculty-administered units of study and used to set agreed standards and targets  
- Benchmarking and alignment with standards across the faculty, and other comparable institutions, and with professional, disciplinary and industry expectations. |
| Educational experience | Thematically coherent program | Educational experience  
- Student surveys  
- Reported to faculty board; reports made public | |
| Educational environment | Formal and informal  
Community of scholars within discipline/ degree program | Educational environment  
- Standards for physical learning space  
- Evaluation of learning spaces  
- Effective use of existing resources | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Evaluation method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Educational outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational outcomes, experience and environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Graduate qualities</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Student survey results used to set targets and benchmark at faculty and University level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prepared for learning, life and work</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meets requirements for accreditation at discipline/professional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meets requirements for Australian Qualifications Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Success in accessing further study</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meets requirements for Higher Education Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meets requirements for professional regulatory bodies e.g. Australian Health Practitioners Regulatory Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rewarding career paths</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cycle of Academic Board/ UE faculty reviews, including learning and teaching processes and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contributing to the community</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meets standards set by Group of Eight (Go8) universities and benchmarked in the Go8 Quality Verification Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Engagement and enquiry to challenge students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with novel problems and issues at every</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stage of the educational process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Physical spaces and equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Virtual learning environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supports working together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHEDULE TWO

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR ACADEMIC UNIT REVIEW PANELS

OBJECTIVES

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

ROLE OF PANEL

To achieve the objectives, the panel will:

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

MEMBERSHIP OF PANEL

(1) Panel members are appointed jointly by the Provost and the Chair of the Academic Board, each of whom may choose to sit on a review committee or nominate a representative to do so.

(2) Review panels will consist of five members, plus a chair. If appropriate, an additional two members may be appointed.
(3) Review panels will be comprised of at least:

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

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

(c) a member of the Academic Board nominated by the Chair of the Academic Board.
## Group of Eight (Go8) Quality Verification System (QVS) Review Report

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

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

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate. 

Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment.

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate. 

**HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.**

There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed.

These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.

### Overall response to the review

Do you have any feedback on the review report?

### Review of Specified Learning Objectives

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

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

Response to comparison of learning objectives at other Go8 universities.

### Review of Assessment Tasks

Response to suitability of assessment tasks – could assessments be modified to better align with unit learning outcomes?

Could the assessment requirements, standards and rubrics be made clearer to students?

Are assessment tasks, criteria and rubrics appropriate to measure unit learning outcomes.
Response to comparison of assessment tasks and marking criteria with other Go8 universities.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information for Program Coordinators and Associate Deans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Go8 QVS Review Report aligns with the feedback provided in the attached review. Program coordinators are asked to provide a response to the feedback in the review, and identify (if possible) ways in which the feedback could be incorporated in future offerings of the unit (or similar units of study). Where a course review section receives a grade of ‘Completely’ or no explanation is provided in the feedback box below (‘please list up to three reasons for making this rating’) a response is not required. Program coordinators are also asked to develop an action plan for implementing changes based on feedback in the review, which will be provided to the University Executive and Academic Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Further comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify how reviewer feedback could be used to enhance other educational offerings across the School or Faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be completed by Faculty Associate Dean (Education)
Guidelines for Majors

In these guidelines:

**ASCED code** means the Australian Standard Classification of Education Code established by the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

**selective** means a unit of study which may be selected from a group of units within a major to fulfil requirements for the major.

**Table A** means a list, specified in award course resolutions, of units of study, majors, minors and streams available to be taken in an award course. Unless otherwise specified, Table A for an award course, is only available to students enrolled in the award course, except by special permission of the unit of study coordinator.

**Table S** means a list, specified in award course resolutions, of units of study, minors and majors common to all Liberal Studies degrees and some specialist and generalist degrees, which are available to be taken in an award course.

(1) **Purpose of the major.** The major should:

   (a) develop depth of expertise in a coherent field of study that is associated with an identifiable community of scholars and is recognised as comprising a distinct and valuable body of scholarship;

   (b) be supported by demonstrated expertise and staff capacity in the area of the major;

   (c) be characterised by a distinctive set of learning outcomes, among which should be depth of disciplinary expertise;

   (d) develop the graduate qualities.

(2) **Overlap of core units and selectives within different majors.**

   (a) Core units that are common to two majors may overlap within the first year of majors (up to 12 credit points) without additional scrutiny by the faculty beyond that which is normally given to ensure cohesion, rigour and appropriate development and alignment of the learning outcomes for the major.

   (b) Where overlap within the major core occurs beyond first year, this should be for sound disciplinary reasons. The decision to do so should be made on the basis of an argued case presented to and considered by the faculty, in order to ensure its necessity and that the major retains distinctiveness. With this caveat, both core and selective units offered within majors may overlap.

   (c) For students, while a single unit of major ‘core’ may be counted against two majors, selective units may not be double counted in this way. A student wishing to complete two majors with overlapping core must choose unique selectives in order to complete the credit point requirements of those majors.
(3) **Overlaps between major and stream**

(a) Units of study may count towards both the requirements of a stream and the requirements of the major, provided that the major meets these guidelines and requirements of the *Learning and Teaching Policy 2015*.

(4) **Pre-requisites and assumed knowledge.**

(a) Units of study within a major must not have pre-requisites for units outside the major that would effectively require a student to complete more than 48 credit points to complete requirements for the major.

(i) Where a major is offered in Table S, units within the major must not have pre-requisites for units outside the major.

(ii) Where a major is offered in Table A for a degree, or only to students in a particular stream, a unit within the major may have a pre-requisite outside the major, provided those units are core units for the degree or stream;

(b) Units of study within a major may specify assumed knowledge outside the major.

(5) **The 3000 level (or higher for 192 credit point professional or specialist degrees) Project unit**

(a) Projects should be designed to explore challenging problems that arise in realistic settings with solutions of clear impact on issues of importance to partners in the project.

(b) The problems on which projects are built should be authentic and offer a rich context that may, depending on the project, also invite interdisciplinary perspectives.

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

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

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

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

(g) Interdisciplinary learning is greatly enriched by involving students from other faculties. The Education, Enterprise and Engagement unit in the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) portfolio brokers projects with external partners suitable to students from multiple faculties and assists in managing the projects.

(6) **Unit requiring application of disciplinary expertise in an interdisciplinary context**

(a) Disciplinary knowledge developed in a major involves an understanding of disciplinary assumptions, methodologies and foundational knowledge and an ability to apply that to solve problems encountered within the discipline.
(b) The interdisciplinary unit should provide an opportunity for students to apply disciplinary knowledge to problems, work or communicate with people with different disciplinary expertise and demonstrate interdisciplinary effectiveness.

(c) ‘Interdisciplinary’ should be understood in an inclusive sense. It may involve any or all of:

(i) the integration of knowledge, methods and skills of two or more disciplines;

(ii) the application of skills, knowledge and methods of two or more disciplines to the components of a problem without necessarily integrating them (sometimes called multi-disciplinary);

(iii) the integration of disciplines into a common framework that transcends any one discipline; or

(iv) the interactions between disciplines and society (sometimes called transdisciplinary).

(d) The interdisciplinary unit may be the project unit.
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee:

1. NOTE this brief; and
2. ENDORSE the attached Cadigal Early Conditional Offer Scheme for consideration by the Academic Board.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

• The purpose of the University’s Cadigal Program is to address the educational disadvantage experienced by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, by facilitating and supporting their participation in University courses. The program offers both access and support to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students who are recent school leavers.

• The Cadigal Program involves a commitment by the University that up to 5% of student places will be available to Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander applicants (Clause 28 (2) of the Coursework Policy 2014), but we are well short of this target with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander enrolments running at less than one percent of our total domestic enrolments (see attachment 2).

• A small working group of staff involved in the pre-tertiary outreach, recruitment and support of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students to the University has identified the need to create an early conditional offer scheme for this cohort to increase the conversion rate between offers and enrolments in the Cadigal Program and thereby increase overall student numbers.

• The conversion rate between application and enrolment in the Cadigal Program has been running at or less than 50% for a number of years, and there is substantial anecdotal evidence that the University is losing promising students due to our lack of an early offer scheme for this cohort.

• The purpose of the University’s Early Offer Schemes as outlined in Clause 29 (1) of the Coursework Policy 2014 is to enable the University to identify, prior to completion of the HSC or equivalent, domestic students with academic promise who have suffered educational disadvantage and would benefit from additional support and early engagement with the University.

• Clause 29 (5) of the Policy allows the Associate Dean to determine if an applicant has demonstrated early academic promise with the approval of Academic Board.

• The attached document outlines a proposed Cadigal Early Conditional Offer Scheme for the admission of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students to an undergraduate Award Course through the Cadigal Program.

• This proposal was endorsed by the Admissions Sub-Committee of Academic Board at their meeting of 9 April 2019.

• This early offer scheme would substantially enhance our ability to engage early with this cohort via our dedicated outreach and recruitment processes. The retention and success rates for this student cohort (attachment 2) show that the University can help these students achieve at Sydney once they enrol.
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- One of the conditions for students being offered a place under this Scheme will be that they undertake Indigenous Tutorial Assistance Scheme (ITAS) tutoring during their first year of study.
- They will also be required to attend the Cadigal Academic Enrichment Program which runs over two weeks prior to the commencement of Semester 1. The workshops conducted during this Program equip students with the necessary skills to succeed in their first year of study, such as academic writing, structuring essays, critical thinking, oral presentation, research methods and time management.
- Post enrolment, they will be supported by the dedicated Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander student support staff in the Mana Yura and Yooroang Garang teams.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

N/A

ISSUES

Anecdotal advice from staff involved in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander student outreach, recruitment and support suggests that the University is losing students who might otherwise enrol at Sydney due to early offers being made by other Universities.

A substantial number of this student cohort will be first in family and they appear to be accepting early offers elsewhere for fear of missing out on a place at University altogether. It appears that once they accept an early offer elsewhere, they disengage with our outreach and recruitment efforts.

OPTIONS

If we do nothing, we will continue to lose students to other universities.

CONSULTATION

Mana Yura & Yooroang Garang student support teams
Mary Teague, Widening Participation and Outreach
Jenni Saville, Deputy Director, Student Recruitment, Global Student Recruitment & Mobility
Wai-Fong Chua, Interim, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Student Life)
Wencong Chai, Director, Admissions

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

There are no financial implications contained in the proposed Scheme.

RISKS / BENEFITS

The benefits of the proposed Scheme can be measured via an improved conversion rate between completed Cadigal applications and students enrolled.

IMPLEMENTATION

An implementation plan for the proposed scheme is being developed.

COMMUNICATION

A communication plan for the proposed scheme will be developed.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Cadigal Early Conditional Early Offer Scheme
Attachment 2: Cadigal Early Conditional Early Offer Scheme data
Cadigal Early Conditional Offer Scheme

(1) The purpose of the Cadigal Early Conditional Offer Scheme is to enable the University to identify, prior to completion of the HSC or equivalent, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students with academic promise who have suffered educational disadvantage and would benefit from additional support and early engagement with the University.

(2) The Associate Dean of a faculty may, under this Scheme, make a prospective Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander student a conditional offer of admission to an undergraduate award course during year 12.

(3) The Associate Dean of a faculty may admit an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander applicant to candidature in an undergraduate award course under this Scheme only if:
   a) the applicant has an ATAR of equal to or higher than the rank determined jointly for the award course by the faculty and the administrator of the Cadigal Early Conditional Offer Scheme; and
   b) the student maintains the level of academic performance demonstrated in accordance with subclause (5) below.

(4) For the purposes of determining whether an applicant has suffered educational disadvantage, the Associate Dean of the relevant faculty may consider any relevant matters including those listed in Clause 29 (4) of the Coursework Policy 2014.

(5) For the purposes of determining whether an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander applicant has demonstrated early academic promise, the Associate Dean may consider:
   a) the applicants completed Cadigal Application;
   b) performance in the Record of School Achievement;
   c) Confirmation of Aboriginality per the University Confirmation of Aboriginality Policy 2014;
   d) other measures of promise including engagement in University pre-tertiary programs, an interview or portfolio.

Note: For subclause 3(a): the minimum ATAR will be lower than that required for mainstream entry.
# Proposed Cadigal Early Conditional Offer Program

## 1. Enrolments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>ABORIGINAL &amp; TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER</th>
<th>ALL STUDENTS (domestic only)</th>
<th>% OF STUDENT COHORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>39,453</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>41,216</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>42,032</td>
<td>0.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>42,067</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>42,670</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>41,945</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>41,462</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>39,637</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Data source IAP Insights.

## 2. Cadigal Program conversions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>CADIGAL APPLICATIONS</th>
<th>CADIGAL OFFERS ACCEPTED/ DEFERRED</th>
<th>CONVERSION RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Data source: Mana Yura Student Support team to 2017; 2018/2019 data is from Recruitment

## 3. Success Rates - Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success Rate (units passed/units attempted)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84.41</td>
<td>85.37</td>
<td>84.06</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Data source IAP Insights.

## 4. Retention Rates - Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rate</td>
<td>77.49</td>
<td>77.99</td>
<td>82.20</td>
<td>78.95</td>
<td>82.27</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Data source: Commonwealth Equity Performance data to 2017. 2018 data is from SIBI
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<td>This report for noting fulfills the requirements of clause 8.4 of the University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016 as the Acting Registrar’s annual report to Senate on student discipline matters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee consider and note this 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.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report fulfills the requirements for reporting of misconduct matters for the calendar year 2018 of the University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016 ("the Rule"). Importantly, this report contains two sets of data for 2018 – misconduct cases received by the SAU; and misconduct cases closed in 2018. The 2017 report only reported these received, so no comparison can be made with cases closed.

As at the end of 31 December 2018, 161 cases received in 2018 remained open. Additionally, 65 cases closed in 2018 had been received prior to 2018.

In 2018 a total of 341 student misconduct cases were received by the Student Affairs Unit (SAU). This represents a substantial increase on the data reported for 2017, 224 cases. The increase can, in most part, be explained by an increase in the referral of fraud in the form of academic dishonesty which is largely due to improved processes for detection and improved case handling across the board.

The largest categories of breaches in cases received broadly follows that of previous years. Fraud (197 cases, equating to 57.8% of all cases received) includes a range of academic misconduct including fraudulent medical certificates, assignments, plagiarism as well as fraudulent documentation for admission. The next largest category received was the group of interpersonal/behavioural misdeeds: discrimination, bullying, assault, and harassment (28, 27, 20, and 20 cases respectively). Of these, 17 cases featured both bullying and harassment.

Sexual assault, indecent assault and sexual harassment accounted for a total of 6.4% of cases received and 4.9% of cases closed. None of the cases of sexual or indecent assault resulted in a finding of misconduct and penalty; but three cases of sexual harassment did.

It should be noted that not all cases received are found to be proven to be misconduct and/or warranting a penalty. While all cases received are appropriately tested, there is a significant proportion across the spectrum of breaches that lack sufficient evidence to result in a finding of misconduct.

In terms of activities completed, the SAU closed a total of 245 misconduct cases. This included cases received prior to 2018 and active as at the start of 2018 (this figure was not reported in 2017). The SAU also handles complaints and appeals cases, but these are outside of the scope of this report.
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Of the 245 misconduct matters closed in 2018, 76 had a penalty applied, 37 were withdrawn for a wide range of reasons, and the remainder of 135 had some other outcome, the majority of which resulted in no misconduct penalty. Other outcomes may include a warning letter, referral back to the faculty for handling under the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy, or no further action.

The online complaint portal and workflow system established in March 2017, which also manages misconduct cases, completed its first calendar year of operation in 2018.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

In 2018, all allegations of student misconduct received were investigated in accordance with the University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016 ("the Rule"). In cases where students admitted to allegations put to them and as such, the matter went straight to a penalty determination without further investigation.

ISSUES

Student misconduct cases received and closed in 2018

This report refers to all student misconduct cases:
1. received by the SAU between 1 January and 31 December 2018 under the Rule, and
2. closed in the same period.

This is summarised in Table A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total no. cases received</th>
<th>Total no. cases closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total cases received BEFORE 2018 and closed in 2018</th>
<th>Total cases received AND closed in 2018</th>
<th>Received in 2018, but closed AFTER 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A summary of student misconduct cases received and closed before, in and after 2018

In 2018, a total of 341 misconduct cases were received by the Student Affairs Unit which represents a 61% increase over the number received in 2017, a total of 224. This represents a measure of student misconduct identified by the University community and referred to the Student Affairs Unit for action under the Rule.

A total of 245 cases were closed by the SAU in 2018. This is a measure of the activity of the Unit in terms of the processing of misconduct cases and this metric was not reported on in 2017. In both years, the Unit also processed student complaints and appeals cases that are not included in this report.
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Table 1 - Categories of case outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misconduct cases closed</th>
<th>Workflow Outcome</th>
<th>No. of cases</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigation or admission &amp; penalties applied</td>
<td>Penalty applied by Acting Registrar</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acting Registrar: determination made after investigation; warning or no penalty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No further actions/ insufficient evidence</td>
<td>Misconduct complaint dismissed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determined to be feedback rather than a complaint</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No further actions</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No/insufficient evidence or referred back to faculty after preliminary appraisal</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not proceeded</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub total</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved via assisted mediation</td>
<td>Resolved via assisted mediation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>Withdrawed</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Cases closed by the Student Affairs Unit and their respective broad categories of outcome

Misconduct outcomes

Approximately one third of misconduct cases closed in 2018 by the Student Affairs Unit did not result in a finding and/or a penalty being imposed. In most cases, this is a result of the allegations being found to be unsubstantiated, which is largely based on; insufficient evidence to support the claims; the matter being determined feedback or being withdrawn. It is significant to note that the number of cases with penalties (76) was outweighed by the number for which no finding was made (104) ‘No further action’ generally means that the allegation lacked merit in some form, including an allegation that is deemed to fall below the threshold for misconduct, but still warrants the provision of a formal warning letter.

Table 2 - Residency/visa holder status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESOS Code Respondent</th>
<th>Cases received</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous/out of scope¹</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian citizen</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand citizen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aust permanent resident</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student visa holder</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent humanitarian visa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other visa holder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2a. The distribution of student misconduct cases received across residency/visa holder status categories

¹ This category involves cases that did not proceed to an outcome because of the limitations on powers to investigate anonymous complaints, and in some cases, the respondent was out of jurisdictional scope as a respondent under the Rule. That is, they may not have been students or staff of the University, or otherwise may not have fallen within the scope of its policies or procedures.
ESOS Code Respondent | Cases closed | % of total  
---|---|---  
Anonymous/out of scope | 72 | 29.4%  
Australian citizen | 58 | 23.7%  
New Zealand citizen | 4 | 1.6%  
Aust permanent resident | 2 | 0.8%  
Student visa holder | 106 | 43.3%  
Permanent humanitarian visa | 2 | 0.8%  
Other visa holder | 1 | 0.4%  
Total | 245 | 100.0%  

Table 2b. The distribution of student misconduct cases closed across residency/visa holder status categories

As shown in Tables 2a and b, international students (particularly Student visa holders) are over-represented in misconduct cases. International students are involved in 47.2% of cases while representing only 40% of enrolments during 2018. This may be explained by the high incidence of student visa holders facing allegations of fraud, particularly in the provision of fraudulent medical certificates and Professional Practice Certificates (PPCs) in special consideration applications (in 2018, the recording of cases in the Student Affairs Unit complaints/misconduct workflow under the category of ‘fraud’ did not allow for the separate identification of subtypes).

The Student Affairs Unit continued to engage in proactive educational activities to reduce the incidence of fraud in the special consideration process, involving the development of an entry in the AHEM (an educational integrity training component for all commencing students) on verifying the credentials of practitioners and on the correct use of medical certificates/PPCs in the special consideration process. Additionally, the Compliance Unit proactively engaged with students on the same topic during Orientation arrival sessions.

Table 3

| Misconduct Breaches – Cases Received | Additional/Secondary Allegations | TOTAL cases with secondary breaches  
---|---|---  
Primary Breach Name | No. of cases | Assaults | Breach of Privacy | Bullying | Discrimination | Harassment | Larceny | Sexual and Indecent Assault | Sexual Harassment | Stalking |  
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---  
Fraud | 197 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  
Discrimination | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  
Bullying | 27 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  
Assault | 20 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 14 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 26  
Harassment | 20 | 1 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  
Larceny | 13 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 0 |  |  | 2  
Sexual Harassment | 11 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 9  
Sexual or Indecent Assault | 11 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  |  | 5  
Stalking | 8 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 |  | 1 | 0 |  |  | 11  
Breach of Privacy | 6 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0  
Grand Total | 341 | 1 | 11 | 12 | 8 | 49 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 89  
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Slightly less than half of all cases received had one or more additional breaches. Fraud was by far the most represented single breach at 197 cases (~58%), and harassment was the most represented secondary breach with 20 cases of harassment alone and 49 cases featuring harassment as an additional breach.

Fraud alone exceeded the number of all other single breaches combined. This predominance of fraud meant that a large proportion of the work done by the SAU involved cases that had some contact with Education Integrity, Special Considerations, and in some instances, the Research Integrity Office and Higher Degree by Research Administration Centre (HDRAC) through being referred to the SAU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misconduct Breaches - Cases Closed</th>
<th>Additional/Secondary Allegations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Breach Name</td>
<td>No. of cases closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach of Privacy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual and Indecent Assault</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>245</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3b Summary of cases closed and their breaches. Each of the 245 cases had a primary breach, and 61 cases had one or more additional breaches

Slightly more than a third of all cases closed had one or more additional breaches. Fraud was by far the most represented breach at 137 cases (~56%) and harassment was the most represented secondary breach with 19 cases of harassment alone and 35 cases featuring harassment as an additional breach.

Again, fraud alone exceeded the number of all other breaches alone combined.
Table 4 – active versus suspended penalties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penalties applied in closed cases</th>
<th>active or suspended</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Suspended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion from admission to or use of University lands for a period of up to one year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion from an award course for a period of up to one year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion from the University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion from the University for a period of up to one year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail and result of zero for a unit of study</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprimand</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension from an award course for a period of up to one year</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension from the University for a period of up to one year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination of Course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination of License under Campus Access Rule</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total of penalties</strong></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total of cases</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Summary of penalties. **Note:** many cases had more than one penalty, so the total number of penalties significantly exceeds the number of cases.

The majority of misconducts receiving a penalty involved fraud in connection with academic dishonesty. As a result, a failed unit result was the most common penalty (51 cases) and in no instances was that penalty suspended. A suspension of enrolment, however, was more likely to be suspended (a ‘suspended suspension’, 45 cases) than applied (13 cases) and represented all but two of the suspended penalties.
Matching misconduct with penalties

The association between misconduct type and penalty imposed provides a broad indication of how the University regards the nature and severity of misconduct.

Table 5 – misconducts and penalties

| Penalty by Primary Breach | Number of cases | Active or suspended | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---
Table 6 – appeals against misconduct outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Penalties and Appeals</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of Cases with Penalty Applied</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of Cases Appealed under the Rule</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal heard under the Rule</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal upheld with some reduction in penalty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal upheld with misconduct not found</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Summary of penalties and appeals

Table 6 indicates a relatively low number of students receiving a misconduct penalty submitted an appeal against a finding of misconduct and/or penalties imposed for misconduct in 10.53% of cases with penalties imposed. Of the total appeals submitted and heard, all were upheld. Three appeals resulted in the quashing of the original misconduct finding, and all three were related.

Faculties, Schools and Administrative Units

Student misconduct may be associated with respondent students or former students being associated with behaviour in a faculty or school; or related to interactions with administrative units such as Faculty Services.

In the faculty or school case, the misconduct may include or involve locations, students, staff or property of that faculty or school. A total of approximately 59% of all student misconduct cases received in 2018 related in some way to respondent as a student or former student of a faculty or school and could include academic and/or behavioural misconduct.

The significant remainder were misconduct cases associated with administrative units and most typically relate to fraudulent Professional Practitioner Certificates or other medical documents provided with Special Consideration applications.

Table 7 comparative rates of misconduct by enrolment by Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases received: comparison with Faculty/School enrolments</th>
<th>Cases received</th>
<th>% of all misconduct cases</th>
<th>% enrolled students (approx.)</th>
<th>% diff. misconduct vs. enrolments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/school-related</td>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23.30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>37.38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Technologies</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.65%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-1.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-4.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine and Health</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-6.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.08%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-1.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-2.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-1.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-wide</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-2.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>60.41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Faculty/School-related</td>
<td>Unidentified/Anonymous, Not Faculty/School-related</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>39.59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>39.59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 7a. The relative proportion of student misconduct cases received across academic and non-academic organisational units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases closed: comparison with Faculty/School enrolments</th>
<th>Cases closed</th>
<th>% of all misconduct cases</th>
<th>% of enrolled students (approx.)</th>
<th>% diff. misconduct vs. enrolments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/ school-related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Technologies</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-4.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine and Health</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.92%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-7.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.87%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-4.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-2.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-3.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-wide</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-11.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>152</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Faculty/ School-related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified/Anonymous, Not Faculty/School-related</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>245</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7b. The incidence of student misconduct cases closed across academic and non-academic organisational units

Tables 7a and 7b compare total proportion of enrolled students for each Faculty or School with the proportion of misconduct respondents from that faculty or school. The final column makes that comparison for cases received (table 7a) and for cases closed (table 7b). Note that positive percentages mean that there are a greater proportion of misconduct respondents than the faculty or school’s enrolled proportion. Negative differences mean the reverse.

The School of Business reflects the highest positive difference between percentage of misconduct cases and overall percentage of enrolments. This issue may relate to the higher percentages of international students in the Business School making it more exposed to the high number of fraudulent medical certificates discussed above. At the other extreme is the Faculty of Medicine and Health which has the lowest incidence of misconduct allegations (both received and closed) as a proportion of student enrolments.

It should also be noted that the proportion of student enrolments is not the only relevant factor in comparing the rate of misconduct across faculties and schools. Smaller faculties and schools have such low baselines of misconduct that a single additional case can double their rate of misconduct. The lowest overall under-representation of misconduct across faculties and schools is the very small number of students not in a faculty or school and largely made up of study abroad or exchange students – but such numbers are so low as to be misleading.

More critically, faculties and schools vary in their capacity and methods of detecting and referring non-academic misconduct matters. Cases associated with faculties or schools may not be relevant to faculty or school processes or decision-making but may arise from external circumstances. Some cases like this are accounted for in the ‘Not Faculty-related’ case group (37.96% of all cases, Table 7b). The degree to which a misconduct can be regarded as directly associated with the actions or processes of a faculty or school is not discernible from the data.
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RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee consider and note this report for submission to Academic Board and the University Senate as fulfilment of the annual reporting requirement of Clause 7.5 of the University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decision) Rule 2006 (as amended).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Clause 7.5 of the University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decision) Rule 2006 (as amended) requires that the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) will report annually to the senate on the Student Appeals Body decisions, and the number of appeal hearings for which membership of the Student Appeals Body did not include a Student of the University, as a proportion of the total number of appeal hearings.
BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

2018 Student Appeals Body (SAB) Annual Report

The University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 provides that any student may appeal to the Student Appeals Body against an academic decision on the ground that due academic process had not been observed by the relevant Faculty in relation to an Academic Decision.

In accordance with section 7.5 of the above Rule, the Registrar provides the Student Appeals Body 2018 Annual Report to Senate. The Report provides information on the following:

- 7.5.1 Student Appeals Body decisions; and
- 7.5.2 The number of appeal hearings for which the membership of the Student Appeals Body did not include a Student of the University, as a proportion of the total number of appeal hearings.

Total appeals to the Student Appeals Body (SAB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>s.7.5.1 SAB decision type</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of appeals</td>
<td>Proportion %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal upheld</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal dismissed (not eligible or unsuccessful)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal withdrawn</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal reconsidered by Faculty prior to hearing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred back to Faculty after hearing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Appeals by domestic students | 68   | 59   | 77    | 50   |
| Appeals by international students | 47   | 41   | 76    | 50   |
| Appeals by postgraduate students | 34   | 30   | 55    | 36   |
| Appeals by undergraduate students          | 81   | 70   | 98    | 64   |

| s.7.5.2 Number of hearings and proportion of total hearings in which the membership of the SAB did not include a Student of the University | 1    | 10   | 17    | 29   |

All 2018 SAB appeals have been resolved and closed. In 2018, the Student Affairs Unit (SAU) received 115 SAB appeals against academic decisions, including (but are not limited to), exclusions, final mark and grade, mark against an assessment task, special consideration/special arrangements and credit applications, etc. 9 of the 2018 SAB appeal matters were resolved and closed in 2019.

The SAU received 38 less SAB appeals in 2018, when compared with 2017 applications, consisting of a decrease in 29% of appeals for hearing by the SAB. Additionally, the SAU has worked closely with faculties and the Academic Panel, through bi-annual meetings, bi-annual presentations, and regular collaborations to improve and ensure consistency with Faculty-level procedures and decision-making on academic outcomes and related appeals. As a result, there has been an increase in appeals that have been referred back to Faculty and reconsidered following submission of SAB appeals to the SAU. It is noteworthy that the following comparative data confirms an increase in reconsideration rates by Faculties when compared with previous years: 0% in 2016, 10% in 2017 and 17% in 2018.

The SAU has invested more heavily in ensuring that student representatives are secured for SAB panels, so as to achieve greater diversity and representation in the decision-making process. As a result, there has been a significant decrease in SAB hearings that did not include a student of the University, as part of the Student Appeals Body at the hearing, with 34% in 2016, 29% in 2017 and 10% in 2018. The SAU directed its focus to the student experience, increased training for SAB participants and ensured diversity in representation on the SAB panels as an acknowledgment of this commitment. Further improvements have also been made by the SAU to better inform students when attending hearings by way of information.
guides in preparation, the implementation of the SAB appeals workflow (a TRIM based system) to facilitate automated messaging, notifications and a reduction in timeframes related to SAB appeals when compared with previous years.

62% of SAB appeals were resolved and closed within two months of lodgement and 38% of SAB appeals required more than two months to resolve. The delays of over two months were exacerbated by a number of factors, such as student examinations, mid-semester and University breaks, availability of SAB panel members, appellants and appellant representations and include weekends. On average, in 2018, the SAU resolved SAB appeals within 52 calendar days.
## Total appeals to the (SAB) by Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type (number of enrolments)</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total appeals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Engineering and IT</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Health Sciences</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Medicine and Health</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney Business School</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Panel</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% COMPARISON</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RBF - Referred Back to Faculty
For comparison: total appeals to the (SAB) by Faculty in 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type (number of enrolments)</th>
<th>Total appeals</th>
<th>Not eligible</th>
<th>Withdrawn</th>
<th>To SAB</th>
<th>Successful (at hearing)</th>
<th>Unsuccessful (at hearing)</th>
<th>Reconsidered by Faculty</th>
<th>Referred back to Faculty</th>
<th>% of total SAB appeals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (14,368)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Dentistry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Education and Social Work (merged with FASS)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Engineering and IT (8705)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Health Sciences (4431)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Pharmacy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Science* (9621)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture, Design and Planning (2033)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music (1032)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School (2524)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Sydney Medical School (9265)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Nursing School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney Business School (13,390)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Consideration/Special Arrangement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% COMPARISON | 100 | 27 | 6 | 38 | 24 (of those heard at hearing) | 67 (of those heard at hearing) | 10 | 21 | 100 |
In most cases, the number of appeals received are proportionate to the size of the Faculties or Schools that the appellants represent. The highest number of SAB appeals that were received were from appellants within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, the Faculty of Engineering and IT and the University of Sydney Business School, closely followed by Faculty of Science.