ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY COMMITTEE

2:00PM – 4:00PM, TUESDAY 25 JUNE 2019

Chair: Professor Jane Hanrahan
Committee Officer: Caroline North
University Secretariat | Office of the Vice-Chancellor

NOTICE OF MEETING

Meeting 4/2019 of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee will be held from 2:00pm – 4:00pm on Tuesday 25 June 2019 in Function Room, Level 5 Administration Building F23.

AGENDA

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

Welcome

For item 4.1: Professor Ross Coleman (Director of Graduate Research, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education))

Apologies

Dr Peter Bryant (Academic Board appointed member for The University of Sydney Business School)

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

2.1 Minutes of Previous Meeting (7 May 2019) Chair attached

2.2 Minutes of Meeting by Circulation (14 May 2019) Chair attached

2.2.1 2019 Research Code of Conduct Feedback Chair, Academic Board attached

2.2.2 New powers of the Research Integrity Office designated officer: In need of oversight by the committee? Professor Manuel Graeber attached

2.3 Action Schedule Chair attached

3 STANDING ITEMS

3.1 Report of the Chair Chair verbal

3.2 Report of Academic Board Chair, Academic Board attached

3.2.1 Academic Board Standing Orders attached

3.2.2 Academic Board Emerging Risk Discussion attached

3.3 Report of the Admissions Subcommittee Chair, Admission Committee verbal

3.3.1 Changes to English Language Proficiency Requirements attached

4 ITEMS FOR ACTION

4.1 Improving HDR Supervision at the University of Sydney Director, Graduate Research attached

4.2 Report on Changes to Assessment Procedures 2011 Chair, Academic Board attached

4.3 Report of the Dual and Joint Degrees Working Group DVC (Education) attached

5 ITEMS FOR NOTING

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

Respect is a core value of the Academic Board
5.2 Addendum to 2018 Student Misconduct Annual Report

6 OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 Any Other Business

Next meeting:
2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 13 August 2019
Level 5 Function Room, F23 Administration Building

Academic Standards and Policy Committee - Terms of Reference

PURPOSE

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

TERMS OF REFERENCE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

12. To consider and report on any matter referred to it by the Academic Board, the Vice-Chancellor or the Deputy Vice-Chancellors.
ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY COMMITTEE

The Academic Standards and Policy Committee met from Tuesday 14 May to Tuesday 21 May 2019 via circulation.

Members Present: Professor Jane Hanrahan (Chair), Associate Professor Tony Masters (Chair, Academic Board), Associate Professor Tim Wilkinson (Chair, Admissions Sub-Committee), Professor Pip Pattison (Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)), Professor Adam Bridgeman (Pro Vice-Chancellor, Educational Innovation), Mr Jacky He (President, SRC), Ms Eolande Bao (SUPRA (Nominee)), Dr Adrienne Keane (The University of Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning), Associate Professor Alex Lefebvre (Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences), Professor Peter Bryant (The University of Sydney Business School), Professor Greg Murray (The University of Sydney School of Dentistry), Associate Professor Vincent Gomes (Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies), Associate Professor Alison Purcell (Faculty of Health Sciences), Professor Rita Shackel (The University of Sydney Law School), Dr Peter Knight (The University of Sydney School of Medicine), Dr Vasiliki Betihavas (The University of Sydney Susan Wakil School of Nursing and Midwifery), Dr Bret Church (The University of Sydney School of Pharmacy), Associate Professor Helen Agus (Faculty of Science), Associate Professor Jennifer Rowley (Sydney Conservatorium of Music), Ms Kerrie Henderson (Office of General Counsel), Associate Professor Maurice Peat (The University of Sydney Business School)

Attendees: Ms Allison L’Armour (SUPRA Student Advice & Advocacy Service), Associate Professor Peter McCallum (Acting Registrar and Academic Director, Education Policy and Quality), Ms Caroline North (Committee Officer, Secretariat)

Apologies: Nil

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

1 ITEMS FOR ACTION

2.1 Update to the Research Code of Conduct

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/4-2
The AB ASPC resolved to endorse the proposed changes to the Research Code of Conduct 2019.

Note for the record
The AB ASPC considered and endorsed the proposed changes to the University’s Research Code of Conduct 2019 which had been updated to comply with the new version of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research released in 2018.

A member referred to the proposed amendments submitted to the Research Integrity Office on behalf of the University of Sydney Association of Professors Council (USAP Council). The concerns related to clauses about the dismissal of complaints, and allegations made by University staff or affiliates considered to be made in bad faith or vexatious. The Research Integrity Office clarified the clauses had been updated to ensure compliance with the ARC/NHMRC/UA Guide to Managing and Investigating Potential Breaches of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research 2018 (the Investigation Guide), which accompanied the new 2018 Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research. The proposed amendments by the USAP Council had been carefully considered but were not included in the final version of the University’s Research Code; the proposed changes in relation to the dismissal of complaints were deemed to be not fully consistent with the requirements of the Investigation Guide. In relation to the proposed changes around allegations made in bad faith, it was noted the Investigation Guide did not specify the process for handling such matters and as such the clause was flexible to allow the University to manage cases in a way that was appropriate to the specific circumstances. In response to a comment about a potential conflict of interest in the involvement of the Research Integrity Office in drafting the updates to the Code given their participation in the processes, it
was noted the draft Code had been prepared by a consultant solicitor from the Office of General Counsel, with input from the Research Integrity Office.

In response to feedback, the Research Integrity Office offered to include the TEQSA Higher Education Standards Framework in the list of relevant legislation.
ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY COMMITTEE

2:00PM – 4:00PM, TUESDAY 7 MAY 2019

Function Room, Level 5, F23 Administration Building

Members Present: Professor Jane Hanrahan (Chair), Associate Professor Tony Masters (Chair, Academic Board), Mr Jacky He (President, SRC), Ms Eolande Bao (SUPRA (Nominee)), Dr Adrienne Keane (The University of Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning), Associate Professor Alex Lefebvre (Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences), Professor Peter Bryant (The University of Sydney Business School), Professor Greg Murray (The University of Sydney School of Dentistry), Associate Professor Vincent Gomes (Faculty of Engineering and I), Professor Rita Shackel (The University of Sydney Law School), Dr Vasiliki Betihavas (The University of Sydney Susan Wakil School of Nursing and Midwifery), Dr Bret Church (The University of Sydney School of Pharmacy), Associate Professor Helen Agus (Faculty of Science), Associate Professor Jennifer Rowley (Sydney Conservatorium of Music), Ms Yasodara Puhule-Gamayalage (Undergraduate Student), Ms Yeon Jae Kim (Postgraduate Student), Professor Alan Fekete (Academic Board representative), Ms Kerrie Henderson (University Policy Manager, Office of General Counsel), Associate Professor Maurice Peat (The University of Sydney Business School), Associate Professor Tim Wilkinson (Chair, Admissions Sub-Committee)

Attendees: Professor Ross Coleman (Director, Graduate Research; for item 4.1), Associate Professor Peter McCallum (Acting Registrar and Academic Director, Education Policy and Quality), Ms Caroline North (Committee Officer, Secretariat)

Apologies: Professor Pip Pattison (Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)), Associate Professor Salvatore Babones (Academic Board representative), Professor Adam Bridgeman (Pro Vice-Chancellor, Educational Innovation), Dr Peter Knight (The University of Sydney School of Medicine), Associate Professor Alison Purcell (Faculty of Health Sciences)

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

1 WELCOME & APOLOGIES

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/3-1
The AB ASPC resolved to note the apologies received as detailed above.

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

2.1 Minutes of Previous Meeting (19 March 2019)

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/3-2
The AB ASPC resolved to approve the Minutes of Previous Meeting (19 March 2019).

3 STANDING ITEMS

3.1 Report of the Chair

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/3-3
The AB ASPC resolved to note the Chair had no items to report.

3.2 Report of Academic Board

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/3-4
The AB ASPC resolved to note the Report of Academic Board.

Note for the record
The Chair, Academic Board, celebrated the University’s TEQSA registration to 3 April 2026. He said there were some non-statutory requests as well as opportunities for enhancements going forward.
3.3 Report of the Admissions Subcommittee

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/3-5
The AB ASPC resolved to note the Report of the Admissions Subcommittee.

4 ITEMS FOR ACTION

4.1 Respectful Research Supervisory Relationships: Amendments to the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/3-6
The AB ASPC resolved to endorse the proposed amendments to the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013 and recommend the amendments to the Academic Board for approval subject to the changes detailed below.

Note for the record
Professor Ross Coleman (Director, Graduate Research) was in attendance to speak to the item. He provided an overview of the proposed amendments to the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013 namely to clause 14 ‘Responsibilities of supervisors’ and clause 15 ‘Responsibilities of students’. The paper was in response to the University’s consideration of the ‘Principles for Respectful Supervisory Relationships’ produced by Universities Australia, the National Tertiary Education Union, the Council of Australian Postgraduate Associations and the Australian Council of Graduate Research. The principles set out the behavioural expectations for institutions engaging in research student supervision. Members were reminded the committee, at its meeting on Tuesday 6 November 2018, supported to development of amendments to the policy to reflect the expectations.

In discussion, the AB ASPC requested that both Clauses 14 and 15 state ‘Sexual or romantic relationships between a student and their supervisor(s) are never appropriate’; and that it be noted such relationships would constitute a conflict of interests on the part of the supervisor. In addition, the committee requested Clause 14 be amended to reflect that it was the responsibility of the supervisor to declare the interest; and the matter could only be managed by a change in supervisor. The committee noted the efforts underway in the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) portfolio and under the Sydney Operating Model Program to encourage students to declare such relationships and improve the culture in this space. It was pointed out that where attention was not reciprocated it would constitute harassment; the complaints process was detailed in the Student Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Policy 2018. The AB ASPC identified a need to provide principles for respectful Supervisory Relationships’ to Honours students and the Code of Conduct – Staff and Affiliates was suggested as a potential fit for such principles.

The Chair expressed thanks to the Director, Graduate Research.

4.2 Amendments to the Coursework Policy 2014 and Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 for the Sydney Professional Certificate and Teaching Periods

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/3-7
The AB ASPC resolved to: 1) endorse the proposed amendments to the Coursework Policy 2014 and Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 to accommodate the offer of the Sydney Professional Certificate, Studies; 2) endorse the administrative changes to the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016; and 3) recommend the amendments to the Academic Board for approval1.

Note for the record
Associate Professor Peter McCallum (Acting Registrar and Academic Director, Education Policy and Quality) provided an overview of the proposed amendments to the Coursework Policy 2014 and Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 including context, rationale, issues for consideration, and implementation plan.

The introduction of clause 89A to the Coursework Policy 2014 served to specify the curriculum for the University’s first accredited micro-credential course, the Sydney Professional Certificate. In response to a 1 Subsequent to the meeting, the Registrar confirmed that additional ESOS compliance issues relating to how compulsory teaching periods were defined required further advice on specific details in the National Code. Therefore, all changes regarding Winter School/Summer School were removed from the policy documents. Following completion of the investigation, the changes relating to Winter School/Summer School would be referred to the AB ASPC for endorsement and subsequently to the Academic Board for approval.
query, it was said the proposed maximum time limit for completion was 2 years and there was no requirement to update the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014. Following concern about potential for the time limitation to pose an issue for graduates in employment, it was said the certificate provided a means to upskill professional skills and knowledge and completion beyond two years would likely mean skills acquired would be out-of-date.

The Acting Registrar spoke about the proposed changes to replace the reference to the 'Summer School' and 'Winter School' with the introduction of a teaching period. The plan was to establish two teaching periods per year, each to comprise of a six-month period and each including one semester. The enrolment requirements had been adapted to the new terminology such that students may enrol in a maximum of 30 credit points of study or 36 credit points in any one teaching period with the approval of the Associate Dean. The committee debated the proposed changes to enrolment limits and agreed a hard limit should not be imposed i.e. students should be able to enrol in units of study beyond 36 credit points in certain circumstances with the approval of the Associate Dean. In response to a suggestion to introduce limits for students who were not meeting academic progression requirements, it was noted that the University's responsibilities in this space were detailed under Part 15 of the Coursework Policy 2014.

The AB ASPC observed the need to consider the language relating to compulsory teaching periods and semesters to ensure alignment with the requirements of the Education and Training to Overseas Students (ESOS) National Code.

4.3 Proposed Cadigal Early Conditional Offer Scheme

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/3-8
The AB ASPC resolved to endorse the Cadigal Early Conditional Offer Scheme and recommend to Academic Board for approval subject to the amendments detailed below.

Note for the record
The Registrar provided an overview of the program to address the educational disadvantage experienced by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, by facilitating and supporting their participation in University courses.

The AB ASPC requested the program be renamed 'Early Conditional Offer Scheme for Cadigal Applicants' to clarify it was available to Cadigal applicants only. In discussion, it was said the proposal was to establish the program under clause 29 'Conditional Early Offers Schemes' of the Coursework Policy 2014 in the interim; the terms would be added to the policy in the next round of formal amendments. The University Policy Manager offered to amend the proposed terms for program to reflect the discussion.

5 ITEMS FOR NOTING

5.1 Annual Student Misconduct Report 2018

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/3-9
The AB ASPC resolved to note the Annual Student Misconduct Report 2018.

Note for the record
The AB ASPC discussed the data for student misconduct cases received and closed in 2018. It was suggested consideration be given to a more nuanced approach to reporting of case completion times; reporting by categories was preferential over averages given the latter did not account for case complexity.

Following a comment about the need for greater feedback to faculties, schools and administrative units about misconduct case outcomes to facilitate continuous process improvement, the Registrar offered to explore what information about the cases could be divulged and provide an update at a future meeting. The AB ASPC noted it would be worthwhile to consider an annual feedback report of student misconduct to faculties and schools. There was a subsequent discussion about the scale of misconduct cases involving international students (particularly residency/visa holders) and the Registrar spoke about the efforts underway to address the matter e.g. the development of an educational integrity training component for all commencing students. The committee also observed the need for caution with reference to the data in table 2b around residency/visa holder status categories given the % anonymous/out of scope.

Respect is a core value of the Academic Board
5.2 Annual Report of Student Appeals Body 2018

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/3-10
The AB ASPC resolved to note the Annual Report of Student Appeals Body 2018.

6 OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 Any Other Business

Resolution AB ASPC 2019/3-11
The AB ASPC resolved to note there was no other business.

Meeting dates for 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda deadline</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 11 June 2019</td>
<td>Tuesday 25 June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 30 July 2019</td>
<td>Tuesday 13 August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 1 October 2019</td>
<td>Tuesday 15 October 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Kate,

RE: 2019 Research Code of Conduct Feedback

USAP Council would like to flag up a problem concerning the way the Section 22 addition is worded and would like to suggest the following revisions (marked in red):

22 Summary dismissal

The Designated Officer may summarily dismiss an allegation if it lacks substance or could not, even if proven, amount to a breach of this policy. If summary dismissal power is used reasons must be given in writing and reported to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee.

Where allegations made by University staff or affiliates are considered to be made in bad faith or vexatious, the Designated Officer must refer the matter to Human Resources to address the conduct of the complainant.

Kind regards

Manuel B. Graeber
USAP President

Cc: VC, DVC-R
Subject: Re: ASPC: For endorsement - Update to the Research Code of Conduct
Date: Wednesday, 29 May 2019 at 09:57:42 Australian Eastern Standard Time
From: Manuel Graeber <manuel.graeber@sydney.edu.au>
To: Research Integrity <research.integrity@sydney.edu.au>
CC: Caroline North <caroline.north@sydney.edu.au>

Dear Rebecca,

Notifying the Academic Standards and Policy Committee (ASPC) about a rare event places a very minor burden on the RIO.

If you do a risk assessment it is obvious that dismissal of what may be a justified questioning of the academic processes is one of the high-risk decisions the RIO can take. Leaving that decision to a single individual (or one office) that can make honest mistakes or may not always be sufficiently independent when the relevant committee can easily safeguard the process would seem negligent.

However, although easy to implement it would not appear appropriate to compare the requested notification of the ASPC to conventional reporting. There is too much of that. It rather means improving transparency of which we cannot have enough at a public university, and especially if we want to be a leading one.

Allow me to reiterate that the threshold for dismissal of a matter by the RIO needs to be very high for the reasons mentioned earlier. It is also highly advisable to involve HR in a case as serious as that, i.e. where the dismissal is upheld by the RIO and noted by the ASPC.

The reference here has to be academic standards.

Kind regards

Manuel

From: Research Integrity <research.integrity@sydney.edu.au>
Date: Monday, 27 May 2019 at 09:00
To: Manuel Graeber <manuel.graeber@sydney.edu.au>
Cc: Caroline North <caroline.north@sydney.edu.au>
Subject: RE: ASPC: For endorsement - Update to the Research Code of Conduct

Dear Manuel,

Thank you for clarifying your concerns. The draft Research Code of Conduct 2019 was prepared by a consultant solicitor from the Office of General Counsel, with input from the Research Integrity Office. Under the draft Research Code of Conduct 2019, the designated officer can only dismiss a matter in two situations:

- Where a matter doesn’t fall under the Research Code, but does breach other University policies – in this case the complaint is forwarded to the relevant team within the University for management (e.g. Workplace Relations in HR, Student Affairs Unit). In this case there is no need for further reporting of the matter as it is still being considered by the University.

- Where the action does not appear to be a breach of the Research Code or of any
other University policy – in this case we write to the complainant to explain the reasons for the dismissal. In some cases, the complainant will be satisfied with the explanation provided, for example where a member of the public or a student had misunderstood the requirements of the Research Code. In this case, there would be no need to report the matter.

Where the complainant is not satisfied they have the right to appeal the decision and will be informed of this right. Under the new Research Code of Conduct 2019 any party involved in a complaint may request a review of the decision by the University’s Review Officer if they believe that the requirements of procedural fairness have not been met. This process is described in clause 30 of the Research Code. The Review Officer will be the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor or another individual of equivalent seniority within the University who does not have a conflict of interest in relation to the matter.

The complainant and respondent also have the ability to request a review from the Australian Research Integrity Committee, which is jointly established by the ARC and NHMRC to review institutional processes for responding to allegations of research misconduct.

Given that processes are in place to allow the respondent or complainant to escalate the matter if they believe the University has not managed the matter appropriately, both within and outside the University, we consider that there is already sufficient scrutiny of any decisions made by the designated officer and that additional reporting is therefore unnecessary.

With regards to vexatious complainants, we agree that if a complaint was found to be vexatious it is likely that it would constitute misconduct under the University’s Code of Conduct and it would be referred accordingly. Where it would need to be referred would vary depending on the person’s status with the University. For example, for staff covered by the Enterprise Agreement allegations of misconduct are managed in accordance with clause 384 in Section H of the Enterprise Agreement, while for affiliates the management of such concerns would depend on the conditions of the affiliation agreement in place. We believe that the current wording of this clause in the Research Code of Conduct provides the flexibility to allow such concerns to be referred to the most appropriate place within the University for management.

Thank you again for your feedback on the draft Code and please let me know if you have further concerns.

Best wishes,

Rebecca

Rebecca Griffin | Research Integrity Manager
Research Integrity | Research Portfolio
THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY
Level 3, F23 Administration Building | The University of Sydney | NSW | 2006
T +61 2 8627 0200
E research.integrity@sydney.edu.au | W http://sydney.edu.au/research_support/

From: Manuel Graeber <manuel.graeber@sydney.edu.au>
Sent: Monday, 20 May 2019 10:38 AM
To: Research Integrity <research.integrity@sydney.edu.au>
Cc: Caroline North <caroline.north@sydney.edu.au>
Subject: Re: ASPC: For endorsement - Update to the Research Code of Conduct

Dear Rebecca,

Both the Academic Standards and Policy Committee and the Academic Board regularly handle confidential matters. That is not a problem but normal practice. In addition, it is normal legal
practice that privacy rights are waived when they would protect misconduct.

Concerning your second point, a malicious grievance justifies disciplinary action and dismissal may be the appropriate action particularly in a case where trust and integrity issues are at the centre. That is why it is necessary to involve HR in such cases.

Importantly, genuine reporting deserves to be encouraged especially at a University where truth finding is the official task and expected by the public. However, reporting is deterred when action is taken against a complainant. Therefore, in the case of the RIO, the threshold for taking action against a complainant needs to be very high. This is the more important as any RIO designated officer is not independent (he or she is merely an employee), and may not have the qualifications and experience of a practising legal expert and, very important, a cover-up, even if by accident or only perceived, at the RIO level may have disastrous consequences for the reputation of a University.

Therefore, the proposed changes to your draft should be made. I would like to clarify that they are not only my mine, but they were written, discussed with and approved by USAP Council which has 15 members with many decades of experience of University life often in leading administrative positions ranging from HOS to DVC.

Furthermore, allow me to point out again that your office has a COI drafting the very code that defines its involvement in the above processes. In other words, your office should not be drafting this part of the code strictly speaking.

The changes USAP Council has proposed serve to protect the University and should be implemented not only to safeguard integrity of process but also following the precautionary principle.

I think we are in agreement that the Investigation Guide is not sufficiently specific with regard to the handling of these important matters.

Kind regards

Manuel

PROFESSOR MANUEL B. GRAEBER MD PhD FRCPath | Neuropathologist

Barnet-Cropper Chair of Brain Tumour Research
University of Sydney Brain and Mind Centre
Director, Brain Tumour Research
THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY
Rm 705, Building F | 94 Mallett Street
Camperdown NSW 2050 Australia
T +61 2 91144008 | F +61 2 93510731

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF NEUROGENETICS

President, University of Sydney Association of Professors
http://www.sydney.edu.au/usap
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Dear Professor Graeber,

Thank you for your feedback on the University’s Research Code of Conduct (the Research Code). The clauses to which you refer have been updated to ensure compliance with the ARC/NHMRC/UA Guide to Managing and Investigating Potential Breaches of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research 2018 (the Investigation Guide), which accompanies the new 2018 Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research. We have carefully considered the corrections you have proposed but unfortunately we were unable to include these in the final version of the University’s Research Code for the reasons outlined below.

In relation to the dismissal of complaints, the Investigation Guide states that:

*Upon receipt of a complaint, the DO (Designated Officer) decides how to proceed. If the complaint represents a potential breach of the Code, then the process continues to preliminary assessment. If the complaint does not represent a potential breach of the Code, then it may be dismissed or referred to other institutional processes*

The first clause you referred to has been designed to be consistent with the process set out in the Investigation Guide. In addition, the Investigation Guide requires that “information will be treated as confidential and not disclosed unless required”. The processes for complaint management outlined in the Research Code have been designed to maintain the confidentiality of all affected persons as far as possible, in the interests of procedural fairness. The proposed amendment to this clause would not be fully consistent with the requirements of the Investigation Guide so we were unable to incorporate this into the updated Research Code.

With regards to allegations made in bad faith, there may be circumstance in which referral to Human Resources may not be the most appropriate way to manage the conduct of the complainant. For example, there may be cases where referral to the person’s Dean or Director may be more appropriate. The Investigation Guide does not specify the process for handling such matters, so we have therefore chosen to leave this clause flexible to allow us to manage such cases in a way that is appropriate to the specific circumstances of the matter.

Thank you again for your comments on the Research Code and please let me know if you have any further concerns.

Best wishes,

Rebecca
Dear Elizabeth,

Please see comment below.

Regards

Caroline

Hi Caroline,

The correct history is that the code was changed in the first place (locally and not in line with the wording or spirit of the national version as far as we can see) and the correction was submitted in response to that.

Besides, the RIO has a COI in this case and should not decide on this par. of the code because their own involvement is affected.

We think the correction is mandatory to preserve integrity of process.
Please let the RIO know and ask them to make the correction.

Kind regards

Manuel

---

From: Caroline North <caroline.north@sydney.edu.au>
Date: Tuesday, 14 May 2019 at 12:00
To: Manuel Graeber <manuel.graeber@sydney.edu.au>
Subject: RE: ASPC: For endorsement - Update to the Research Code of Conduct

Hi Manuel

The suggestion was considered by the Research Integrity Office, but was not incorporated into the final version of the Code. If you have further questions, please refer them to (research.integrity@sydney.edu.au), or Rebecca Griffin (Research Integrity Manager) on 8627 0816.

Best wishes

Caroline

---

From: Manuel Graeber
Sent: Tuesday, 14 May 2019 9:22 AM
To: Caroline North <caroline.north@sydney.edu.au>
Subject: Re: ASPC: For endorsement - Update to the Research Code of Conduct

Hi Caroline,

The attached correction is missing. Can you confirm this?

Kind regards
Dear all,

Please find attached an item for endorsement in relation to the Research Code of Conduct.

Please provide your response by return email to me by Tuesday 21 May.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Best wishes

CAROLINE NORTH | Committee Officer, University Secretariat
Office of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal |
THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY
Level 5, F23 Administration Building | The University of Sydney | NSW | 2006
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What universities can learn from one of science’s biggest frauds

Detailed analysis of misconduct investigations into huge research fraud suggests institutional probes aren’t rigorous enough.

Holly Else

Search for this author in:

Pub Med
Nature.com
Google Scholar
Bone-health research was hit by a sprawling case of misconduct that affected tens of studies. Credit: Auscape/Universal Images Group/ Getty

By day, Andrew Grey studies bone health. But over the past few years, he's developed another speciality: the case of one of science's most prolific fraudsters.

From 1996 to 2013, Yoshihiro Sato, a Japanese bone-health researcher plagiarized work, fabricated data and forged authorships — prompting retractions of more than 60 studies in the scholarly literature so far. Grey and colleagues at the University of Auckland in New Zealand and the University of Aberdeen, UK, are among the researchers who have raised concerns about Sato's work over the past decade or so, and they have studied the case in detail — in particular, how universities involved in the research investigated concerns about his work and allegations of misconduct.

At the World Conference on Research Integrity in Hong Kong from 2 to 5 June, Grey's team described its years-long efforts to clean up Sato's literature, and presented its analysis of the inquiries conducted by four universities in Japan and the United States ensnared in the scandal (the team published its analysis of three investigations in a paper in February¹). Grey says their findings provide evidence to support a growing view in the academic community: that university investigations into research misconduct are often inadequate, opaque and poorly conducted. They challenge the idea that institutions can police themselves on research integrity and propose that there should be independent organizations to evaluate allegations of research fraud should.
Nine pitfalls of research misconduct

The analysis is one of just a few to look closely at research-misconduct investigations, and the first to use a systematic approach to rate them, says C. K. Gunsalus, a specialist in research integrity at the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, who was not part of the analysis. Too many research-misconduct investigations turn out to be inadequate or flawed, says Gunsalus, who had a hand in creating a 26-point checklist that university officials can use to guide probes into research misconduct, which Grey’s team used to rate the investigations.

The checklist questions an investigation’s scope, reliability and impact — for instance, whether the investigating committee included external members and whether evidence could have been tampered with. The team independently assessed each investigation report using the checklist; one report had addressed none of the points adequately and two others properly addressed only two or three points. “Overall, each report was considered unacceptable,” say Grey and colleagues.

Alarm bells

Sato, who died in 2016, studied and ran clinical trials of drugs and supplements that might help to prevent bone fracture. Researchers in the field began raising concerns about Sato’s work in the mid-2000s, when some questioned the speed at which Sato had recruited and assessed participants for some of his studies. Sato later apologized for not disclosing all the hospitals from which he had recruited participants, and admitted a mistake in one paper. But more researchers flagged irregularities about his papers to journals, and in 2016, Grey and colleagues published an analysis in Neurology that raised concerns about 33 of Sato’s studies. Sato admitted
that three of these studies were fraudulent, asked for them to be retracted, and cleared his co-authors of any wrongdoing. Twenty-seven of those studies have now been retracted.

In 2017, Grey's team also flagged their concerns about hundreds of Sato's papers to four institutions that had co-authors on these studies — Kurume, Hirosaki and Keio universities in Japan and New York University's Winthrop Hospital; Sato had been a researcher at Kurume and Hirosaki universities. Two institutions had already launched investigations into some of the work when Grey contacted them, and the others began investigations.

The researchers asked the institutions for the reports of their investigations to understand how they had responded to the allegations. None of the reports revealed exactly who or which papers had been investigated; one found that an unnamed researcher had committed misconduct, and two reports recommended that papers be retracted.

Grey's team rated each report as inadequate overall. The researchers also suggested that the investigations focused too much on determining whether research misconduct had occurred, rather than on understanding the validity of the research in question and correcting or retracting unreliable articles. Grey and colleagues argue that protecting the integrity of the literature should be the priority of any investigation — because integrity can be compromised without evidence of misconduct.

Grey says that his and his colleagues' motivation to pursue the case for so long is to correct the literature that clinicians and patients rely on. Academic institutions, publishers and journals have not been willing or able to do a comprehensive job, he says, so his team has persisted in raising concerns.

Further review

Gunsalus agrees that the Sato case highlights some of the problems with misconduct investigations, and says that if shortcomings emerge, further reviews may be needed. She suggests institutional panels should include external members and that officials should also use a standardized checklist to strengthen their processes. “There should be some way for journals, funders, patients and others to be assured of the credibility and thoroughness of university reviews,” says Gunsalus.

Grey's findings also suggest that institutions in Japan — which has seen several high-profile research misconduct cases in recent decades — should review their processes for investigating misconduct, says Alan Price, a research-misconduct consultant in Texas.

The universities did not respond directly to criticisms of the investigations, which Nature flagged to them, but offered further details about their inquiries and the outcomes. Winthrop Hospital said that it spent more than a year investigating the concerns, including digging up receipts for lab equipment, but found no misconduct. Keio University said that its investigation included external experts and statistical analysis of data; it found no research misconduct, but some errors in methods and typos in studies.

Kurume University asked a committee of statisticians and medical researchers to investigate 39 papers authored by Sato, and found some data falsification and inappropriate authorships. It said that it cannot conclude whether fraud was involved in another 32 papers because Sato is dead and records for these experiments no longer exist. Hirosaki University — whose 2017 investigation found “research irregularities” in 14 research papers, 7 of which had already been retracted — did not respond to Nature's request for comment.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING DATE</th>
<th>REF.</th>
<th>BUSINESS ARISING</th>
<th>LEAD</th>
<th>DUE</th>
<th>PROGRESS REPORT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/05/19</td>
<td>03.01/19</td>
<td>Amendments to the <em>Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013</em></td>
<td>Director, Graduate Research</td>
<td>04/06/19</td>
<td>28/05/19 update: Updated policy referred to Academic Board for approval on 4 June 2019.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/05/19</td>
<td>03.02/19</td>
<td>Amendments to the <em>Coursework Policy 2014 and Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 for the Sydney Professional Certificate and Teaching Periods</em></td>
<td>Acting Registrar and Academic Director, Education Policy and Quality</td>
<td>Future meeting</td>
<td>28/05/19 update:</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/05/19</td>
<td>03.03/19</td>
<td>Proposed Cadigal Early Conditional Offer Scheme</td>
<td>University Policy Manager</td>
<td>04/06/19</td>
<td>28/05/19 update: Updated paper referred to Academic Board for approval on 4 June 2019.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/05/19</td>
<td>03.04/19</td>
<td>Annual Student Misconduct Report 2018</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>25/06/19</td>
<td>28/05/19 update: To feature on agenda at 25 June meeting.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MtNo.RefNo/Year

Key:
- Complete
- On hold
- Ongoing
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 4 June 2019.

REPORT OF ACADEMIC BOARD MEETING

Items related to the Academic Quality Committee
The Academic Board noted the report from the meeting of the Academic Quality Committee held on Tuesday 30 April 2019 and:

- noted that the Committee received and noted course monitoring outlier data;
- noted that the Committee approved the completed Course Review for the Master of Human Resource Management & Industrial Relations (and embedded courses) subject to the provision of a timeline and map of changes;
- noted the Educational Integrity Annual Report 2018 and agreed to recommend it to Senate;
- noted that the Committee deferred to the next meeting the consideration of a request to accept the response to Recommendation 19 of the Academic Board thematic review into Student Wellbeing and Safety; and
- approved by circulation the Joint Academic Board / University Executive Phase Five Thematic Review of Student Wellbeing and Safety.

Items related to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee
The Academic Board noted the report from the meeting of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee held on Tuesday 7 May 2019 and:

- approved the amendment of the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013, as presented, with effect from 18 June 2019;
- approved the amendment of the Coursework Policy 2014 and Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 and endorsed administrative changes to the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016, with effect from 1 July 2019; and
- approved the introduction of the Cadigal Early Conditional Offer Scheme, as enabled by the Coursework Policy 2014, with effect from 1 July 2019.

Items related to the Graduate Studies Committee
The Academic Board noted the report from meeting of the Graduate Studies Committee held on 30 April 2019 and:

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Creative Writing, Graduate Diploma in Creative Writing, and Graduate Certificate in Creative Writing 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 Master of Art Curating, Graduate Diploma of Art Curating, Graduate Certificate of Art Curating, Master of Contemporary Art, Graduate Diploma in Contemporary Art, Master of Cultural Studies, Graduate Diploma in Cultural Studies, Graduate Certificate in Cultural Studies, Master of Development Studies, Graduate Diploma in Development Studies, Graduate Certificate in Development Studies, Master of Economic Analysis,
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Graduate Diploma in Economic Analysis, Graduate Certificate in Economic Analysis, Master of Health Security, Graduate Diploma in Health Security, Graduate Certificate in Health Security, Master of Human Rights, Graduate Diploma in Human Rights, Graduate Certificate in Human Rights, Master of International Relations, Graduate Diploma in International Relations, Graduate Certificate in International Relations, Master of International Security, Graduate Diploma in International Security, Graduate Certificate in International Security, Master of Moving Image, Graduate Diploma in Moving Image, Master of Museum and Heritage Studies, Graduate Diploma in Museum and Heritage Studies, Graduate Certificate in Museum and Heritage Studies, Master of Peace and Conflict Studies, Graduate Diploma in Peace and Conflict Studies, Graduate Certificate in Peace and Conflict Studies, Master of Political Economy, Graduate Diploma in Political Economy, Graduate Certificate in Political Economy, Master of Public Policy, Graduate Diploma in Public Policy and Graduate Certificate in Public Policy and approved the amendment of course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from January 1, 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 and approved the amendment to the table of Units of Study arising from the proposals, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Data Science and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from Sydney Law School to amend the Resolutions of the University of Sydney Law School for Coursework Awards and the Master of Laws and Graduate Diploma in Law, and approved the amendment of the School and course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from the Sydney Law School to amend the Master of Laws, Graduate Diploma of Laws, Master of Criminology, Graduate Diploma in Criminology, Master of Environmental Law, Graduate Diploma in Environmental Law, Master of Business Law, Graduate Diploma in Business Law, Master of International Law, Graduate Diploma in International Law, Master of Law and International Development, Graduate Diploma in International Business Law, Master of Global Law, Master of Taxation, Graduate Diploma of Taxation and Master of International Taxation 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 amend the Bachelor of Veterinary Biology / Doctor of Veterinary Medicine and Doctor of Veterinary Medicine and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Master of Agriculture and Environment 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 amend the Master of Marine Science and Management 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 amend the Master Mathematical Sciences and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine and Health to amend the Master of Medicine (Infection and Immunity), Master of Science in Medicine (Infection and Immunity), Graduate Diploma in Infection and Immunity, Graduate Diploma of Science in Infection and Immunity, Graduate Certificate in Infection and Immunity and Graduate Certificate of Science in Infection and Immunity and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;

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

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine and Health to amend the Master of Public Health and approved the amendment of the 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 Global Health and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;
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- approved the proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend the Master of Business Administration and approved the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020; and
- approved the proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend the Master of Commerce, the Graduate Diploma in Commerce and Graduate Certificate in Commerce and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020.

**Items related to the Undergraduate Studies Committee**
The Academic Board noted the report from the meeting of the Undergraduate Studies Committee held on 7 May 2019, and:

- approved the proposal from the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Bachelor of Design Computing and the Bachelor of Design Computing / Bachelor of Advanced Studies and approved the amendments to the Course Resolutions and Units of Study Table arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;
- approved the proposal from the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Major in Design for the Bachelor of Advanced Studies and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;
- approved the proposal from the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Major in Biological Design for the Bachelor of Advanced Studies and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;
- approved the proposal from the Sydney Business School to introduce an Advanced Coursework (non-Honours) pathway in Business for students enrolled in the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, approved the proposal for existing Honours pathways to be embedded in the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, 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 amend the Bachelor of Arts / Bachelor of Advanced Studies and the Bachelor of Economics / Bachelor of Advanced Studies 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 amend the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Arts / Bachelor of Advanced Studies 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 amend its Faculty Resolutions and approved the amendment of the 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 / Master of Nursing and approved the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering to amend the Bachelor of Project Management 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 to amend the Bachelor of Advanced Computing and approved the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering to amend the Bachelor of Engineering (Honours) 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 Health Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise Physiology) and the Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise and Sport Science) 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 Health Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise Physiology), Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise and Sport Science), Bachelor of Applied Science (Physiotherapy) and Bachelor of Health Sciences, and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;
- approved the proposal from the Sydney Law School to amend the Bachelor of Laws and approved the amendment of the Unit of Study Tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020; and
- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine and Health to amend the Bachelor of Pharmacy, Bachelor of Pharmacy (Honours), Bachelor of Pharmacy and Management and Bachelor of Pharmacy
and Management (Honours), 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 Science to amend the Bachelor of Science and the Bachelor of Science / Bachelor of Advanced Studies and approved the amendment of the unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to update the Bachelor of Science and approved the amendment of the unit of study tables for the Table 1 majors (pre-2018) tables, with effect from Semester 2 2019;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to update the Bachelor of Science, approved the amendment of unit of study tables for the pre-2018 Table 1 Majors arising from the proposal with effect from 1 January 2020, and approved the amendment of unit of study tables for the Environmental Studies Table 1, with effect from Semester 2 2019;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science in Agriculture and approved the amendment of the pre-2018 unit of study table, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Animal and Veterinary Bioscience and approved the amendment of unit of study tables, with effect from Semester 2 2019;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Animal and Veterinary Bioscience and approved the amendment of unit of study tables, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Veterinary Biology / Doctor of Veterinary Medicine and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine and Health to amend the Bachelor of Nursing (Post-registration) Singapore and approved the amendment of unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 July 2019;

- approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Psychology and approved the amendment of the Course Resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2020; and

- approved the proposal from the DVC Education Portfolio to extend the deadline for assessment plans to December 2019.

Other matters
The Academic Board also:
- discussed and endorsed the Research Code of Conduct 2019, noting that further amendments will be presented to the Academic Board as necessary to address emerging regulatory changes;
- noted an update from the Acting Registrar and Academic Director, Education Policy and Quality, on progress and piloting of the Graduate Qualities Rubric;
- noted a presentation by Brent Liang and Kirath Singh on the University’s entry for the Hult Prize;
- received and noted the Reports of the Chair and of the Vice-Chancellor;
- approved the creation of session codes to enable the delivery of the 2020 Academic Calendar for the Faculty of Medicine and Health;
- approved the 2020 Academic Calendar for the Sydney School of Veterinary Science in the Faculty of Science; and
- noted amendments to the academic staff membership of the Academic Panel for the period 2019 – 2021.
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**RECOMMENDATION**

*That the Academic Standards & Policy Committee discuss and provide feedback on the proposed draft Academic Board Standing Orders, as presented.*

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In accepting the Recommendations of the Review of the Academic Board on 28 March 2017, the Board agreed to several changes in its procedures. These Standing Orders have been prepared, in part, to provide a record, other than institutional memory, of these procedures. They are also a simple means of enabling new members to appreciate the conduct of meetings of the Academic Board, its Committees and sub-Committees.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – Draft Academic Board Standing Orders
In accepting the Recommendations of the Review of the Academic Board on 28 March 2017, the Board agreed to several changes in its procedures. These Standing Orders have been prepared, in part, to provide a record, other than institutional memory, of these procedures. They are also a simple means of enabling new members to appreciate the conduct of meetings of the Academic Board, its Committees and sub-Committees.

Part 1 Preliminary

1.1 Commencement

These Standing Orders have been adopted by the Academic Board on xxxxxx.

1.2 Purpose

The purpose of these Standing Orders is to provide guidance for the conduct of the business and proceedings of meetings of the Academic Board and its Committees as defined in the University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017 (the “Academic Board Rule”). The Standing Orders also give effect to recommendations of the Review of the Academic Board 2016, accepted by the Academic Board on 28 March 2017.

These procedures are subsidiary to those included in the Academic Board Rule. The Academic Board Rule specifies the constitution of the Academic Board, the quorum, the content of minutes, resolutions and voting. Electoral provisions are described in the Election Procedures 2015 and the Election Candidates’ Conduct Procedures 2017.

1.3 Coverage/Limitations

a) These Standing Orders are subject to the requirements of applicable University rules, policies and procedures, including, but not limited to, those referenced in the Academic Board Rule.

b) These Standing Orders apply to all meetings of the Academic Board unless the meeting resolves, that any part(s) of these Orders be suspended for the whole or any part of a meeting.

c) Committees, Sub-Committees and other advisory groups of the Academic Board may elect to adopt these Standing Orders.

d) Any procedural matter not dealt with by the Academic Board Rule or by these Standing Orders shall be determined by the Chair of the meeting.

e) Business submitted to the Academic Board, its Committees and Sub-Committees will be that defined by the Academic Board Rule, the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority - Academic Functions) Rule 2016 and the Committee or Sub-Committee Terms of Reference.

1.4 Interpretation/Definitions

The meanings of terms within these Standing Orders are those defined in the Academic Board Rule and the University of Sydney (Governance of Faculties and University Schools) Rule 2016. In addition:

a) Academic Board Rule means the University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017, as amended.
b) Academic Delegations of Authority means the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority –
Academic Functions) Rule 2016 as amended.

c) GoFUS Rule means the University of Sydney (Governance of Faculties and University Schools)
Rule 2016 as amended.

d) Motion means the formal expression of a proposal put to the meeting.

e) Resolution means the formal record of a decision of the meeting.

f) Starring of agenda items means the identification of agenda items for reporting and/or
discussion.

2 Agenda and Supporting Materials

Notice of a meeting and a copy of the business papers shall be circulated electronically by the Executive
Officer or Committee Officer, with timing of distribution as determined in the Committee/Sub-
Committee Terms of Reference and/or advertised on the Academic Board or Committee website.
Academic Board meetings are scheduled in the month prior to a meeting of the University Senate.
Additional items and business papers that require a decision may be circulated with the permission of
the relevant Chair, and for the Academic Board and Committees must be circulated at least three
working days before the meeting. The Chair of the meeting may allow additional documentation (e.g.,
copies of presentations, briefing documents, supporting materials) to be tabled at the meeting. Such
material shall not be considered if the Academic Board or Committee resolves that it be held over to a
subsequent meeting and/or referred to another Committee, Sub-Committee, Taskforce, Review
Committee or working party of the Academic Board or other body as appropriate.

3 Agenda Items

The full, complete and final version of the proposal intended for consideration by the Academic Board or
Committee must be received by the Executive Officer or Committee Officer by the close-off for receipt
of agenda items advertised on the Academic Board or Committee website; items received after this date
may only be included in the agenda with the permission of the relevant Chair. Items received after the
distribution of the agenda and accepted for the meeting will be starred.

4 Meetings by Circulation

For matters that require urgent consideration, in the absence of an appropriate imminent meeting:

a) The Executive Officer or Committee Officer will seek the permission of the relevant Chair to
propose an item for circular resolution, noting the circumstances which make the decision one
of an emergency or one which is required to avoid disadvantage;

b) If agreed by the relevant Chair, the Executive Officer or Committee Officer will forward the item
by electronic notice to the members of the Academic Board or Committee, advising that a
decision is sought regarding proposed recommendations, noting the circumstances, and
attaching the proposed recommendations and any supporting documents;
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c) The Executive Officer or Committee Officer will advise the Academic Board or Committee that the period for deliberation is at least seven calendar days or until a majority decision is received, unless a shorter timeframe is approved by the relevant Chair;

d) Upon receipt of a majority decision the recommendations shall be deemed approved or rejected in accordance with the decision; or

e) Upon the expiration of seven calendar days, if no majority decision is received the recommendations shall be deemed to have lapsed.

The suspension of Standing Orders is not possible for a meeting by circulation.

5 Order of Business

The normal order of business at each regular meeting of the Academic Board shall be as follows –

a) Welcome and Apologies.

b) Procedural Matters:

i) adoption of unstarred items

ii) minutes of previous meeting

iii) proposed changes to the Academic Board Rule

iv) business arising out of the minutes not listed in the agenda

v) proposed changes to the membership of the Academic Board, its Committees or Sub-Committees.

c) Strategic Items of Business.

d) Report of the Chair.

e) Report of the Vice-Chancellor.

f) Questions with or without notice to the Vice-Chancellor and Chair of the Academic Board.

g) Motions of which notice has been given.

h) Reports of Academic Board Committees

i) General Business.

j) Next Meeting

The normal order of business at each regular meeting of the Committees and Sub-Committees of the Academic Board shall be as determined in the agenda, consistent with these Standing Orders.
The Chair may alter the normal order of business. Motions, other than those put by the Chair, must be proposed and seconded by members of the Academic Board, Committee or Sub-Committee.

6 Starring of items
   a) The Agenda may indicate items starred for discussion, with other items to be resolved as presented without discussion.
   b) Members of the Academic Board or Committee may star unstarred items for discussion by giving notice to the Executive Officer or Committee Officer at least two working days prior to the meeting, and in doing so must confirm the item they wish to be starred and provide a brief description of the reasons for their request.

7 Conduct of Meetings

Meetings are conducted as described in Part 7 of the Academic Board Rule, observing normal meeting procedures, with the Chair determining the speaking order from speakers communicating their desire to speak to the Chair before the meeting, or at the meeting by raising their hand. The method of voting at meetings of the Academic Board is described in Part 7(7) et seq. of the Academic Board Rule.

At the 12 June 2018 meeting of the Academic Board, members agreed that conversations at the Academic Board and its Committees should be polite, respectful, inclusive, factual, on-topic and non-pejorative. Members of the Academic Board and its Committees, and Academic Board representatives on Appointment or Promotion Committees, should conform to relevant University codes and policies, including the Staff Code of Conduct, the External Interests Policy 2010 and the Code of Conduct for Students. Members of the Academic Board, its Committees, Sub-Committees and Appointment and Promotion Committees should not disclose confidential information.

8 Duration of Meetings

The expected standard duration for meetings of the Academic Board and Committees will be two hours; where the duration of an individual meeting will vary from this, the intended meeting duration will be communicated as far as possible in advance to all members. When required, meetings may be extended by a further 15 minutes by a vote of the members present.

9 Changes to Standing Orders

Changes to these Standing Orders will be made by the Academic Board only on the recommendation of the Academic Board’s Academic Standards and Policy Committee.

Note: Extract of Part 7 of the Academic Board Rule

7.1 Meetings of the Academic Board
   (1) The Chair is responsible for convening meetings of the Academic Board, in the manner specified in the procedures.
(a) The Chair must convene at least six meetings in each calendar year.
(b) The Chair may also convene a meeting at any time on their own motion.
(c) The Chair must convene a meeting if requested to do so by any of:
   (i) Senate;
   (ii) the Vice-Chancellor; or
   (iii) at least 50% of all members.

(2) A meeting held or a resolution passed at a meeting is not invalid because:
   (a) a person entitled to receive notice of the meeting did not receive it; or
   (b) less than the prescribed time of notice was given.

(3) A person who is acting in the position of an ex officio member may attend meetings and may exercise the voting rights of that position.

(4) An ex officio member, elected staff member or student member may nominate a standing alternate to attend meetings on their behalf.
   (a) The member must inform the Secretary to the Academic Board in writing of the following at least two days before the next meeting:
      (i) the fact of the appointment of the alternate;
      (ii) the alternate’s name;
      (iii) the alternate’s contact details; and
      (iv) the alternate’s position.
   (b) The alternate must meet the membership criteria applicable to the member.

(5) Quorum for Academic Board meetings is 30 members.
   (a) If no quorum is present within 30 minutes of the notified starting time of a meeting, the meeting may consider only procedural matters and must not transact any other business.
   (b) If no quorum is present within 30 minutes of the notified starting time of a meeting, the meeting may consider only procedural matters and must not transact any other business.

(6) The Secretary to the Academic Board must arrange for minutes of each meeting to be taken and recorded.

   (a) Minutes must record all motions put to a meeting, and their outcomes.
   (b) Copies of draft minutes must be provided to each member no later than the date when notice of the next meeting is given.
   (c) Minutes, once approved, must be signed by the Chair as a true and correct record.

(7) Any resolution which is to be put to a vote by members must be duly proposed and seconded.

(8) Each member present at a meeting has one deliberative vote.
   (a) Voting will be conducted by show of hands, unless a secret ballot is required.
   (b) A secret ballot must be conducted if:
      (i) demanded by any two members present at the meeting and entitled to vote; or
      (ii) directed by the Chair.

(9) Except in relation to motions of dissent under subsection 7.1(13), the Chair has one casting vote, in addition to a deliberative vote, if there is a tied vote.
(a) No casting vote is available in relation to a motion of dissent under subsection 7.1(13).

(10) Ordinary resolutions will be carried by a majority of those present at the meeting and eligible to vote.

(11) A special resolution will be carried by at least 75% of those present at the meeting and eligible to vote.

(a) A special resolution is required to amend any Rule made by the Academic Board.

(12) Except for a motion of dissent in the Chair, only the Chair may put a motion without notice to a meeting of the Academic Board.

(13) A member of the Academic Board may move a motion of dissent from a ruling by the Chair without notice.

(a) A motion of dissent will be carried by at least 75% of those present at the meeting and eligible to vote.

(b) A successful motion of dissent will:

(i) overrule the relevant ruling of the Chair; and

(ii) substitute a new ruling for that ruling.

(c) The Chair must not preside when a dissent motion is put and resolved. The Deputy Chair will preside in such circumstances, and if they are not present, the Academic Board must elect another member to preside.

7.2 Meetings of Committees

(1) Committee Chairs are responsible for convening committee meetings, and will determine the schedule of meetings in consultation with the Chair of the Academic Board.

(2) A member of a committee may nominate an alternate to attend a meeting on their behalf, by giving written notice to the relevant Chair at least two days before any meeting the alternate is to attend.

(3) Meeting and quorum requirements for committees will be as specified in their Terms of Reference.

(4) The Secretary to the Academic Board will arrange for minutes of each committee meeting to be taken and recorded.
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee provide input into the mitigation status and trends in emerging risks to the work of the Academic Board.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The University’s Academic Board and Risk Management team have been working together to identify risks of the Academic Board. Based on observations of emerging risk trends in the higher education sector, we have put together potential risks and seek insights of the members of the Board on the risk trend and mitigation status.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Academic Board Risk Discussion
Agenda

The University’s Academic Board and Risk Management team have been working together to identify risks of the Academic Board. Based on observations of emerging risk trends in the higher education sector, we have put together potential risks and seek insights of the members of the Board on the risk trend and mitigation status.

Agenda of today’s presentation is:
– Understanding risk
– Identifying your risk
– Open discussion
– Next steps
What is risk?

Risk is not only about uncertainty …

A RISK is ANYTHING that may affect the achievement of an organisation’s OBJECTIVES.

It is not just about the UNCERTAINTY that surrounds future events…

…but the POSSIBILITY of an ADVERSE outcome.

Risk can also be an opportunity …

… a RISK that may HELP in the achievement of objectives.
Risk identification: Academic Board’s objectives

The Academic Board has the principal responsibility to encourage and maintain the highest standards in teaching, scholarship and research and to safeguard the academic freedom of the University.

The Academic Board is also responsible for:

- Overseeing the development of all academic activities of the University
- Formulating and reviewing policies, guidelines and procedures in relation to academic matters
- Playing an active role in assuring the quality of teaching, scholarship and research in the University

To be confident that the policy structures properly sustain academic quality assurance and are appropriate to the University's needs, the Board monitors their implementation and effectiveness.
Risk identification: A Risk Universe approach

External

Stable / Known

Changing / New

Internal

CORE EXTERNAL

EMERGING TRENDS

CORE OPERATIONS

BUSINESS CHANGE
## Risk discussion: Emerging risk trends

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Risk Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consequences</th>
<th>Insignificant</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Severe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Certain</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Green Square" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Yellow Square" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Red Square" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Red Square" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Red Square" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Green Square" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Yellow Square" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Red Square" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Red Square" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Red Square" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Green Square" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Yellow Square" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Red Square" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Red Square" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Red Square" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Green Square" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Yellow Square" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Red Square" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Red Square" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Red Square" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Green Square" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Yellow Square" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Red Square" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Red Square" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Red Square" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee endorses the proposed amendments to the Admissions Standards – English Language Proficiency (attachment 1).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Changes to the Admissions Standards – English Language Proficiency are proposed to tertiary studies and updates to faculty specific requirements. The amendments pertaining to tertiary studies further specify the requirements based on the location of study and whether the level of study is at an undergraduate or postgraduate level. It is understood that the faculty-specific variations from standard requirements added to the standard, in regards to duration of study for courses offered by the School of Architecture, Design and Planning and the School of Nursing, and for specific courses in Table 4 and Table 5 of the Standard, have been previously approved by the Academic Board.

CONTEXT

The Admissions Working Party was established at the 19 March 2018 Admissions Subcommittee meeting and conducted four meetings throughout 2018 to address a range of policy gaps pertaining to admissions. The three main issues were clarifying the role of the Academic Board in determining entry requirements and standards, formalising the previously announced mathematics prerequisites in policy, and addressing a number of discrepancies regarding ELP requirements. The latter resulted in the introduction of the Admissions Standards – English Language Proficiency, which lists standards set by the Academic Board for ELP admission. This document was largely based on existing information in the Coursework Policy 2014, University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (HDR Rule), and admissions concordance tables. Where there were discrepancies between the various sources of ELP requirements at the University these were resolved. For instance, there was a nonalignment of ELP test score conversions across the three documents. The HDR Rule and postgraduate subclause of the Coursework Policy set the minimum IELTS score at 6.5 and specifies a TOEFL paper-based score of 577, the advertised Admissions Concordance Table sets the equivalent of an IELTS 6.5 as a TOEFL paper-based score of 565, while the undergraduate admissions subclause of the Coursework Policy lists this equivalent TOEFL score as 550. In response to this, the different scores were aligned to 577 following consultation with the Centre for English Teaching and Go8 benchmarking to ensure consistency across degree-types. As such, the purpose of the Admissions Standard is to be the source of ELP admissions requirements and equivalent scores as set by the Academic Board. For future changes to requirements of existing degrees (such as degree specific IELTS scores), these need to be endorsed by the Admissions Subcommittee for approval by the Academic Board (via Academic Standards and Policy Committee).

ISSUES

Changes to the Standard are proposed regarding proof of ELP via tertiary studies to clarify duration of study requirements for different degree types and location of study. It is proposed that for applicants demonstrating ELP through tertiary studies in an English speaking country (as defined in 2(1) of the Standard) at least one year of full-time or equivalent part time study in an institution where the language of instruction is English is
required. For applicants providing proof of ELP via tertiary studies in a non-English speaking country, a variation has been included based on the level of study (undergraduate or postgraduate). For tertiary studies at an undergraduate level, the degree must be at least three years duration full time or equivalent part time and completed. For postgraduate studies, the requirement is one year of completed full time or equivalent part time study. Faculty based exceptions to these requirements (School of Nursing and School of Architecture, Design and Planning) have been listed in 4(5) of the Standard.

Additional changes are proposed where new degrees have been introduced and titles need to be updated. Also new degrees with IELTS scores varied from the University standard of 6.5 overall and 6.0 are listed in tables 4 and 5. Other amendments since the introduction of the Standard are included, such as the Danish Agency for Science and Higher Education changing the grading scale of the Denmark Studentereksamen whereby the score required in English A is now 7 (previously 8).

Further changes to the Admissions Standard are necessitated by the Nursing and Midwifery Board of Australia’s new registration standards. In particular, these registration standards have a narrower definition of countries whereby an applicant can demonstrate English as a first language (recognised country only means: Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Republic of Ireland, South Africa, United Kingdom, or United States) and different duration of study times for demonstrating ELP. These changes will be brought to the 16 July Admissions Subcommittee meeting, 13 August Academic Standards and Policy Committee, and 3 September Academic Board meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Admissions Standards – English Language Proficiency
ADMISSIONS STANDARDS – ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

1 Definitions

(1) Words and phrases used in these standards and not otherwise defined in this document have the meanings they have in the Coursework Policy 2014.

(2) In these standards:

- **IB** means the International Baccalaureate
- **CAE** means Cambridge English: Advanced
- **CPE** means Cambridge English: Proficiency
- **GCE** means the General Certificate of Education
- **HKDSE** means the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education
- **IELTS** means the International English Language Testing System
- **IGCSE** means the International General Certificate of Secondary Education
- **IGCSE English** means IGCSE First language English, IGCSE Second language English, IGCSE Literature, Singapore-Cambridge O-level, UK OCR level English
- **STPM** means the Siji Tinggi Persekolahian Malaysia
- **TOEFL** means the Test of English as a Foreign Language
- **TOEFL IBT** means internet based TOEFL
- **TWE** means the Test of Written English (completed as part of a paper-based TOEFL)
- **UK A Level English** means the GCE English subject that has been undertaken at full Advanced (A2) level
- **UK AS Level English** means the GCE English Language and Literature subject or English Language subject.
- **UK A Level Humanities** means any of the following GCE A Level humanities subjects: History, Humanities, Philosophy – Critical Thinking, Politics, Law, Religion, Sociology and Psychology

2 Applicants whose first language is English

(1) In order to satisfy the requirements of clauses 21A and 23A of the Coursework Policy 2014, or section 7.1 of the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by
Research) Rule 2011 the applicant must have citizenship or permanent long-term residency (minimum ten years) from one or more of the following countries and have completed secondary or tertiary study from one of the following countries:

(a) American Samoa  
(b) Australia  
(c) Botswana  
(d) Canada (excluding Quebec)  
(e) Fiji  
(f) Ghana  
(g) Guyana  
(h) Ireland  
(i) Jamaica  
(j) Kenya  
(k) Lesotho  
(l) Liberia  
(m) New Zealand  
(n) Nigeria  
(o) Papua New Guinea  
(p) Samoa  
(q) Singapore  
(r) Solomon Islands  
(s) South Africa  
(t) Tonga  
(u) Trinidad and Tobago  
(v) United Kingdom (including Northern Ireland)  
(w) United States of America  
(x) Zambia  
(y) Zimbabwe

(2) An applicant for admission to an undergraduate award course in a faculty that has set proof of English as a first language separate to the countries listed in 2(1) must meet the faculty’s requirements, as approved by the Academic Board.

Note These faculty requirements must be approved by the Academic Board in accordance with the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016.

3 Applicants whose first language is not English – secondary qualifications

(1) These standards apply to undergraduate coursework applicants:
(a) whose first language is not English;
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(b) who wish to demonstrate English proficiency through secondary qualifications; and
(c) who, if successful, will commence studies after 1 January 2019.

(2) Applicants seeking admission to an undergraduate award course on the basis of satisfactory achievement in secondary studies must have completed senior secondary study.

(3) An applicant whose first language is not English must have:
(a) achieved a record of satisfactory achievement in secondary studies within five years of the date on which they will commence the course:
   (i) in an English speaking country; or
   (ii) in which the instruction and assessment were entirely in English; or
(b) achieved a record of satisfactory achievement in secondary studies within two years of the date on which they will commence the course:
   (i) not undertaken in English; but
   (ii) which meets the requirements listed in Table 1 or Table 2.

(4) An applicant for admission to an undergraduate award course in a faculty that has set English language requirements above the minimum requirements set out in subclause 3(3) must meet the faculty’s requirements, as approved by the Academic Board.

Note: These faculty requirements must be approved by the Academic Board in accordance with the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016.

4 Applicants whose first language is not English – tertiary studies

(1) These standards apply to undergraduate and postgraduate coursework, and higher degree by research, applicants:
(a) whose first language is not English;
(b) who wish to demonstrate English proficiency through tertiary studies; and
(c) who, if successful, will commence studies after 1 January 2019.

(2) An applicant whose first language is not English must have achieved a record of satisfactory achievement in tertiary studies:
(a) within five years of the date on which they will commence the course;
(b) at a provider approved by the University; and
(c) in which the duration of study:
   (i) was at least one year of full-time (or equivalent part time) conducted in an English speaking country as defined in item 2(1) and where the language of instruction, assessment, examination, and the institution was English; or
   (ii) was a completed undergraduate degree of at least three years full time (or equivalent part time) conducted in English, and in which the language of instruction, assessment, examination, and the institution was English; or
   (iii) was a completed postgraduate or higher degree by research award course of at least one year full-time (or equivalent part time).
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(3) An applicant for admission to an award course that has English language duration of study requirements separate to the requirements established in 4(2)(c) must meet the faculty’s requirements as approved by the Academic Board.

Note These faculty requirements must be approved by the Academic Board in accordance with the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016.

(4) The courses and separate requirements referenced in 4(3) are listed below:

(a) admission to all postgraduate award courses offered by the School of Architecture, Design and Planning requires, in addition to 4(2)(a) and 4(2)(b), satisfactory achievement in tertiary studies in which the duration of study:
   (i) was at least two years of full time (or equivalent part time) conducted in an English Speaking country as defined in 2(1) and where the language of instruction, assessment, examination, and the institution was English; or
   (ii) was a completed undergraduate degree of at least three years full time (or equivalent part time) conducted in English, and in which the language of instruction, assessment, examination, and the institution was English; or
   (iii) was a completed postgraduate or higher degree by research award course of at least two years full-time (or equivalent part time) conducted in English, and in which the language of instruction, assessment, examination, and the institution was English.

(b) admission to all undergraduate courses offered by the Sydney Nursing School requires, in addition to 4(2)(b), satisfactory achievement in tertiary studies in which the duration of study:
   (i) was at least one year of full time university study in an English speaking country within the past two years at the time of commencement;
   (ii) or in a university institution where the language of instruction, assessment, examination, and the institution was English within the past two years at the time of commencement.

(c) admission to all postgraduate courses offered by the Sydney Nursing School requires, in addition to 4(2)(b), satisfactory achievement in tertiary studies in which the duration of study:
   (i) was a three year degree, completed no more than five years prior to the commencement of study in which the language of instruction, assessment, examination, and the institution was English; or
   (ii) was a degree of two years or more, completed no more than three years prior to the commencement of study in which the language of instruction, assessment, examination, and the institution was English.
5 Applicants whose first language is not English – English language test scores

(1) These standards apply to all undergraduate and postgraduate coursework, and higher degree by research, applicants:
   (a) whose first language is not English;
   (b) who wish to demonstrate English language proficiency through an English language skills test score;
   (c) who, if successful, will commence studies after 1 January 2019.

(2) An applicant whose first language is not English must have achieved within two years of the date on which the applicant will commence the course an IELTS overall band score of:
   (a) 6.5, with at least 6.0 in each band; or
   (b) an equivalent score as listed in Table 3.

(3) An applicant for admission to an award course in a faculty that has set English language requirements in addition to or above the minimum requirements set out in subclause 5(2) must meet the faculty’s requirements as approved by the Academic Board and listed in Table 4 (undergraduate courses) and Table 5 (postgraduate courses).

   Note: These faculty requirements must be approved by the Academic Board in accordance with the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016.

(4) The Head of School and Dean of the Sydney College of the Arts may, on application and at their discretion, admit to the Bachelor of Visual Arts an applicant who has achieved an IELTS overall band score of 6.0.

(5) The Head of School and Dean of the Sydney Conservatorium of Music may, on application and at their discretion, admit to the Diploma of Music an applicant who has achieved an IELTS overall band score of 6.0.

6 Other applicants whose first language is not English

(1) These standards apply to all undergraduate and postgraduate coursework, and higher degree by research applicants:
   (a) whose first language is not English;
   (b) who wish to demonstrate English proficiency otherwise than in accordance with clauses 3 – 5; and
   (c) who, if successful, will commence studies after 1 January 2019.

(2) An applicant whose first language is not English must have:
   (a) lived and worked in an English speaking country specified in subclause 2(1) continuously for at least five years prior to the date on which they will commence the course; or
   (b) current registration with an accreditation body that has an English language requirement equivalent to, or higher than, the standards otherwise required by the University.

(3) An applicant applying for admission to post-registration postgraduate courses offered by the Sydney Nursing School may provide proof of English Language.
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Proficiency by a record of current registration with the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency (AHPRA) as a (Division 1) Registered Nurse and proof of current employment in this capacity at an appropriate health facility.

(4) Other admissions standards or requirements may be set by a Faculty subject to approval by the Board.

Notes These faculty requirements must be approved by the Academic Board in accordance with the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016.

7 Exceptional circumstances

(1) In exceptional circumstances, a Dean may determine that an applicant demonstrates English language proficiency requirements by means other than those prescribed in these standards, provided that:

(a) the applicant must have:
   (i) an IELTS score or equivalent as specified in Table 3; and:
   (ii) an overall or average band score no more than 0.5 below the overall or average band score otherwise required; and
   (iii) no individual band score more than 1.0 below the individual band score otherwise required; or

(b) the Dean is satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated enough competence in written and spoken English to complete the course successfully.

(2) For undergraduate applicants, the Chair of the Undergraduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board may, in exceptional circumstances, modify the limits prescribed in subclause 7(1)(a), as they apply in a particular case.

(3) For postgraduate coursework and higher degree by research applicants, the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board may, in exceptional circumstances, modify the limits prescribed in subclause 7(1)(a), as they apply in a particular case.

(4) In considering whether an applicant has demonstrated enough competence in written and spoken English to complete the course successfully, the Dean:

(a) must take into account any advice of the relevant Associate Dean; and

(b) may consider any other relevant matter, including:
   (i) the applicant’s ability to communicate in an academic environment;
   (ii) whether the applicant has been known to the faculty for at least two years;
   (iii) any appropriate work experience that the applicant has had in an English language environment; and
   (iv) any oral discussions between faculty members and the applicant.

(5) The Dean must record in writing on the student file any approval to waive English language requirements, including:

(a) the proof of proficiency in English provided by the applicant; and

(b) the Dean’s reasons for granting the exemption.
### TABLE 1

Concordance estimates for qualifications used to provide evidence of English language proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IELTS Score</th>
<th>UK A Level English</th>
<th>Singapore-Cambridge A Levels: English Language and Linguistics</th>
<th>HKDSE English Language and Literature in English</th>
<th>STPM Literature (920)</th>
<th>UK A Levels Humanities</th>
<th>UK AS Levels English</th>
<th>IGCSE English</th>
<th>IB English A – Higher Level</th>
<th>IB English A – Standard Level</th>
<th>IB English B – Higher Level</th>
<th>IB English B – Standard Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A/B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>B/C</td>
<td>B/C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>B/C</td>
<td>A/B</td>
<td>A/B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>5**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2

Subject and grade requirements guide for accepted secondary qualifications not undertaken in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification/subject</th>
<th>Grade requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark Studentereksamen</td>
<td>7 in English A or 10 in English B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland Upper Secondary School Certificate</td>
<td>8 in English or English A Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany Abitur</td>
<td>3 in Advanced Level English (LF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands VWO</td>
<td>8 in Level 6 High School English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway Vitnemal</td>
<td>4 in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STPM Literature</td>
<td>B/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden Avgangsbetyg/Slutbetyg</td>
<td>VG or C in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3

**English Language Skills Tests conversion table – Overall scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IELTS Academic</th>
<th>TOEFL Paper Based Test (pre-October 2017)*</th>
<th>TOEFL IBT</th>
<th>PTE Academic</th>
<th>Cambridge English Scale: CAE and CPE (from 2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**English language Individual skills tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R/L/S/W</th>
<th>TWE</th>
<th>R/L/S</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Scores from TOEFL Paper Based Tests taken after 14 October 2017 are not accepted.
### TABLE 4

**Faculty-specific English Language Requirements – Undergraduate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty/Course</th>
<th>English Language Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All undergraduate courses</td>
<td>IELTS: Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.0 in each of the components (this applies to non-UAC admissions only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Design in Architecture (Honours) / Master of Architecture</td>
<td>IELTS: Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.0 in each of the components (this applies to non-UAC admissions only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts / Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Media and Communications)</td>
<td>IELTS: Overall band score of 7.5 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Economics, Bachelor of Economics / Bachelor of Advanced Studies</td>
<td>IELTS: Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Bachelor of Education (all streams) | IELTS: Minimum overall result of 7.5  
Minimum of 8.0 in speaking and listening modules  
Minimum of 7.0 in reading and writing modules |
| **Sydney Business School** | |
| All undergraduate courses except combined law and Bachelor of Commerce / Doctor of Medicine (see below) | IELTS: Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.0 in each of the components |
| **Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies** | |
| Bachelor of Engineering Honours / Bachelor of Commerce | IELTS: Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.0 in each of the components |
| Bachelor of Advanced Computing / Bachelor of Commerce | IELTS: Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.0 in each of the components |
| Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Civil) / Bachelor of Design in Architecture | IELTS: Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.0 in each of the components |
| **Faculty of Health Sciences** | |

*Deleted: Bachelor of Economics / Bachelor of Laws  
Deleted: Information Technologies  
Deleted: Bachelor of Health Sciences (including combined degrees)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>IELTS Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Applied Science (Speech Pathology)</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Applied Science (Occupational Therapy)</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Applied Science (Physiotherapy)</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise Physiology)</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.5 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Law School</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.5 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science / Doctor of Medicine</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts / Doctor of Medicine</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Midwifery combined degrees</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Nursing (Advanced Studies)</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science / Doctor of Dental Medicine</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Oral Health</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.5 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science / Master of Nutrition and Dietetics</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 6.5 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Veterinary Biology / Doctor of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5
Faculty-specific English Language Requirements – Postgraduate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning</th>
<th>Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All postgraduate (coursework and research) award courses</td>
<td>For students without a Bachelor’s Degree from an English language university, and who have studied less than two years in an institution of English instruction, an IELTS score of a minimum average of 7.0 with no section below 6.0 must be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Master of Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Art Curating, Graduate Diploma in Art Curating, Graduate Certificate in Art Curating</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Creative Writing, Graduate Diploma in Creative Writing, Graduate Certificate in Creative Writing</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 with a minimum of 7.0 in the Writing band and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Crosscultural and Applied Linguistics, Graduate Diploma in Crosscultural and Applied Linguistics, Graduate Certificate in Crosscultural and Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Cultural Studies, Graduate Diploma in Cultural Studies, Graduate Certificate in Cultural Studies</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Development Studies, Graduate Diploma in Development Studies, Graduate Certificate in Development Studies</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Digital Communication and Culture, Graduate Diploma in Digital Communication and Culture, Graduate Certificate in Digital Communication and Culture</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Economic Analysis, Graduate Diploma in Economic Analysis</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.5 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Economics, Graduate Diploma in Economics, Graduate Certificate in Economics</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>IELTS Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of English Studies, Graduate Diploma</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in English Studies, Graduate Certificate in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Health Communication, Graduate</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in Health Communication, Graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate in Health Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Health Security, Graduate Diploma</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Health Security, Graduate Certificate in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Human Rights, Graduate Diploma</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Human Rights, Graduate Certificate in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of International Relations, Graduate</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in International Relations, Graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate in International Relations,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of International Security, Graduate</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in International Security, Graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate in International Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of International Studies, Graduate</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in International Studies, Graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate in International Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Media Practice, Graduate Diploma</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Media Practice, Graduate Certificate in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Museum and Heritage Studies,</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Museum and Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies, Graduate Certificate in Museum and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Peace and Conflict Studies,</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Peace and Conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies, Graduate Certificate in Peace and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Political Economy, Graduate</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in Political Economy, Graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate in Political Economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Public Policy, Graduate Diploma</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Public Policy, Graduate Certificate in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Admissions Standards – English Language Proficiency
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>IELTS Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Publishing, Graduate Diploma in Publishing</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Strategic Public Relations, Graduate Diploma in Strategic Public Relations</td>
<td>IELTS overall 7.0 and a minimum of 6.0 in other bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of US Studies, Graduate Diploma in US Studies</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or above with a result of a minimum of 6.5 in Speaking and Writing and a minimum of 6.0 in Listening and Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Teaching</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.5 or better with minimum of 8.0 in speaking and listening modules and minimum of 7.0 in reading and writing modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Social Work (Qualifying)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.5 or better with minimum of 7.0 in each band</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sydney Business School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>IELTS Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Business Administration (Leadership and Enterprise)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Commerce (and embedded sequences)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations (and embedded sequences)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of International Business (and embedded sequences)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Logistics and Supply Chain Management (and embedded sequences)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Management, Master of Management (CEMS)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Professional Accounting</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All research degrees</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with a section minimum of 6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>IELTS Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Professional Engineering</td>
<td>IELTS – A minimum result of 7.0 overall and a minimum result of 6.0 in each band</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Admissions Standards – English Language Proficiency
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>IELTS Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Professional Engineering (Accelerated)</td>
<td>IELTS – A minimum result of 7.0 overall and a minimum result of 6.5 in each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Complex Systems, Graduate Diploma in Complex Systems</td>
<td>IELTS – A minimum result of 7.0 overall and a minimum result of 6.0 in each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Project and Program Management</td>
<td>IELTS – A minimum result of 7.0 overall and a minimum result of 6.0 in each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Project and Program Management</td>
<td>IELTS – A minimum result of 7.0 overall and a minimum result of 6.0 in each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Transport</td>
<td>IELTS – A minimum result of 7.0 overall and a minimum result of 6.0 in each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Transport</td>
<td>IELTS – A minimum result of 7.0 overall and a minimum result of 6.0 in each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Transport</td>
<td>IELTS – A minimum result of 7.0 overall and a minimum result of 6.0 in each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Diagnostic Radiography</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with at least 6.5 for Speaking and for Writing on each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Exercise Physiology</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with at least 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with at least 7 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Physiotherapy</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with at least 7 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Speech Language Pathology</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with at least 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All postgraduate (coursework and research) award course except for those below</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 with no band less than 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Music Studies (Composition)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band of 6.5 with no band less than 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Music Studies (Opera Performance), Graduate Diploma in Music (Opera Performance)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 with no band less than 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Music (Performance)</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band of 6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sydney Law School
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>IELTS Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juris Doctor</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.5 or better with a minimum of 7.0 in each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other postgraduate (coursework and research) award courses</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with at least 6.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty of Medicine and Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy (Medicine and Health)</td>
<td>IELTS 7.0 with no band below 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Bioethics, Graduate Diploma in Bioethics</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with at least 6.5 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Clinical Dentistry, Graduate Diploma in Clinical Dentistry</td>
<td>IELTS 7.0 with no band below 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Dental Medicine</td>
<td>IELTS 7.0 with no band below 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Medicine</td>
<td>IELTS – overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum of 7.0 in each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Clinical Trials Research, Graduate Diploma in Clinical Trials Research</td>
<td>IELTS – overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum of 7.0 in each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Medicine (stream), Master of Medicine (Advanced) (stream), Master of Science in Medicine (stream), Master of Science in Medicine (Advanced) (stream), Master of Philosophy, Master of Science in Medicine (stream)/Master of Philosophy, Master of Science in Medicine (stream), Graduate Diploma in Medicine (stream), Graduate Diploma in Science in Medicine (stream), Graduate Certificate in Medicine (stream), Graduate Certificate in Science in Medicine (stream). This applies only to the following streams: Critical Care Medicine, Clinical Neurophysiology, Child and Adolescent Health, General Practice and Primary Health Care, Internal Medicine, Metabolic Health, Paediatric Medicine, Psychiatry, Pharmaceutical and Medical Device Development, Sexual and Reproductive Health, Sleep Medicine and Trauma informed Psychotherapy</td>
<td>IELTS – overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum of 6.5 in each band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Midwifery - All postgraduate (coursework and research) award courses</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with at least 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deleted:** HIV, STIs and Sexual Health,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>IELTS Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy - All postgraduate award courses, with the exception of the Master of Philosophy and Doctor of Philosophy and Graduate Certificate in Evidence-Based Complementary Medicines</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with no component being below 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Clinical Psychology; Master of Clinical Psychology/Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 with no band less than 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional English language requirements apply under the current Australian Health Practitioners Regulation Agency (AHPRA) standards for registration. Where these are inconsistent with University of Sydney standards, the higher standard will apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Science in Coaching Psychology; Graduate Diploma in Coaching Psychology; Graduate Certificate in Coaching Psychology</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.5 as a minimum on each band with no band falling below a score of 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Environmental Science and Law</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 with no band less than 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Nutrition and Dietetics</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.5 or better, with at least 6.5 in each of the components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deleted: Master of Environmental Law
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee discuss the attached paper, and endorse the DVC Education Portfolio proposal to review the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Research education is core to the University and its Strategic plan 2016-2020. Under this plan, the University has dedicated considerable time and effort to improve the experience and outcomes for Higher Degree by Research (HDR) students, with initiatives such as greater opportunities for intellectual development and skill acquisition as well as providing new means to improve engagement through internships and mobility.

We have also invested millions of dollars in scholarships to attract the best research students to come to the University, so it is only fitting that we consider how to offer such students the best possible supervision. The motivation for doing so is the recognition that supervision is very important; in almost every analysis of research student success, the strongest positive impact on student success comes from excellence in supervision.

This paper explores how we can characterise good practice in the most fundamental part of research education – the process and outcomes of HDR supervision. It is the first stage of a programme of work to improve the experiences of students through better supervision.

The key issues explored in the paper are:

1. Student feedback indicates a perceived decline in the quality of supervision at Sydney, and identifies consequences when students receive poor supervision;
2. There is a need to review and refresh our policies that govern HDR supervision;
3. There are a variety of modes of candidature and project structures, yet we seem to utilise one model of supervision in preference to other versions; and,
4. The institution offers development opportunities for new supervisors, but does not really support faculties to improve supervision for their students nor offer further development for established supervisors; and,

This review made five key recommendations:

1. **Develop tools, capabilities and data to support HDR candidatures**
   We can use the Sydney Operating Model (SOM) HDR Support project to develop new tools and capabilities to help students, supervisors and faculties track student progress throughout HDR candidatures. These tools will also generate data that can be used to develop indicators of supervision quality.

2. **Review the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013 and other HDR-related policies**
   We will seek to review the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013 (the Supervision Policy) so it better supports our move to creating a new grade of supervisor who has a higher standard of practice, is capable of supporting larger teams and who will contribute to Annual Progress Review panels; and enabling faculties to suspend the registration of supervisors so they may deliver a better student experience. Other HDR-related policies will be reviewed to reflect these changes.
3. **Improve training for supervisors via a new course aligned with the Advance Higher Education Fellowship scheme**

The DVC Education portfolio has committed to supporting academics commencing HDR supervision to take a new course aligned to the Advance Higher Education Fellowship scheme. This will replace the existing Foundations of Research Supervision course. Current supervisors can join for specific activities that will help them improve supervision skills.

4. **Develop and communicate clear expectations for supervision**

Whilst the Supervision Policy describes the expectations arising from all parties involved in HDR supervision, these are often not communicated clearly to students and supervisors. We have the opportunity to develop and deliver clear descriptions of expectations for supervision that reflect faculty variations in practice.

5. **Improve ‘local’ cultures of supervision within faculties**

Faculties can build on existing practices by investigating the needs of their academic community with respect to HDR supervision and develop new processes that can lead to an improved student experience. Such initiatives can be properly evaluated by directly involving the HDR student cohort in design, development, delivery and review.

These recommendations serve as the basis for delivering the best quality supervision to our graduate research students over the near to medium future.
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Executive Summary

“Traditionally, most supervision was based on the ‘secret garden’ model, in which student and supervisor worked closely together without a great deal of external scrutiny or accountability” (Park 2007)¹

“… research supervision is probably the most complex and subtle form of teaching in which we engage.” (Brown and Atkins 1988)²

Research education is core to the University and its Strategic plan 2016-2020. Under this plan, the University has dedicated considerable time and effort to improve the experience and outcomes for Higher Degree by Research (HDR) students, with initiatives such as greater opportunities for intellectual development and skill acquisition as well as providing new means to improve engagement through internships and mobility.

We have also invested millions of dollars in scholarships to attract the best research students to the University, so it is only fitting that we consider how to offer such students the best possible supervision. The motivation for doing so is the recognition that supervision is very important; in almost every analysis of research student success, the strongest positive impact on student success comes from excellence in supervision.

This paper explores how we can characterise good practice in the most fundamental part of research education – the process and outcomes of HDR supervision. It is the first stage of a programme of work to improve the experiences of students through better supervision.

The key issues explored in the paper are:

1. Student feedback indicates a perceived decline in the quality of supervision at Sydney, and identifies consequences when students receive poor supervision;
2. There is a need to review and refresh our policies that govern HDR supervision;
3. There are a variety of modes of candidature and project structures, yet we seem to utilise one model of supervision in preference to other versions; and,
4. The institution offers development opportunities for new supervisors, but does not really support faculties to encourage excellent supervision for their students nor offer further development for established supervisors.

The recommendations are listed on the next page and relate to proposed next steps, which can serve as the basis for delivering the best quality supervision to our graduate research students over the near to medium future.

---

Recommendations

1. Develop tools, capabilities and data to support HDR candidatures
   We can use the Sydney Operating Model (SOM) HDR Support project to develop new tools and capabilities to help students, supervisors and faculties track student progress throughout HDR candidatures. These tools will also generate data that can be used to develop indicators of supervision quality.

2. Review the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013 and other HDR-related policies
   We will seek to review the [Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013](#) (the Supervision Policy) so it better supports our aspirations for consistent and high quality supervision. We propose creating a new grade of supervisor who has a higher standard of practice, is capable of supporting larger teams and who will contribute to Annual Progress Review panels; and enabling faculties to suspend the registration of supervisors so they may deliver a better student experience. Other HDR-related policies will be reviewed to reflect these changes.

3. Improve training for supervisors via a new course aligned with the Advance Higher Education Fellowship scheme
   The DVC Education portfolio has committed to supporting academics commencing HDR supervision to take a new course aligned to the Advance Higher Education Fellowship scheme. This will replace the existing Foundations of Research Supervision course. Current supervisors can join for specific activities that will help them improve supervision skills.

4. Develop and communicate clear expectations for supervision
   Whilst the Supervision Policy describes the expectations arising from all parties involved in HDR supervision, these are often not communicated clearly to students and supervisors. We have the opportunity to develop and deliver clear descriptions of expectations for supervision, including, where warranted, faculty variations in practice.

5. Build ‘local’ cultures of excellent supervision within faculties
   Faculties can build on existing practices by investigating the needs of their academic community with respect to HDR supervision and develop new processes that can lead to an improved student experience. Such initiatives can be properly evaluated by directly involving the HDR student cohort in design, development, delivery and review.
Introduction

The University is invested in re-defining its PhD. The focus of this renewal is to substantially improve student experiences and outcomes by increasing our focus on developing the student as a researcher in a leading research-intensive university. The student will then be better equipped to maximise their own contribution to their intellectual development, while producing new knowledge for the discipline in which they sit. This dual outcome (improving both the student experience and their contribution to a body of knowledge) will yield enhanced research capacity for many stakeholders.

Our re-visioning of the higher degree by research (HDR) student experience is based on a clear articulation of the graduate qualities which define a Sydney PhD. These graduate qualities are given below in Table 1. Their relevance here is that they frame our consideration of how best to improve student outcomes and as a trigger for enhancing the institutional support for HDR candidates.

Table 1: Definition and purpose of the PhD graduate qualities as agreed by the Academic Board in August 2017 (Resolution AB2017/6-7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sydney PhD graduate qualities</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deep expertise</td>
<td>To possess expert, world standard knowledge in an area of specialisation, a mastery of relevant research methods and the capability to contribute to scholarship and knowledge discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader skills:</td>
<td>- To display high level capabilities in critical thinking and problem solving and a commitment to lifelong learning and discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Critical thinking and problem solving</td>
<td>- To have excellent oral and written communication skills relevant to specialist and general audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communication (oral and written)</td>
<td>- To evaluate and utilise contemporary digital tools, resources and technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Information/digital literacy</td>
<td>- To be innovative and creative in response to novel problems, and to be willing to take risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inventiveness</td>
<td>- To display high level capabilities in disseminating research, and build understanding of own research in a broader context by participating in engagement with end-users of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Engagement</td>
<td>- To plan, manage and deliver research projects effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project planning and delivery</td>
<td>Cultural competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary effectiveness</td>
<td>To work effectively in interdisciplinary settings to develop broader perspective, innovative vision and the capacity to work effectively within national and international research and innovation systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, ethical, personal identity</td>
<td>To exercise integrity, confidence and resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>To be professionally and socially responsible and make a positive contribution to society; Recognise and promote the implications of own research in a broader societal context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This discussion is also underpinned by the understanding that the success of HDR students is fundamentally driven by the quality of supervision and the way in which excellent supervision...
amplifies the quality and impact of the broader HDR experience. Whilst overall, data discussed in this report indicates our HDR students are satisfied with the quality of supervision, this proportion is declining across the University. There is sufficient commentary from students identifying poor supervision as a problem to warrant the consideration of opportunities to improve outcomes for our HDR students.

Key points that require attention include looking at how we can ensure excellence in supervision and in particular, help faculties deliver the best quality supervisory environments for our research students. As we review and improve our training for new supervisors, we have an opportunity to offer training and development for all supervisors wishing to improve their practice.

Also, as an institution, we need to consider whether alternative types of supervision model can better suit our students, and if so, how can we adapt our practices and systems to enable these supervision models to be delivered. Such changes in supervision model may well vary with changing focus on the student as a researcher or producer of knowledge, noting that it is not unreasonable to expect both from students at a research-intensive university. We also need to consider that part-time candidates may well need different models of supervision, to better reflect their needs.

And finally, as the governance of HDR supervision is delivered via a range of policies and procedures, this review must include examining the main Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013 and consider if new practices need to be developed. Any policy review needs to be followed by an effective communications campaign that can inform stakeholders about changes to policy but also draw attention to existing, but underutilised, opportunities for alternative supervision practices.
Context

'Research education' sits at the intersection of research and education. It is the term used to describe student learning through research activities but also incorporates associated academic training and specialist teaching methods for Higher Degrees by Research (HDR).

Over the last 30 years, research education has developed into a distinctive field of educational endeavour in its own right. There are peak bodies (for example, the Australian Council for Graduate Research – ACGR; UK Council for Graduate Education – UKCGE; Council for Doctoral Education – CDE in Europe and the US Council of Graduate Schools), a defined set of pedagogies, and a robust culture of critical enquiry around best practice.

At the University of Sydney, research education is a core part of the Strategic Plan 2016-2020. Strategy 2 ("Attract and develop outstanding researchers") focuses on improving the experience and outcomes for HDR students with the overall aim of attracting and developing the best researchers to the University. Within this strategy, sub-initiative R.2.2 has led to projects focusing on creating greater opportunities for intellectual development and skill acquisition as well as providing new means to improve engagement through internships and mobility. It has also led to the development of the set of graduate qualities for PhD students, as described in above.

To measure the success of these strategic initiatives, key performance indicators (KPIs) have been developed, notably to encourage increased rates of on-time student completion of HDR degrees. The role of supervision in helping faculties and the university improve performance in respect of this KPI is critical.

More broadly, many KPIs currently focus on the student’s experience of the University, which for HDR supervision, means that while we need our students to complete in a timely manner, completions should not come at the expense of student health or quality of education. A singular focus on completion times may mean that less emphasis is paid to the quality of the student learning experience. The measure of success in respect of research education should be human-focused attributes such as researchers being experts in their discipline, and resilient, respectful people with very high levels of communication skills.

Developing student researchers occurs within, and as a product of, the academic environment of the institution, so core support must be provided by different parts of the university and most fundamentally, the research supervisors. At its heart, HDR supervision is a human relationship, not just an intellectual transaction of knowledge and skills. As we re-think the function of research education in the context of a knowledge-based economy, there are opportunities to take a critical view of how we support our students through research candidatures and to identify opportunities for new ways of thinking and doing.

---


5 Pattison, P. (2018) "A strategy for the student experience at the University of Sydney." DVC Education Portfolio, The University of Sydney.

Student Feedback on Supervision

HDR students’ perception of quality is captured by the Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ) and the Student Research Experience Questionnaire (SREQ). PREQ respondent have completed candidature and so their answers reflect their experience of the entire research degree journey. SREQ respondents currently are enrolled in candidature so their answers reflect a limited experience.

In the 2018 PREQ survey, the results on the quality of supervision showed that the University of Sydney has lost its lead over the rest of the sector with respect to high-quality supervision. Table 2 shows data for the reporting years 2014-2018 by faculty, in aggregate and compared with the Group of 8 Research Intensive Universities (Go8) and Universities Australia (UA) sector level data, noting that Go8 and UA data are not available prior to 2016. The results show the University is now at the sector average of 82% in terms of satisfaction with supervision; a figure consistent with the SREQ data.

Table 2. Summary data from Quality of Supervision data from PREQ surveys 2016-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FASS</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USBS</td>
<td>85%*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>81%*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feng</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHS</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMH</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fsci</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCM</td>
<td>73%*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>83%*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USLaw</td>
<td>40%*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USADP</td>
<td>67%*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>92%*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst, in general, our HDR students are generally content with the quality of supervision, this figure obscures poor experiences and practices.

Students taking part in these surveys may leave comments in response to open-ended questions. Indicative responses with respect to supervision from the 2018 SREQ survey are presented in Table 3 below. The SREQ was selected because this survey has much greater participation than the PREQ, so although only a small proportion of survey respondents leave comments, the size of the SREQ survey means a greater extent of commentary is captured.

Table 3. Indicative comments from respondents in the 2018 SREQ survey (2018) in respect of Areas in Need of Improvement – supervision. Comments are quoted verbatim and in their entirety.

---

7 SREQ satisfaction scores of 80-82%. Source Quality & Analytics, DVC Education Portfolio
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Size</th>
<th>Open Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Not much really. The academic staff are overwhelmed by their admin, teaching and research load so supervising PhD students for them are just extra burden. It seems that most supervisors don’t really care about their PhD students based on my own experience and conversations with other fellows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Supervisory relationships were a strain in this my first year of research. What I had thought were solid relationships with my Primary Supervisor, Assistant Supervisor and an informal Supervisor in another department, all fell apart mid-way through the year. This was very disappointing for me personally and disruptive for my project. I had invested a lot of time (and enthusiasm) into these relationships, some over many years. It did become clear though once the reality of the doctorate was underway that they were not suitable. Their comments were often ill-considered. They didn’t engage with my project in a disciplined manner. And finally after the relationships ended they seemed angry, and to blame me for leaving them and their ‘group’, rather than considering the limitations of their own knowledge and creative expertise. Essentially each of the three supervisors over promised and under delivered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>The responses here about supervision are prior to a very late change in my supervisor (who is now awesome). I was pushed into a direction which I didn’t agree for my research by my previous supervisor for a long time with and ultimately would have left me with no thesis to write up. Some supervisors are actually too busy, disconnected into administrative functions or have personal style issues which are not suitable for students who have significant industry experience where the culture is so vastly different (and much more supportive - less arrogant and positional).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>My supervisors could both benefit greatly from pedagogical instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>For many times I had problems with my supervisor and the school did not have a clear procedure to handle the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>The supervisor having enough time to really sit down and go through details - when I attend for a group meeting there is still only a short time to sit down and go through issues. I wonder whether if I was on campus I would have more opportunity for closer supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Given the power imbalance between supervisors and students, I think supervisors should be more pro-active in setting up meetings and requesting work, at least in the early stages while the student and supervisor are establishing how much time the student can spend, what his or her other obligations are etc. I think many students are too timid or concerned about their supervisors other commitments to seek as many meetings or as much consultation is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>I am not in a lab with others, and it is very isolating when one does not have a pre-existing network within the department -- which would be ok if one were simply conducting research in a vacuum. But I have experienced discrimination and had my privacy breached by a supervisor and am not sure how to deal with that without putting my candidature at risk. I am still in shock after having recently discovered the breaches. To be completely candid, I have felt like one of Weinstein’s victims weighing up the benefits/risks of disclosure or seeking support, and contemplating whether doing so would be career suicide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>My lab head is able to get away with very minimal supervisory duties, he mainly leaves it to the postdocs and is not particularly well informed about the day to day goings on in the lab. This is mainly an issue because postdoc positions are not secure so if the lab runs out of funding our key supervisors have to leave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Useless supervisors who I need to have on publications to keep the peace, but who don’t offer support or appropriate feedback, meaning that I am facing an ethical dilemma of letting them claim credit for work to which they have not contributed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Supervisors/faculty/university administration seem out of touch. Many supervisors (speaking for other PhD students as well here) seem unable to tell when students are struggling, or to provide appropriate support. Feels like specific training in management/etc for supervisors would be helpful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The responses in Table 3 indicate poor experiences that reflect instances that at best result in dissatisfied students, but at worst can impact on student, and supervisor, health. A wide range of poor experiences can result in reputational damage to many levels of the organisation. We should consider though, that not all our HDR students complete the SREQ questionnaires, and some do not leave open comments. So, whilst the comments above are not representative of the experiences of all HDR students, they do provide a lived, phenomenological snapshot of supervision experiences at Sydney.

Taken together, these data and commentary from the HDR students indicate that there is a need to address the supervisory environment at Sydney and that this need is not unique to a discipline or faculty.

The recent review of the student experience at Sydney has identified that attention to the supervisory environment will be fundamental to improving the outcomes and experiences of HDR students. This focus on the role of the supervisors in improving student outcomes is not restricted to the University. The ACOLA report highlights supervisory performance, both identifying outstanding supervision and improving poor supervisory practices as a key challenge for the higher education sector. The need to reduce the impact of poor HDR supervision was further substantiated by the NSW Ombudsman’s report, which identified that putting in place better mechanisms to support students in situations where supervision is less than satisfactory should be a priority for universities.

HDR Supervision as Education

By considering how HDR supervision functions as research education, we can better identify opportunities to improve the practice of HDR supervision at the University.

The primary function of a supervisor is to maximise an HDR student’s potential to develop research skills and abilities and to facilitate the production of high-quality research by the student. There are two domains for us to consider how supervisors may help students best achieve their potential as researchers. The first dimension defines the purpose of supervision – that is the ‘what’ and the ‘why’ as this directly influences the delivery of supervision and the second dimension is the ‘who’ and usually describes the variety of ways in which supervision interacts with candidate development.

An additional complexity in considering what type of supervision is appropriate is that students may have different modes of attendance and participation in HDR education.

In the analysis below, PhD and HDR have been used synonymously. In many jurisdictions, doctoral degrees other than the PhD and research-only master-level degrees are not the norm, so the academic literature in this field tends to refer solely to the PhD.

The Purpose of HDR Supervision

The first dimension of supervision is embedded in the ‘purpose’ of candidature. Whilst to some extent, we have already had the conversation about whether the product of an HDR

---

candidature is the person or the research\textsuperscript{12}; that discussion was largely directed at policy settings and system architecture. This overview of different purposes of HDR education needs to acknowledge that it is supervisors that will often be the strongest determinant of the successful implementation of enhancements to research education\textsuperscript{12}. In one sense, the perceived tension between the two considerations of the ‘product’ of research education is artificial. In a leading research-intensive university such as Sydney, we should be producing the best research and the best researchers. Åkerlind and McAlpine's\textsuperscript{12} analysis of supervision at Oxford noted high-quality supervision will often address helping the student produce innovative research findings and produce outstanding researchers, this is achieved by modifying the emphasis in advising students; at times emphasising development activities for a student and at other occasions addressing research outcomes. The key to success is making the breadth of supervisory activities explicit to students and ensuring alignment of student and staff expectations in respect of the why and what of supervision.

Supervision Structures

The second dimension considered here is the ‘who’ of supervision. Early practices of PhD supervision in many places in the world, including Australia, were based on the ‘master-apprentice’ model and were explicitly localised and discrete to any given supervisory relationship. This model has been criticised as a ‘secret garden’ or private academic space\textsuperscript{13}. When such arrangements work well through engaged and supportive relationships, good student outcomes are frequently observed. In contrast though, the closed nature of the dynamic between supervisor and supervised means that less-successful supervisory relationships are hidden from view; in such circumstances, situations can arise that present risks to the individuals concerned and to the institution. At the University, we require every student to have at least two active supervisors. This requirement ensures that a student’s access to supervision is maximised by always having at least one academic available (Supervisor + 1 or more auxiliary supervisors; or coordinating supervisor + 1 or more co-supervisors). Evidence from the SREQ (see Table 2 for examples) indicates that the extent and depth of involvement of auxiliary supervisors in HDR candidatures is idiosyncratic across the university, and ranges from fully committed to ‘in name only’. We currently have no visibility of how auxiliary supervision is working and this lack of visibility can give rise to a question about the value of this arrangement.

The obvious alternative to the master-apprentice supervision model is one where a group of academics lead and guide the student in developing his/her research capacity and skills. In a review of PhD supervision and practices, Buttery et al\textsuperscript{14} argued for two alternatives to the Supervisor + auxiliary/auxiliaries model (SA) – these are Group Supervision (GS) and Joint Panel Supervision (JPS) configurations. The GS approach involves a hub and spoke structure where a single academic acts as a focal supervisor responsible for candidature, but different actors are formally involved at different stages of candidature as defined by the needs of the student. For example, a librarian and writing mentor may be designed as supervisors during literature review or thesis preparation stage and a researcher with the necessary appropriate technical expertise could be involved during different parts of data collection, noting that guiding input need not come from academics. The key theme of this model is that there is temporary involvement of intellectual and practical advice other than the lead academic, done on an ‘as-needs’ basis. This model of supervision has been suggested to be most appropriate for traditional Australian PhDs, which are often more speculative in pushing the boundaries of knowledge than industry PhDs focused on solving specific issues\textsuperscript{14}. The JSP model explicitly involves joint decision-making and discussion about progress; in this model the constitution of the supervisory panel is determined by the project and student combination. Such an approach


is amenable to the involvement of external parties and developing entrepreneurial culture, but places greater strain on the personnel managing candidature.

At the University, our policy settings permit all of these possibilities, but neither of the group or panel models are frequently encountered. Moreover, all of our system capabilities are directed towards the SA model and focused solely on the lead or principal supervisor, thus making it hard for us to understand the efficacy of different supervision models in contributing to student success. Given that different models of HDR supervision have their benefits for students, then the challenge for us to understand what are the barriers that reduce the wider uptake of different models of supervision. The role of the student as a co-developer of the supervisory environment needs also to be incorporated. By establishing and articulating his/her needs and expectations of supervision, a given student will be more invested in candidature; such an approach explicitly acknowledges the student as a partner in the educational endeavour. A further complication is that among faculties, there is a diverse approach to formally recognising the different modes of supervision and workload calculations (Table 4). Academic staff seem sensitive to how workload calculations are presented in the context of fulfilling a role. The emphasis on workload calculations has cemented the traditional supervisor approach as by far the most common model in faculty practice without considering alternative practices that may better serve a given student. In such cases considering different supervisory approaches may lead to better student outcomes.

Table 4. Recognition of Auxiliary Supervision contributions in faculty workload models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Current Cohort Size (enrolments)</th>
<th>Auxiliary Supervision recognised in workload</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Allocated according to a supervisor defined split</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>Yes (but not all units)</td>
<td>In some units no, in others a case has to be argued with line manager (variation among departments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>HDR supervision is not counted in any way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Allocated according to a supervisor defined split</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; IT</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Allocated according to a supervisor defined split</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Supervision per se is included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine &amp; Health</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>Under development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Extent of allocation varies among schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervision and Modes of Attendance

A critical assumption of the factors leading to over-time completions (UE-RE papers May [Item 4.1] and October [Item 6.1] 2018) led to the inescapable conclusion that part-time candidatures are not handled well in our current approach to HDR supervision. Consistently, part-time students are overrepresented (scaled to the proportion in the cohort as a whole) and statistics about poor completion, regardless of discipline or faculty. Additionally, the part-time students themselves tell us that they feel poorly served supported by our approaches and processes. Even though a possible solution to this may be to abandon part-time candidatures completely, such a decision will not align well with the University’s mission to offer the best education experience to students, regardless of background and runs counter to our culture of supporting inclusion and diversity. Moreover, many of our faculties have research programs
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strongly connected to, and embedded within, professional practice. Offering HDR pathways through part-time candidatures is critical for these disciplines’ continued success in engaging the professions with research and evidence. The alternative to discontinuing part-time candidatures is to consider new ways supporting the development and success of our part-time HDR students. Our current practice is to treat part-time candidatures as a fractional equivalent of a full-time candidature. The question therefore arises – are there alternative, better, approaches?

Challenges in HDR Supervision and Opportunities to Improve

There are four main themes to consider in setting the University framework to improve HDR supervision. The first is a clear picture of what excellence in supervision looks like, the second aspect involves supporting staff to become excellent supervisors, the third theme involves how to provide early identification and support to bring supervisory relationships back on track, and the fourth theme is remediation of supervisory relationships or practice where recalcitrant aspects of poor behaviour have been noted.

The annual Academic Performance & Development process allows staff to self-identify development needs in respect of supervision skills, but currently, we cannot fulfil those needs in-house. In responding to candidatures where the supervisory relationship has been identified as problematic, those charged with improving the HDR experience such as Associate Deans Research Education and Postgraduate Coordinators16 are often unable to make effective changes in a timely manner to relieve stresses on students. Moreover, the policy and delegation settings for HDR supervision are both unclear and unhelpful in solving ‘on-the-ground’ issues.

To become an HDR supervisor at the University of Sydney, an academic must first be entered onto the Supervisor Register. This can be done on the basis of recognised prior experience, as adjudicated by the Associate Dean Research Education, or through completion of the Foundations of Research Supervision (FoRS) course17 run by the Education Innovation unit in the DVC Education portfolio. The FoRS course was established some years ago, and as far as can be established, the course has no participant evaluation data and has never been formally reviewed. Significantly, whilst we mandate and provide training for neophyte supervisors, we offer little or no opportunities for supervisors wishing to improve their supervisory practice. This also means that those responsible for maintaining the standards of research education in faculties are unable to refer under-performing supervisors to development opportunities.

The rules by which the University delivers and improves HDR education are given in policies of the Academic Board. The key policy relevant here is the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013 (known as the Supervision Policy). It is a requirement of the University that policies are reviewed every 6th year after commencement. The Supervision Policy is now due for review.

Excellent Supervision

In any organisation, identification of excellent, or poor, performance is fundamental to improving outcomes and driving success. Reviews of supervision practices in the context of national strategies for research education18 have clearly flagged that enhancing the success of

research students is underpinned by best practices in supervision, in addition to student attributes and institutional contexts. The University has identified a focus on excellence as fundamental to its Strategy for 2016-20.

At the University, we are fortunate to have many opportunities for academic staff to be acknowledged for excellence in HDR supervision. There is a whole-of-institution award for the best supervisors (the Vice-Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in HDR Supervision) and student driven awards at an institutional level (SUPRA Supervisor of the Year). Independently of these awards, the University can nominate supervisors/teams for national recognition via the ACGR awards. Each of these awards are supplemented by faculty and/or school-based schemes that recognise the contribution that excellent supervision makes to student success. Thus, across the institution, there is a very good picture of what good supervision looks like, and this is now clearly laid out in promotion pathways.

Developing Supervision Skills

The requirement that a University or higher education provider engaged in research education must help staff develop supervisory skills is embedded in the national governance of higher education standards by the Tertiary Education and Quality Standards Agency (TEQSA) “TEQSA will look at the higher education provider’s history of supporting academics to develop the skills for effective supervision”19. At the University, we offer the Foundations of Research Supervision (FoRS) course. Whilst this programme fitted the institutional context for when the course was designed, the way we conceive of HDR education has changed at national and local levels making the current course less relevant. The University has also made a strategic decision that investment in developing staff to become better educators is a key part of a mission towards excellence in teaching. With this in mind, the DVC Education portfolio has committed to review and refresh our training for potential supervisors. Such training should be modularised to spread the time burden on staff and allow reflection on key activities, which is known to improve learning20. Modularising the staff training in supervision would also allow specific units to be used as a top-up/refresher for staff wishing to undertake further development.

An opportunity exists to frame supervisor development in the context of externally validated qualifications. Advance Higher Education (formerly the Higher Education Academy) is a UK based academic accreditation organisation that offers fellowship recognition to university teachers based on excellence and innovation in teaching and educational leadership. The fellowship scheme recognises progression from junior academic (Associate Fellow) through to university leadership roles (Principal Fellow). Importantly, this scheme has a pathway for academic staff whose teaching activities are solely in HDR supervision. This scheme, and the recognition of innovation / success in education as part of the promotions system at Sydney provides an incentive for staff to develop their supervisory skills and be recognised for having done so.

Early Intervention to Help Off-Track Supervision

Whilst recognition of excellent supervisory practice and outcomes is acknowledged in promotion pathways, understanding when supervision may be deviating from expected standards is currently not easily detected nor rectified. As described above, HDR supervision is a human relationship and when the quality of that relationship starts to deteriorate or an already less-functional one shows no sign of getting better; then intervention from someone external to that relationship can prove helpful. If each of supervisor or student have the
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insights to know supervision is not going so well\textsuperscript{21}, then reaching out for assistance is possible. Problems arise when either of supervisor or student are unaware of problems or potentially in denial of the symptoms of failing supervision.

First, we do not have a good means of knowing when poor supervision is occurring. Whilst some longer-term events (e.g. a greater number of attrition events, an excess number of transfer requests) may be indicative of less-than-satisfactory practices, most poor supervision will go undetected. HDR students are required to take part in Annual Progress Reviews\textsuperscript{22} (APRs), which are supposed to consider supervisory arrangements. The stated aim of an annual progress review at the University of Sydney is to document the successes and challenges experienced by students and note how these have influenced progress. The procedure and associated interview also has the intent of recording the nature of supervisory interactions — frequency of meetings, supportive and developmental supervision meetings and timely feedback on written work. As noted by Mewburn and co-workers\textsuperscript{23}, such lofty interests are often not realised. Students are rarely honest in the sense that they do not, or feel they cannot, report when supervision is inadequate or inappropriate — a pattern noted in the literature.\textsuperscript{3}

Work done as part of the University Executive — Research Education committee review into over-time completions has identified that consideration needs to be given to reforming the APR process and a better means of identifying when supervision is going awry will be needed. A further criticism of the APR system is that cycle of annual reviews treats all years as equal. In fact, the first of candidature is critical in success and so having more than one review addressing different aspects of academic progress was endorsed by the UE-RE (5\textsuperscript{th} September 2018). So, we need different Annual Progress Reviews and a varying frequency, contingent on the stage of candidature.

Outside of the APR process, how can we better understand the supervisory situations experience by students and staff. It is important to consider that non-functioning supervisory relationships can impact on academic staff with consequences for productivity, success and ultimately, health. The power asymmetry between academic staff and their HDR students means that resolution of unsatisfactory supervisory arrangements is easier for staff than students. The current recommendation in the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013\textsuperscript{7} for students experiencing problems with supervision is that a student should discuss these issues with the Postgraduate Coordinator (PGC) at a school level. Clearly, this can put the student in a difficult position and with limited routes to raise issues. The University needs to find alternative ways to hear the student voices about quality of supervision.

What may be useful for PGCs and other staff accountable for improving the student experience of HDR candidates would be other, finer-grained, information as to when a student-supervisory may be going off-track. For example, if a student repeatedly misses meetings/submissions of written work or if a supervisor postpones supervision meetings or delays return of work for feedback, then it is reasonable to assume effective supervision is probably not occurring. In the undergraduate coursework space, if a student repeatedly fails to submit work, then faculty staff can be notified, and the student followed up with. This intervention has been demonstrated to reduce student attrition in large first year Biology units. Such a process may be useful for HDR candidatures. For those charged with ensuring the best outcomes for students in their faculties, having better data on students under supervision can help drive interventions and improve student success.

\textsuperscript{22} Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree By Research Students Procedures 2015
Addressing poor supervision

As shown in Table 2, receiving poor or non-existent supervision can be a stressful and negative experience for students. Once poor supervision has been identified, the difficulty is how to address the issues causing it. There are currently few options available under the current policy settings:

- first, supervision can be reassigned, but this can be challenging if the supervisor is resistant or if there are grant funding/expertise constraints. An alternative pathway may involve inserting an extra supervisor into the candidature to help resolve issues and mentor the student to success. This approach can be effective in many cases but may be resource intensive and have implications for workloads;
- second, if an academic staff member is not performing well with respect to HDR supervision, then an Associate Dean Research Education can decide not to admit students to be supervised by that academic until the Associate Dean Research Education is satisfied of the quality of supervision available to students. This path can be fraught, especially if problematic supervisors are high-flying research academics whose research is seen as important for faculty or institutional success; AND
- finally, there is the option of de-registering a supervisor; this is extremely difficult under current policy arrangements. There are three ways in which a supervisor can be removed from the register. The first is by leaving the University or becoming research inactive, the second is for poor performance where a Dean has identified an academic as failing to perform to a satisfactory standard. The third means of removing a supervisor from the register can happen upon the request of the Provost, when a supervisor has been found to have committed research misconduct. In each of the latter two processes, the needs of natural justice and procedural fairness means that each process can take up to 2 years.

Each of these latter two processes are potentially career-ending for the supervisor and exposes HDR students to extended periods of poor supervision. In the case of poor performance identified during Academic Performance and Development reviews, we essentially require students to be continually exposed to poor practices, so that we can demonstrate that the academic staff member is failing to meet our expectations of supervision. In a university that is taking student-centricity to the heart of its dealings with our students, this is surely inappropriate. It is essential that new processes and procedures be developed that can be timely, effective and protect the interests of students, staff and the University.

A further aspect of supervision that causes student disquiet is the funding of their research activities. When students are associated with grant-funded research, the quantum of funding may not be an issue, but perceived fairness in access to resources may be problematic. There are student reports of funding being denied for planned research activities in an arbitrary manner or in a way that students describe as bullying. Equally though, such issues may arise because the student’s proposed use of funds was inappropriate or misguided, but the manner in which the decision was communicated / implemented caused a breakdown in the supervisory relationship. It is important to recognise that Chief Investigators do have responsibilities and accountabilities in respect of grant funding and good supervision will effectively communicate these expectations. More problematically though, there are cases of supervisors taking on students with no clear understanding of how the student’s research activities will be supported. Each of the key policies in this area require the admitting faculty/school and supervisor to provide the necessary resources for students to succeed, but this is not always clear to the student. Greater clarity is needed around the expectations of supervision with regard to provision of research support.

24 Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013
25 SREQ open comments 2018. Source: Quality & Analytics, DVC Education Portfolio
26 Sources: Confidential reports to SUPRA and also similar comments from students to the Director, Graduate Research. Students asked for identifying information not to be made available. Heads were notified.
Proposed next steps

The following next steps are proposed to address the issues outlined above. These are whole-of-university responses, reflecting the need to ensure a consistent high-level of student experience and academic activity across the university whilst still preserving discipline variations and faculty nuances.

Adapt HDR student support mechanisms, currently being developed through the Sydney Operating Model program. This will enable better student-supervisor interactions and planning, with means to provide the student and supervisor to note progress and perception of supervision. Such tools should enable each party to notify leaders and managers when supervision may be going awry. The potential to develop early warning indicators from such tools will increase the capacity of faculty HDR leadership teams to develop appropriate interventions.

Review and renew relevant policies and procedures.

a) Improve the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013

This policy will also need to be supported by appropriate procedures. Reviewing and updating policies on a five-year cycle is normal practice and the DVC Education Portfolio has committed to reviewing this policy in 2019. The outcome of this review will be an updated policy that lays out the University’s expectations and requirements for supervision in the context of the reformed HDR experience. The review will need to commence in Q3 of 2019 and be informed by the work done above. The revised policy and new procedures will need to go through the relevant committees during Q4 of 2019.

Key opportunities for improving this policy include:

- Analysis done as part of the UE-RE consideration of over-time completions has noted that excessive student load\(^{28}\) can be problematic for students in that they rarely interact with the research supervisor. Large teams of research students are often associated with externally funded research grants and highly successful research academics; we should permit this to happen but only under the circumstances of appropriate training and periodic assessment of the quality of supervision. One way to achieve this may be to create an extra grade of supervisor in addition to our current Auxiliary or Research Supervisor. This ‘Principal supervisor’ (indicative nomenclature only) recognition would allow a supervisor to exceed policy limit of five students providing good outcomes for students were sustained. Being recorded as a ‘Principal supervisor’ could be done on the basis of prior experience, awards for excellence or training and would carry a commitment to mentor junior supervisors, contribute to APR panels and contribute to HDR matters in the academic unit concerned such as being a convenor of oral examinations.

- Our work on over-time completions identified that the Annual Progress Review (APR) system is in need of improvement. Faculties and the Higher Degree by Research Administration Centre (HDRAC) face significant challenges in staffing APR panels as academics may decline to participate or withdraw with little or no notice\(^ {29}\). One solution to this could be to change the supervision policy is that being an active HDR supervisor imposes an obligation to serve on APR panels, much in the same way the holding an Australian Research Council requires grantees to act as assessors of other ARC grant applications.

- Adapt the policy to facilitate better management of HDR supervision. Faculty leadership needs to be able to request the temporary removal of supervisors from the Supervisory Register. This can be in addition to the permanent removal processes already discussed in the policy\(^ {25}\) and could be triggered by events such

\(^{28}\) The Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students policy 2013 sets an upper limit of 5 students per supervisor unless with the express permission of the Associate Dean. Currently, 96 of the approx. 1500 active supervisors have a student load greater than 5, with 13 of these supervisors having 10 or more students.

\(^{29}\) G. Carayannopoulos (Manager HDRAC) Pers. Comm.
as consistent poor commentary (3 or more) by HDR students in Annual Progress Reviews, repeated transfer of students away from that supervisor, or breaches of WHS, ethics or research data management in relation to the work of HDR students.

- Considering how our policy settings align with the nationally agreed Good Practice Guidelines in respect of the supervision of research students.
- Further elaborating on the responsibilities and accountabilities of staff, schools and faculties to enhance the HDR student experience.
- Reviewing and updating this policy should be followed by a concerted communications campaign. This will allow us to identify areas that have and have not changed and also flag to the academic community that a variety of supervisory structures are all possible and that faculties should adopt a given structure that best suits the needs of an individual candidature.

b) Improve the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students 2015

Assign a mentor role to a member of the student’s Annual Progress Review Panel. This panel member should, as far as possible, be in role for the duration of the student’s candidature and would be available to support the student if issues arise from supervision.

Improve opportunities for professional learning, development and support for current and potential HDR supervisors. This will involve reviewing existing provision and development of new opportunities, for example:

- replace the FoRS course. The DVC Education portfolio has committed to replacing the Foundations of Research Supervision (FoRS) course. The Education Innovation team will lead the development of a new programme for new supervisors that will align with the requirements for Associate Fellowship of Advance Higher Education, as well as allowing modules to be available for established academics to improve practice. The development of the new course should also be informed by consulting with existing supervisors within the institution. It is envisaged that the course will be modular in nature and delivered through online and in person activities. The development of the new course will take place over Q3 and 4 2019, with the structure of a new course for approval by the UE-RE and Graduate Studies Committee in Q1 of 2020, to be delivered in 2020 onwards;
- in addition, faculties can assign mentors for supervisors to help develop best practices. Many faculties can access recipients of awards for HDR supervision to more clearly demonstrate what good looks like.

Identify best practice in aligning staff and student expectations with respect to HDR supervision. This is predominantly delivered via the Annual Progress Review (for students) or Academic Performance and Development (for staff) systems. In some units (e.g. School of Psychology) there is additional investment in clarifying expectations through a ‘supervision contract’. Faculties could consider codifying expectations of supervision in terms of a successful student experience as well as using metrics such as timely completion and include appropriate information of funding of student research projects. We should ensure a consistent provision of information to stakeholders describing our expectations for staff and students as partners in the supervision of candidature.

Further evidence from the UE-RE over-time completions study noted that a much greater proportion of part-time candidatures had candidatures exceeding nominal limits than would be expected by their relative abundance in the cohort. A consideration here might be that faculties and supervisors set realistic expectations about student progression and integrate these into their candidature management protocols. Additionally, for those faculties where part-time candidatures are a key part of the HDR cohort, then consideration should be given to developing robust local provisions about part-time candidature that focus on enhancing student success. The UE-RE should undertake exercises to ensure that faculties are providing appropriate information to staff and students apropos expectations around supervision and UE-RE should seek reassurance from faculties that the effectiveness of this provision of information is reviewed frequently.
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Consider how the role of HDR supervision in contributing to the success of the university and to individual faculties could be recognised via consistent approach to recognising different types of supervision in workload recognition. Although a standardised workload model is outside the scope of this document, the UE-RE could consider proposing a set of expectations in respect of workload associated with different modes of HDR supervision and recommend to Deans that these be adopted in faculty workload management systems.

Supervision practices often vary with discipline, so faculties should consider local initiatives directed at the culture of supervision within their cohorts. Such initiatives would benefit from a deeper understanding of the experiences of HDR students in the context of a given faculty. Whilst surveys such as PREQ can reveal institutional trends, they lack the granularity to generate insights at smaller scales of academic organisation. An organisational learning approach can be instructive here; the faculty proposes changes/initiatives around local practices and tests these with stakeholders, these initiatives are then refined, and the changes reported back to stakeholders and the stakeholders’ responses to those changes incorporated into subsequent reviews of success. The mechanisms of consultation can be via surveys or focus groups. A starting point here could be for each faculty to propose a suite of practices that would embody their approaches for HDR supervision; a suitable model for this is given in appendix 2.

The outcomes of this activity will a greater fit of supervision to the needs of HDR students participating in research education. Faculties would be encouraged to report such activities and associated advances in practice to the University community via the UE-RE as well as more bespoke showcases.
Appendix 1

The attached document was produced by Griffith University to (1) address issues of consistency in approach to the Supervision of HDR students and (2) to provide a basis to develop discipline and thematic approaches to aspects of HDR supervision. It is provided as an example only.
Principles to Promote Excellence in HDR Supervision at Griffith University

Background

Griffith University attaches the highest importance to ensuring consistently high quality experiences and outcomes for all its higher degree by research (HDR) candidates and acknowledges the critical role of HDR supervisors in achieving these goals. The Principles to Promote Excellence in HDR Supervision Practices at Griffith University, outlined here, were informed by the HDR supervision literature, developed in consultation with experienced Griffith supervisors and refined by feedback from HDR candidates. The resulting principles were then endorsed by the Board of Graduate Research in October 2014.

The principles seek to reflect the diversity of views around excellence in supervisory practice and to be relevant to all supervisors, irrespective of their background, experience, and training. They can be used as a guide for improving supervision practice, rather than as a formula or recipe for excellence in supervision. Each supervisor will need to interpret and operationalise the principles as appropriate within their own context, guided by evidence-based approaches, and in consultation with colleagues. Although each principle is supervisor-centred, it is acknowledged that supervisors are not fully responsible for all of the actions embedded within these principles and that many of the listed actions involve responsibilities shared across the University. Supervisors nevertheless play an important role in these areas.

### Principles to promote excellence in HDR supervision at Griffith University:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recruit &amp; Evaluate</td>
<td>Employ strategies for recruiting high quality HDR candidates and carefully evaluate the fit between the candidate, project and supervisory team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Involve &amp; Support</td>
<td>Involve candidates in the culture of research and provide support tailored to the needs and circumstances of the individual candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communicate &amp; Negotiate</td>
<td>Communicate and negotiate regularly, respectfully and effectively with candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Guide &amp; Challenge</td>
<td>Guide and challenge candidates to achieve high levels of knowledge, skill and intellectual capability and to uphold high standards of professionalism and integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Encourage &amp; Inspire</td>
<td>Encourage and inspire students to reach their potential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6. Review & Improve

Continuously review and improve supervision practice
The following outlines ways in which each of the Principles to Promote Excellence in HDR Supervision at Griffith University might be reflected in practice.

1. Recruit & Evaluate

*Employ strategies for recruiting high quality HDR candidates and carefully evaluate the fit between the candidate, project and supervisory team*

   a) **Implement** a strategy for recruiting high quality HDR candidates  
   b) **Align** HDR student recruitment with relevant strategic research goals  
   c) **Evaluate** the capacity of potential candidates to undertake the proposed project  
   d) **Ensure** alignment of the background, interests and expectations of the candidate with the proposed project and supervision team  
   e) **Evaluate** the feasibility of the proposed project  
   f) **Evaluate** the capacity of the supervision team to effectively supervise the candidate and proposed project (e.g. interest, expertise, experience, time, accreditation status)

2. Involve & Support

*Involve candidates in the culture of research and provide support tailored to the needs and circumstances of the individual candidate*

   a) **Actively involve** candidates in the intellectual life of the element, University and discipline/profession  
   b) **Advise** candidates of relevant research training opportunities (e.g. workshops, seminars, peer/research/professional networks) and resources  
   c) **Advise** candidates of problem solving mechanisms and available support services (e.g. Health services, counselling)  
   d) **Demonstrate** care for the general development and welfare of the candidate  
   e) **Adapt** the supervisory style and/or strategy to accommodate individual differences and changing roles and circumstances throughout candidature  
   f) **Involve** the candidate in important decisions affecting their candidature  
   g) **Ensure** candidates are aware of and comply with institutional requirements associated with their candidature

3. Communicate & Negotiate

*Communicate and negotiate regularly, respectfully and effectively with candidates*

   a) **Understand** the interests, needs, motivations and circumstances of candidates  
   b) **Demonstrate** interest in and enthusiasm for the candidate’s work  
   c) **Negotiate** a plan for meeting regularly with candidates, establishing reasonable and agreed expectations, setting and regularly reviewing goals, and providing meaningful, constructive and timely feedback  
   d) **Value** and **accommodate** individual and cultural diversity  
   e) **Model** collegial, respectful and culturally competent interactions  
   f) **Acknowledge** the value of candidate’s input  
   g) Closely **monitor** candidate’s progress and commitment, and **intervene** early and **assist** if problems arise
4. Guide & Challenge

**Guide and challenge** candidates to achieve high levels of knowledge, skill and intellectual capability and to uphold high standards of professionalism and integrity

a) **Guide** candidates through critical phases of candidature (e.g. orientation and induction, developing a research plan, obtaining ethics approval, candidature milestones, and thesis preparation, submission, examination and revision)
b) **Share** your time, knowledge, expertise and experience with the candidate
c) **Guide and challenge** candidates to achieve a high level of intellectual capability and a deep knowledge of the field
d) **Guide and challenge** candidates to achieve a high level of communication, collaboration and research skill
e) **Model and encourage** professionalism and integrity in the conduct of research

5. Encourage & Inspire

**Encourage and inspire** students to reach their potential

a) **Encourage** the spirit of critical enquiry and creative innovation informed by scholarly research
b) **Create** an engaging, motivating and intellectually stimulating learning environment
c) **Encourage** interaction and collaboration
d) **Celebrate** candidate progress and help build student confidence
e) **Model** enthusiasm for the pursuit of original knowledge and its dissemination
f) **Encourage and assist** candidates to publish and disseminate their research findings
g) **Encourage** candidates to achieve their scholarly and professional goals
h) **Encourage** candidates to develop their professional identity and facilitate the career aspirations of the candidate throughout and beyond candidature

6. Review & Improve

**Continuously review and improve** supervision practice

a) **Continuously review** and improve personal supervision practice (e.g. through self-reflection, peer evaluation, student feedback, participation in communities of practice, performance reviews and/or other professional development activities)
b) **Conform** to University policies and procedures relating to HDR supervision (e.g. Responsibilities of key stakeholders, intellectual property, ethics, health and safety)
c) **Contribute** to enhancement of HDR supervision practices and outcomes (e.g. involvement in supervision training and mentoring, leadership/service in HDR supervision)
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Purpose: To advise the Academic Standards and Policy Committee of action taken by the Chair of the Academic Board at the request of the Executive Director of Student Administration in response to an audit of examination procedures.

RECOMMENDATION

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

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

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

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

I consulted with the Chairs of the Academic Board Committees and student representatives from the SRC and SUPRA on the nature of the proposed changes and the advisability of me acting on behalf of the Academic Board.

The unanimous view was that we should have the draft in place if the audit has identified issues.

Accordingly, I approved the request on behalf of the Academic Board, noting that the draft document would also be submitted to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee for noting and any additional consideration.

ATTACHMENTS

1 Purpose and application

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

(b) These procedures apply to:

(i) all coursework programs offered by the University; and

(ii) assessment tasks at unit and program or course level, including individual and group tasks.

2 Commencement

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

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

3 Interpretation

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

Note: See clause 5 of the policy.

(2) In these procedures:

- **academic unit** means a faculty, University school, board of studies, school, of the University.
- **assessment rubrics** means marking guides that state the criteria against which an assessment will be marked.
Dean means:

- In relation to a faculty, the Dean of the relevant faculty;
- In relation to a University school, the Head of School and
  Dean of the relevant University school

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

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

Faculty means a faculty or a University school.

formal examination period means weeks 15 and 16 of each semester

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

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

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

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

Note: See also the University Recordkeeping Manual

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

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

Note: See clause 7

Student Identification Number means the unique identification number assigned to each student
upon their first enrolment at the University

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

4 Application of implementation statements to assessment principles

(1) These procedures set out the implementation statements designed to give effect to
the assessment principles established by the policy.
Schedule 1 to these procedures is a table correlating assessment principles to implementation statements.

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

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

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

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

Note: See also the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(11) Where possible, assessments should be designed to enable students to apply feedback provided for an earlier task to a later task. This is particularly relevant to first year units.

(12) Feedback on student work, either individually or in a group, should be sufficiently detailed to be a useful identification of strengths and areas for improvement, yet not so detailed as to discourage self-reliance in learning and assessment.

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

6 Informing students – Principles 1 and 2

(1) The scope and nature of the assessment for each unit of study should be explicitly stated in the unit of study outline and published no later than one week prior to the commencement of the semester or teaching period in which the unit is offered. This statement should include:
(a) details of all aspects of the assessment system, including the intended learning outcomes to be tested;

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

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

(c) an assessment table, with:
   (i) the weighting of items and of tasks or papers;
   (ii) the due date for submission or testing;
   (iii) the conditions under which examinations will be sat;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note: See clause 11A of these procedures, and clause 66A of the Coursework Policy 2014.

7 Marking and determination of grades – Principles 2 and 3

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

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

Note: See Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

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

(4) In the interests of transparency of grading the University uses a standards-based approach to assessing the achievements of students.
In this approach, grades are allocated using pre-determined standards. Students’ grades are not determined in relation to predetermined distributions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Due account must be taken of any special consideration granted under clause 67, and reasonable adjustment under clause 68, of the policy.

8 Conduct of examinations - Principles 1 to 4

The principal examiner is responsible for:

(a) complying with and completing all administrative requirements for the examination by the specified deadline;

(b) providing the examination paper to the Examinations Office by the specified deadline;

(c) securing working papers developed in preparation for examinations; and

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

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

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

All examinations other than those which include non-written elements must be administered by the Examinations Office.

In relation to all examinations, the Examinations Office is responsible for:

(a) managing examination venue bookings;
(b) security protocol and printing examination papers;
(c) retaining final examination papers in the University archives;
(d) scheduling examinations generally;
(e) scheduling examinations in postgraduate coursework units of study, as far as practicable, at times consistent with class times; and
(f) recruiting and training examination invigilators
(g) ensuring that students do not leave the examination venue with examination materials.

All examinations must be of one of the following durations:

(a) 1 hour;
(b) 1.5 hours;
(c) 2 hours;
(d) 2.5 hours; or
(e) 3 hours.

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

All examinations must be invigilated by University trained invigilators.

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

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

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

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

Tests may be held during classes provided that faculties ensure that the overall assessment practices in all units of study are reasonable and not structured in a way that may disrupt attendance at other classes.
The week after the end of teaching in each semester will be a study break (Stu-Vac, week 14) with the formal examination period to commence the following week, week 15.

Principal examiners seeking to directly administer written examinations without the involvement of the Examinations Office must obtain the Registrar’s written permission to do so each year. Such requests must:

(a) set out the reason why the examination cannot be administered by the Examinations Office; and

(b) detail the arrangements for secure printing and storage of examination papers.

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

(a) providing the Examinations Office with all necessary information to schedule the examination, within the timeframes specified by the Examinations Office;

(b) arranging the Examinations Office to book an appropriate examination venue;

(c) arranging secure printing and storage of examination papers;

(d) providing a copy of the final examination paper to the Examinations office for retention in the University archives; and

(e) arranging for invigilation of the examination by University trained invigilators.

9 Security of Examination Papers - Principles 1 to 4

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

10 Emergency evacuations during examinations - Principles 1 to 4

(1) If an emergency evacuation is required:
   (a) invigilators will make a note of the time at which the examination is stopped;
   (b) invigilators will adhere to the instructions of Campus Security Unit and emergency services; and
   (c) Precinct officer will contact the Examinations Office to inform them of the evacuation.

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

(3) Invigilators will inform students that any communication, including the use of an electronic or smart device, is not permitted.

(4) If an emergency evacuation affects one or more examination venues, the Examinations Office will:
   (a) determine to resume the examination if 30 minutes or less has elapsed from the documented time of evacuation and Campus Security Unit or emergency services confirm that there is no threat;
   (b) determine to abandon the examination if more than 30 minutes has elapsed from the documented time of evacuation;
   (c) determine to abandon the examination if advised that the examination venue was evacuated, the Examinations Office must notify:
      (i) the principal examiner;
      (ii) the relevant dean;
      (iii) the director of the Student Centre; and
      (iv) the Registrar.

(5) Immediately following the decision to resume or abandon the examination venue, the Examinations Office will notify by email:
   (a) the primary examiner;
   (b) the relevant Associate Dean (Education);
   (c) Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education);
   (d) and precinct officer(s).

(6) Invigilators will inform students of the decision to resume or abandon the examination.

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

(8) If the examination is abandoned students’ work (such as answer booklets or computer answer sheets) is deemed null and void for the purposes of marking.

(9) The Examinations Office will consult with the primary examiner of the abandoned examination to make arrangements for the affected students to re-sit the examination at the earliest opportunity.
The primary examiner will provide the Examinations Office with a new examination paper if the examination paper was compromised during the emergency evacuation.

Invigilators will advise students that the Examinations Office will contact them via their University email about a re-sit and they must remain close to campus and not make any travel plans until 6pm on that day unless otherwise advised.

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

### 11 Use of personal computers, electronic and smart devices and calculators in examinations - principle 3

1. **Personal computers; electronic communication and recording devices; items with internet connectivity; and/or items with Bluetooth or smart technology capability are not normally permitted in examinations.** This includes, but is not limited to:
   - Laptops;
   - Mobile phones;
   - Tablets;
   - Watches; and
   - Headphones.

2. Students are required to leave these devices switched-off in their bag or under their desk in the examination venue.

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

4. **Faculties** may develop examinations and assessments in which such devices are permitted but in doing so must consider the equity, supervisory and logistical implications of their use.

5. The University adopts the approved calculator list for 2 Unit Mathematics issued by the NSW Board of Studies as its list of non-programmable calculators acceptable for use in examinations at the University.
   - A copy of this list must be available on the University website.
   - Students must take any calculator they wish to use in an examination to the Student Centre for approval prior to their examination.

### 12 Accessible examination and assessment arrangements - Principle 3

1. Students who have registered with the University’s Disability Services, and have satisfied the University’s requirements for supporting documentation, may be eligible for reasonable adjustments or accessible examination and assessment arrangements.
University staff are generally required to implement the examination and assessment adjustments or arrangements notified by Disability Services, with the exceptions described in the *Disability Standards for Education (2005)*.

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

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

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

Adjustments applicable to the formal examination period also apply to, and must be provided in, the replacement examination period.

In-faculty-coordinated examinations, tests, take home tests, within-semester assessments, practical and oral assessments are managed by the faculty. Faculty responsibilities include:

(a) notifying students in a timely manner of
   (i) the confirmed adjustments or arrangements; and
   (ii) the time and location of any adjusted examination;

(b) providing notified adjustments and accommodations, including supervision, scribes or equipment;

   Note: Disability Services provides assistance with specialist equipment, ergonomic furniture and access to assistive technology, and can also provide a list of trained scribes and invigilators.

(c) providing adjustments or arrangements to the original examination or assessment for any replacement assessment, unless the form of assessment has changed, in which case Disability Services must be notified.

The provision of reasonable adjustments or accessible arrangements does not preclude a student from claiming special consideration due to illness or misadventure.

Note: See also clause 14 of these procedures and clause 67 of the policy.

(a) All requests for special consideration and special arrangements are managed by the Student Administration Services (SAS) Professional Services Unit (PSU).

   Note: See schedule 3 of these procedures

13 Special arrangements for assessment or examinations - Principle 3

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

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

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

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

(5) Late requests for special arrangements for assessment or examination will be considered only where the student provides a reasonable explanation for the delay.

(6) Requests for special arrangements for examinations must be lodged, with all necessary forms and supporting documentation, no later than the close of business 14 days after the publication of the examination timetable.

(7) A request for special arrangements must be accompanied by sufficient and relevant supporting documentation, in English. This may include, but is not limited to:
   (a) in the case of religious beliefs, a supporting letter from the student’s imam, pastor, rabbi or equivalent spiritual or community leader;
   (b) in the case of compulsory absence, a copy of the summons, subpoena, court order or notice of selection for jury duty;
   (c) in the case of sporting, cultural or political/union commitments, supporting documentation from the organising body;
   (d) in the case of parental or adoption commitments, a certificate from a medical practitioner or midwife stating the expected date of birth or documentation from the relevant adoption agency stating the expected date of placement;
   (e) in the case of defence force or emergency services commitments, supporting documentation from the student’s brigade or unit;
   (f) in the case where continuing employment would be jeopardised, supporting documentation from the student’s employer;
   (g) in the case of other situations, such documentation as is considered necessary by the University.

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

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

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

(a) Schedule 3 to these procedures prescribes the standard responses to the most common circumstances.
Occasionally circumstances of a longer term nature may have a substantial impact on a student’s ability to study and undertake assessments. In such cases, affected students should discuss their circumstances with an advisor or counsellor within or outside their faculty before lodging a request for special consideration.

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

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

- Where circumstances preclude this, a student may still request special consideration but must provide a reasonable explanation for the delay.
- The University will not decline a request on the grounds of late lodgement where a reasonable explanation is provided.

A request for special consideration must:

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

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

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

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

International students suffering illness, injury or misadventure should also contact the University for information about possible impacts on visa and other arrangements.
A student may withdraw a request for special consideration made prior to, during or immediately after an assessment (usually an examination) at any time prior to the earlier of:

(a) release of results for that assessment; or
(b) completion of a replacement assessment.

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

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

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

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

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

(a) Replacement assessment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) Extension.

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

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

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

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

(c) Reweighting or averaging.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(c) If the relevant delegate considers that the functioning of the group is not impaired but that its ability to complete the task as assigned is impaired, an extension of time or an alternative assessment will be provided as appropriate.
If the relevant delegate considers that the group can no longer function, the assessment task will be redefined for the remaining active members, based on the contributions they were to make.

(i) Assessment will then be based on the redefined task.
(ii) The lecturer or teacher may also allow an extension of time.
(iii) The group member(s) who suffered the illness, injury or misadventure will, if their request is accepted, be given an alternative assessment.

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

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

14A Simple extensions - Principle 3

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

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

15 Processing and release of results - Principles 1 to 4

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

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

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

(4) Late results must be:
   (a) approved by the head of the relevant academic unit;
   (b) entered into the student management system as soon as they become available; and
   (c) released as soon as possible after the release date determined by the Registrar.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(12) After the expiry of the applicable retention period, examination scripts and marking sheets may be destroyed. The destruction must be authorised by the head of the unit and documented as required by the Recordkeeping Manual.
16 **Appeals - Principles 1 to 4**

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

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

17 **Professional development - Principles 2 and 4**

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

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

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

18 **Effectiveness of assessment policies - Principle 4**

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

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

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

   (c) through feedback from students on assessment (directly and via unit of study evaluations and related feedback tools).
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## SCHEDULE 1 – IMPLEMENTATION TABLE

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assessment will be evaluated solely on the basis of students’ achievement against criteria and standards specified to align with learning outcomes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Assessment practices address issues of equity and inclusiveness to accommodate and build upon the diversity of the student body so as not to disadvantage any student.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessment procedures

- **Item 4.2 Attachment 1**

#### 4. Assessment practices must be continuously improved and updated

- **(1)** Assessment tasks and outcomes are moderated through academic peer review and used to inform subsequent practice.  
  - **5**
- **(2)** Assessment is regularly updated to ensure alignment with program learning outcomes or graduate attributes.  
  - **5**
- **(3)** Professional development opportunities that are related to design, implementation and moderation of assessment are provided to staff.  
  - **17**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment title</th>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Example of Assessment type</th>
<th>Description of Assessment type</th>
<th>Exam / Quiz type</th>
<th>Individual or Group</th>
<th>Length / duration</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Due date and time</th>
<th>Closing date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free format text to name each assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid Assessment type values for each</td>
<td>Specify for each assessment (select one)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specify for each</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specify for each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of assessment task</td>
<td>Exam</td>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td>Written exam, written exam with non-written elements, or non-written exam, however administered. Worth 30% or greater.</td>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In-semester exam</td>
<td>Written exam, written exam with non-written elements, or non-written exam, however administered. Worth 30% or greater.</td>
<td>In-semester exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of assessment task</td>
<td>Skills-based assessment</td>
<td>Placements</td>
<td>Professional experience placement, internship, or site visit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skills base evaluation</td>
<td>Clinical skills assessment or lab skills assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creative assessments / demonstrations</td>
<td>Performance, recital or jury-assessment performance, or exhibition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Due date may be expressed as a time period when exact date not known e.g. final exam period, week 7. Time to be included where assessment must be submitted by a cut-off time e.g. 23:59 EST.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment title</th>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Example of Assessment type</th>
<th>Description of Assessment type</th>
<th>Exam / Quiz type</th>
<th>Individual or Group</th>
<th>Length / duration</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Due date and time</th>
<th>Closing date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of assessment task</td>
<td>Submitted work</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Essay, report, case study, proposal, literature review, portfolio, or design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of assessment task</td>
<td>In-class assessments</td>
<td>Tutorial quiz, small test or online task</td>
<td>Worth less than 30%.</td>
<td>Tutorial quiz, small test or online task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small continuous assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Worth less than 30%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oral presentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optional assignment or small test</td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes formative assessments.</td>
<td>Optional small test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of assessment task</td>
<td>Group work</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Written, non-written elements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

A special consideration report listing all assessments and the form of consideration granted is available to UOS Coordinators.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</th>
<th>Assessment description</th>
<th>Form of consideration</th>
<th>Conditions for standard decision</th>
<th>SAS</th>
<th>Faculty, University school, or school</th>
<th>UOS Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exams</strong></td>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td>Written exam</td>
<td>Replacement exam</td>
<td>Final exam scheduled and managed centrally</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix and Schedule and manage replacement exam</td>
<td>Where the student is unable to attempt the replacement exam and a valid form of replacement assessment or alternative means of assessment is not possible, award a grade of DC (discontinue not to count as failure) if appropriate</td>
<td>Provide replacement exam paper by specified deadline, Download special consideration report, Construct a valid form of replacement assessment or an alternative means of assessment where the student is unable to attempt the replacement exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category</td>
<td>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, or school</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td>Written exam with non-written elements or non-written exam</td>
<td>Replacement exam</td>
<td>Final and replacement exams may be managed by faculty, University, school, or school</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>For final and replacement exams managed by faculty, University, school, or school the relevant area will schedule and manage the exam including managing and implementing Disability Services adjustments; and informing the student of the schedule</td>
<td>Where the student is unable to attempt the replacement exam and a valid form of replacement assessment or alternative means of assessment is not possible, award a grade of DC (discontinue not to count as failure) if appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide final and replacement exam paper
Download special consideration report
Construct a valid form of replacement assessment or an alternative means of assessment where the student is unable to attempt the replacement exam
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</th>
<th>Assessment description</th>
<th>Form of consideration</th>
<th>Conditions for standard decision</th>
<th>SAS</th>
<th>Faculty, University school, or school</th>
<th>UOS Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>In-semester exam</td>
<td>Written exam, worth 30% or greater (refer to section 14.13(c)(iii) above)</td>
<td>Replacement exam for in-semester exam</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Schedule and manage replacement exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exam type could be any of the following: written exam, written exam with non-written elements, or non-written exam, however administered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide replacement exam</td>
<td>Inform student of replacement exam schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manage and implement Disability Services adjustments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placements</td>
<td>Professional experience placement, internship, or site visit</td>
<td>New or varied placement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Schedule and inform student of new or varied placement details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills based evaluation</td>
<td>Clinical skills assessment or lab skills assessment</td>
<td>New or varied evaluation</td>
<td>Not on “non-repeatable” list</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Schedule and inform student of new or varied evaluation details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category</td>
<td>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, or school</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills based assessment</td>
<td>Skills based evaluation</td>
<td>Clinical skills assessment or lab skills assessment</td>
<td>Alternative assessment</td>
<td>On “non-repeatable” list (e.g. evaluations with specialised resource requirements)</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills based assessment</td>
<td>Creative assessments/demonstrations</td>
<td>Performance, recital or jury assessment performance, or exhibition</td>
<td>New or varied evaluation</td>
<td>Not on “non-repeatable” list</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Schedule and inform student of alternative assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills based assessment</td>
<td>Creative assessments/demonstrations</td>
<td>Performance, recital, jury assessment performance, or exhibition</td>
<td>Alternative evaluation</td>
<td>On “non-repeatable” list, (e.g. assessments/demonstrations with specialised resource requirements)</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Schedule and inform student of alternative evaluation details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category</td>
<td>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, or school</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted work</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Essay, report</td>
<td>Extension of time</td>
<td>1. Impacted period is 20 or</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>case study, proposal,</td>
<td>(refer to section</td>
<td>fewer working days (refer to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>literature review,</td>
<td>14.13(b) above)</td>
<td>section 14.13(b) above) and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>portfolio or design</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. The new due date(^2) is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honours Thesis</td>
<td>Non-HDR thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td>prior to the return date(^3)</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) New due date is the revised submission date for the assessment.

\(^3\) Return date refers to the date when an assignment or the answers are returned to the cohort and is usually within 10 working days (14 calendar days) from the original due date of the assessment, unless otherwise specified by the faculty or University school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</th>
<th>Assessment description</th>
<th>Form of consideration</th>
<th>Conditions for standard decision</th>
<th>SAS</th>
<th>Faculty, University school, or school</th>
<th>UOS Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Essay, report, case study, proposal, literature review, portfolio or design</td>
<td>Determined by faculty or University school</td>
<td>1. Impacted period is more than 20 working days (refer to section 14.13(b)(iv) above) or 2. The new due date is after the return date</td>
<td>Refer to UOS Coordinator for form of consideration</td>
<td>Where the student is unable to attempt the replacement assessment or alternative means of assessment is not possible, award a grade of DC (discontinue not to count as failure) if appropriate</td>
<td>Determine appropriate form of consideration Determine consideration longer than 20 working days or set an alternative assessment in cases where remaining student cohort would be disadvantaged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Thesis</td>
<td>Non-HDR thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 New due date is the revised submission date for the assessment.
5 Return date refers to the date when an assignment or the answers are returned to the cohort and is usually within 10 working days (14 calendar days) from the original due date of the assessment, unless otherwise specified by the faculty or University school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</th>
<th>Assessment description</th>
<th>Form of consideration</th>
<th>Conditions for standard decision</th>
<th>SAS</th>
<th>Faculty, University school, or school</th>
<th>UOS Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-class assessments</td>
<td>Tutorial quiz, small test or online task</td>
<td>Worth less than 30% Students will be encouraged to check with their unit of study coordinator if any repeat sessions will be available before submitting a special consideration application.</td>
<td>Mark adjustment (refer to section 14.13(c) above)</td>
<td>Not on “no mark adjustment allowed” list</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report Make mark adjustment (re-weight, average etc.) Provide an alternative assessment where a student has missed more than one third of the regular assessment components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category</td>
<td>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, or school</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment type</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tutorial quiz, small test or online task</strong></td>
<td><strong>Worth less than 30% (refer to section 14.13(c)(iii) above)</strong></td>
<td><strong>New or varied assessment</strong></td>
<td><strong>On “no mark adjustment allowed” list</strong></td>
<td><strong>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</strong></td>
<td><strong>Download special consideration report</strong></td>
<td><strong>Schedule and inform student of new or varied assessment details</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small continuous assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Oral presentation</strong></td>
<td><strong>New or varied presentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Download special consideration report</strong></td>
<td><strong>Schedule and inform student of new or varied presentation details</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-class assessments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optional assignment or small test</strong></td>
<td><strong>Includes formative assessments</strong></td>
<td><strong>No action required</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>None</strong></td>
<td><strong>None</strong></td>
<td><strong>None</strong></td>
<td><strong>None</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category</td>
<td>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, or school</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Group work (refer to section 14 above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written, non-written elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Written, non-written elements</td>
<td>Extension of time or alternative assessment for the impacted student</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Extension of time or alternative assessment for the impacted student</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The procedures must be amended to improve the operationalisation of procedures for emergency evacuations during examinations and to ensure that references to technology and devices prohibited in...
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The reason for and aims of the proposed procedure amendments are to ensure consistency in decision making affecting students in exam situations, optimise the operationalisation of examinations and to significantly improve the academic and student experience by providing consistent, relevant and clear procedures for decision making during exams and emergency evacuations.
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RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee considers and endorses the recommendations of the Dual and Joint Degrees report (attachment 1).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Dual and Joint Degrees Working Group was established to develop and implement a strategic framework and governance structure for dual degree and joint PhD partnerships. The working group produced a report that contained ten recommendations pertaining to the nomenclature, approval process, partnership framework, delegations of authority, and co-badging arrangements of courses offered under an inter-institutional agreement. The Academic Standards and Policy Subcommittee is asked to endorse the recommendations of the report of the working group which are detailed in this paper.

CONTEXT

There has been an increase in the provision of dual degree arrangements across the sector, reflecting the evolving nature of international engagement amongst global universities. Dual degree and joint PhD programs provide an opportunity to increase the University’s engagement with other leading institutions and offer students a valuable mobility experience. In response to this trend, a working group was established to ensure that the University of Sydney’s engagement in this evolving landscape is strategic and robust. In keeping with that approach, the Working Group has developed a framework that will allow the University to assess new and existing dual degree partnerships, to identify and address institutional barriers, to improve the governance architecture, and to encourage the participation of students in our dual degree offerings. It is proposed that the University establishes a framework based on ‘collaboration tiers’ that will provide guidance on evaluating, prioritising and approving new university partnerships related to dual degrees (coursework) and joint PhDs. Under this model, tier one partners will be populated by Office of Global Engagement (OGE) priority partners, tier two will be based on aligning partnerships with University or faculty strategies with non-priority partner institutions, and tier three allow for bespoke and tactical arrangements with research degree partners.

The Working Group explored the array of dual degree models across the sector and considered the disparate array of terms used to describe similar dual/joint courses. To assist in differentiating the various modes of dual award arrangements, five types of dual courses are identified in the paper: (1) dual degree, (2) outbound pathway degree, (3) inbound pathway degree, (4) joint PhD, and (5) dual PhD (formerly Cotutelle). Coursework dual degree programs offer students the opportunity complete two degrees – one at their ‘home’ institution and another overseas (as distinct from a double degree program where both degrees are completed at the home institution). The two degrees are typically within the same discipline area and credit is applied across both degrees. Inbound and outbound credit-sharing arrangements that lead to two coursework degrees (one from Sydney and the other form the partner institution) were also reviewed by the Working Group. These situations do not comprise a new course per se, but a credit sharing arrangement between the two institutions. As these offerings result in two degrees for a Sydney student and involve a close relationship with the partner institution, these programs were considered within scope of the Working Group’s review and should be incorporated in policy reform in this space. A key difference between the dual degree and the pathways is that it is a distinct course with a CRICOS offered by the University in which study may commence at either institution, whereas the outbound or inbound pathway model has a one-way flow of students (the
second degree is completed after finishing study at Sydney or the partner) and applies credit to an existing degree. A joint PhD involves the completion of a single degree and the award of one testamur, while a dual PhD (Cotutelle) results in the award of two testamurs.

To ensure consistency in nomenclature, avoid confusion when engaging with potential partners, and reflect the universal nature of our research and education collaboration, it is proposed that uniform ‘dual’ arrangements are established at a coursework and research degree level. This would result in all coursework (undergraduate and postgraduate) credit sharing programs that result in a separate degree from each university to be termed ‘dual degrees’ and joint candidate doctorates completed with a partner institution that result in the provision of one testamur renamed as ‘joint PhDs’. The shift from ‘Cotutelle’ to ‘joint PhD’ reflects a more global and contemporary approach to research degree collaboration. In situations where a joint PhD cannot be awarded, scope should be provided for establishing a ‘dual PhD’, whereby two separate testamurs are awarded. This would ensure consistency with dual degree arrangements at a coursework level whereby two separate degrees/testamurs are awarded. However, the term ‘joint PhD’ better reflects the nature of the degree offering, and as such, the single testamur ‘joint PhD’ should be the default model going forward.

The Working Group also recommended that the University should identify institutions that have significant overlapping areas of research and establish Principal Joint PhD Agreements with these partner Universities. These agreements would cover the overarching requirements of a joint PhD at an inter-institutional level, such as requirements pertaining to admission, intellectual property, and tuition fees, and examination process. This would streamline the research education agreement process for individual students as much of the agreement terms between universities would be in place, and only student-specific terms would need to be agreed. In the first instance, the University should seek to leverage off existing OGE priority partnerships in formalising Principal Agreements.

These priority partners will form the first of three tiers of University dual degree and joint PhD partnerships proposed by the Working Group. OGE’s priority partners have been chosen because they are top ranked universities that share our ambitions and have complementary strengths. Currently, the University has priority partnership agreements with 18 international institutions. When new priority partnerships are negotiated, or existing partnerships are renewed, the Working Group recommends that broad language is included within the priority partner memorandum of understanding to lay the groundwork for future discussions around dual degree arrangements.

The second tier are potential degree partners that do not meet the OGE criteria for ‘priority partners’, but have a strong research or educational relationship existing with the University. Tier two partners also represent identified partnership opportunities which the University will pursue in order to meet a specific strategic objective outside of ‘priority partnership’ activity. These partners will typically be at a faculty to faculty level, though opportunities for university-to-university collaboration with non-priority partner institutions should be supported where there is strong research or education collaboration and strategic alignment potential. The partnerships at this level will need to align with either faculty strategic plans, faculty internationalization plans, or University-wide strategic areas. The majority of dual degree offerings will occur in this tier, as well as other global engagement initiatives, such as visiting researcher models, co-supervision arrangements, and exchange programs. The CCPC will be asked to oversee the strategic alignment potential of new dual degree courses and joint PhD agreements that occur under this tier.

The third tier will cover individual or smaller-scale research degree collaboration, such as co-supervision, exchange agreements, or joint PhD agreements not based on a strategic plan but can demonstrate a balanced and sustainable two-way flow of students. It is envisaged that the tier scheme will offer an opportunity for partner mobility, whereby extended research or co-supervision relationships between a Sydney faculty and an overseas faculty results in the formalisation of a formal dual degree or joint PhD agreement with the partner (and thus moves to the second collaboration tier). Moreover, the level of institutional support for new partnerships shall correspond to the tier (with tier one accorded the highest priority).

It is recommended that all new dual degree course proposals will be assessed via existing University committees. The strategic alignment and academic quality of courses will be reviewed by the relevant committees of the University Executive and Academic Board, with the Academic Board having final approval of the course proposal. As such, the development of new dual degree programs will reflect the processes in place to assess single course proposals. Under this model, an inter-institutional agreement and EOI form for
the new dual degree are submitted to UE CCPC to review the strategic alignment potential of the degree and recommend to University Executive whether a full course proposal (with a business case) should be prepared. If the EOI and agreement are approved, a course proposal is developed while consultation continues with the institutional partner. Following the endorsement of the University Executive, the dual degree course proposal would be provided to the relevant Academic Board committees. For inbound and outbound pathway arrangements, the agreement would be provided to UE CCPC for endorsement. All new joint or dual PhD institutional agreements would also need UE oversight via CCPC, however the individual student agreement that sits under the principal agreement would not need to go to UE or Academic Board Committees.

The Working Group also conducted a review of the existing policy documents in this space, recommending that the Cotutelle Scheme Policy be rescinded and replaced with a new policy that better clarifies existing arrangements, fills policy gaps, and ensures strategic alignment of partnerships. The committee approval process for dual degree programs and dual degree agreements should also be formalised in policy. As such, it is recommended that a new ‘Dual Degree and Joint PhD Policy’ is developed to cover coursework and research degree arrangements with other Universities. If endorsed, a working group will be established to draft the new policy, with the intention of providing it to the 15 October ASPC meeting.

Additionally, it is recommended that the committee approval processes, strategic alignment, and academic quality assurance for both research and coursework dual degree proposals discussed in this paper are formalised in the policy. The University’s delegations of authority will also need to be updated to reflect the recommendations in this paper. The strategic decisions pertaining to research collaboration and student exchange will need to remain under direction of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) and Vice-Principal (External Relations) respectively. Indeed, the authority to sign agreements in these areas is already established under relevant delegations of authority, and as such, no change is required. Moreover, the decisions pertaining to the eligibility and criteria of priority partners remains with the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement). However, the academic component of coursework and research dual degrees will need to be clarified. Currently, the University’s delegations of authority do not delineate responsibility for dual degrees. The Deputy-Vice Chancellor (Education) has delegated authority to approve credit recognition agreements with other educational institutions, and it is proposed that this is clarified further by specifying oversight for the academic content and credit sharing arrangements of dual degree and pathway agreements. Reference to ‘Cotutelle’ agreements will also need to be updated in the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule 2016 to reflect the change to ‘joint PhD’ and ‘dual PhD’ terminology proposed in this paper.

ISSUES

Currently, the University offers Cotutelle arrangements whereby separate testamurs are issued upon successful completion of the research program. Under the revised nomenclature approach outlined in this paper, it is proposed that a delineation is made between a ‘joint PhD’ (one testamur, two crests/badges) and a ‘dual PhD’ (two separate testamurs, one awarded by each institution). The former would be the default option of the University, as unlike the dual degrees identified at a coursework level, the Cotutelle PhD is a single research degree and therefore should be reflected via the issuing of a single degree certificate. Additional regulatory considerations will be required when establishing new joint PhD agreements with international partners. Where a joint award is to be offered by a registered Australian Higher Education Provider and an overseas entity that is not registered in Australia, TEQSA assesses ‘whether half or more of the course is provided overseas and will also have regard to the regulatory principles of risk, proportionality and necessity when determining whether or not regulatory action is necessary’. While there is no guidance that suggests a joint award with an international institution cannot be self-accredited by the University without TEQSA input, it is recommended that consultation with TEQSA occurs when developing such an award to ensure compliance with complex regulatory requirements. Moreover, under the AQF Issuance Policy, only organisations authorised by legislation to do so can issue an AQF qualification (2.2.1). Therefore, as the University partners with international organisations or non-registered higher education providers to offer the joint PhD, Sydney would be required to issue the qualification. This approach aligns with the University of Sydney (Testamur Seal) Rule 2011, which prevents the Sydney testamur seal from being affixed to testamurs issued by another institution. However, the rule does not prohibit other seals/crests from being affixed to the Sydney testamur, as evidenced by the previously offered Master of Molecular Imaging with the University of Queensland, which involved the provision of a single testamur with the both institutions’ crests.
CONSULTATION

The membership of the Working Group included:

- Ainslie Bulmer (Chair), Executive Director, Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education);
- Prof. Richard Miles, Pro Vice-Chancellor, Education - Enterprise and Engagement;
- Prof. Ross Coleman, Director, Graduate Research;
- Kylie Colvin, Director, Strategic Planning, Vice-Principal (Strategy);
- Amanda Sayan, Director of Partnerships, Office of Global Engagement;
- Leonie Patrick, Director, Sydney Global Mobility, Global Student Recruitment & Mobility;
- Thommy Gatling, International Agreements Manager, Global Student Recruitment & Mobility;
- Dr Sean O'Reilly, Recruitment Manager (Postgraduate Research), Global Student Recruitment & Mobility;
- Hugh O'Dwyer, Manager, Policy and Projects, Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education); and
- Julian Miller, Policy and Projects Officer, Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).

The Office of General Council were also consulted and provided advice regarding regulatory barriers to offering joint award degrees. The report will be provided to the following committees:

- University Executive (framing and decision meeting);
- University Executive Education Committee;
- Curriculum and Course Planning Committee;
- Undergraduate Studies Committee;
- Graduate Studies Committee; and
- Academic Board.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Report of the Dual and Joint Degrees Working Group
Dual and Joint Degrees Working Party

Draft Report – February 2019

Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)
# Table of Contents

Table of Contents.............................................................................................................................................. 1
Dual Degrees and Joint PhDs .............................................................................................................................. 2
  Executive Summary ........................................................................................................................................ 2
  Recommendations ......................................................................................................................................... 4
Dual and Joint Degrees Working Group ........................................................................................................... 5
    Purpose ...................................................................................................................................................... 5
    Terms of Reference ................................................................................................................................. 5
    Membership............................................................................................................................................... 5
Current Practice .................................................................................................................................................. 6
  Overview of dual courses at Sydney............................................................................................................... 6
  Case studies of joint or dual PhD arrangements at other universities ......................................................... 9
Future Model ..................................................................................................................................................... 12
  Definitions ............................................................................................................................................... 12
  Collaboration Tiers ..................................................................................................................................... 14
  Strategic Alignment ................................................................................................................................. 16
  Establishing new dual degree and joint or dual PhD agreements ............................................................... 18
  Delegations of Authority .......................................................................................................................... 20
  Student Admission .................................................................................................................................... 21
  Immediate Support Requirements ............................................................................................................ 21
Process Maps .................................................................................................................................................... 23
New Dual Degree and Joint PhD Policy ........................................................................................................ 27
  Existing Arrangements ............................................................................................................................ 27
  New Policy – Dual Degree and Joint PhD Policy .................................................................................. 28
Dual Degrees and Joint PhDs

Executive Summary

There has been an increase in the provision of dual degree arrangements across the sector, reflecting the evolving nature of international engagement amongst global universities. Dual degree and joint PhD programs provide an opportunity to increase the University’s engagement with other leading institutions and offer students a valuable mobility experience. In response to this trend, a working group was established to ensure that the University of Sydney’s engagement in this evolving landscape is strategic and robust. In keeping with that approach, the Working Group has developed a framework that will allow the University to assess new and existing dual degree partnerships, to identify and address institutional barriers, to improve the governance architecture, and to encourage the participation of students in our dual degree offerings. It is proposed that the University establishes a framework based on ‘collaboration tiers’ that will provide guidance on evaluating, prioritising and approving new university partnerships related to dual degrees (coursework) and joint PhDs.

The Working Group also explored the array of dual degree models across the sector and considered the disparate array of terms used to describe similar dual/joint courses. To ensure consistency in nomenclature, avoid confusion when engaging with potential partners, and reflect the universal nature of our research and education collaboration, it is proposed that uniform ‘dual’ arrangements are established at a coursework and research degree level. This would result in all coursework (undergraduate and postgraduate) credit sharing programs that result in a separate degree from each university to be termed ‘dual degrees’ and joint candidature doctorates completed with a partner institution that result in the provision of one testamur renamed as ‘joint PhDs’. The shift from ‘Cotutelle’ to ‘joint PhD’ reflects a more global and contemporary approach to research degree collaboration. In situations where a joint PhD cannot be awarded, scope should be provided for establishing a ‘dual PhD’, whereby two separate testamurs are awarded. This would ensure consistency with dual degree arrangements at a coursework level whereby two separate degrees/testamurs are awarded. However, the term ‘joint PhD’ better reflects the nature of the degree offering, and as such, the single testamur ‘joint PhD’ should be the default model going forward.

Current Cotutelle arrangements lack strategic alignment at University or faculty level. To address this, the University should identify institutions that have significant overlapping areas of research and establish Principal Joint PhD Agreements with these partner Universities. Such agreements would cover the overarching requirements of a joint PhD at an inter-institutional level, such as requirements pertaining to admission, intellectual property, tuition fees, and examination process. This would streamline the research education agreement process for individual students as much of the agreement terms between universities would be in place, and only student-specific terms would need to be agreed. In the first instance, the University should seek to leverage off existing Office of Global Engagement (OGE) priority partnerships in formalising Principal Agreements.

These priority partners will form the first of three tiers of University dual degree and joint PhD partnerships proposed by the Working Group. The second tier are potential degree partners that do not meet the OGE criteria for ‘priority partners’, but have a strong research or educational relationship existing with the University. Tier 2 partners also represent identified partnership opportunities which the University will pursue in order to meet a specific strategic objective outside of ‘priority partnership’ activity. These partners will typically be at a faculty to faculty level, though opportunities for university-to-university collaboration with non-priority partner institutions should be supported where there is strong research or education collaboration and strategic alignment potential. The third tier will cover individual or smaller-scale research degree collaboration, such as co-supervision, exchange agreements, or joint PhD agreements not based on a strategic plan but can demonstrate a balanced and
sustainable two-way flow of students. It is envisaged that the tier scheme will offer an opportunity for partner mobility, whereby extended research or co-supervision relationships between a Sydney faculty and an overseas faculty results in the formalisation of a formal dual degree or joint PhD agreement with the partner (and thus moves to the second collaboration tier).

Inbound and outbound credit-sharing arrangements that lead to two coursework degrees (one from Sydney and the other form the partner institution) were also reviewed by the Working Group. These situations do not comprise a new course per se, but a credit sharing arrangement between the two institutions. As these offerings result in two degrees for a Sydney student and involve a close relationship with the partner institution, these programs were considered within scope of the Working Group’s review and should be incorporated in policy reform in this space. To assist in differentiating the various modes of dual award arrangements, five types of dual courses are identified in the paper: (1) dual degree, (2) outbound pathway degree, (3) inbound pathway degree, (4) joint PhD, and (5) dual PhD. A key difference between the dual degree and the pathways is that it is a distinct course with a CRICOS offered by the University in which study may commence at either institution, whereas the outbound or inbound pathway model has a one-way flow of students (the second degree is completed after finishing study at Sydney or the partner) and applies credit to an existing degree. The primary difference between the joint PhD and dual PhD is whether a single testamur or two separate testamurs are issued upon completion of the program.

The Working Group also conducted a review of the existing policy documents in this space, recommending that the Cotutelle Scheme Policy be rescinded and replaced with a new policy that better clarifies existing arrangements, fills policy gaps, and ensures strategic alignment of partnerships. The committee approval process for dual degree programs and dual degree agreements should also be formalised in policy. As such, it is recommended that a new ‘Dual Degree and Joint PhD Policy’ is developed to cover coursework and research degree arrangements with other Universities. Additionally, it is recommended that the committee approval processes, strategic alignment, and academic quality assurance for both research and coursework dual degree proposals discussed in this paper are formalised in the policy. The University’s delegations of authority will also need to be updated to reflect the recommendations in this paper. The strategic decisions pertaining to research collaboration and student exchange will need to remain under direction of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) and Vice-Principal (External Relations) respectively. Indeed, the authority to sign agreements in these areas is already established under relevant delegations of authority, and as such, no change is required. Moreover, the decisions pertaining to the eligibility and criteria of priority partners remains with the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement). However, the academic component of coursework and research dual degrees will need to be clarified. Currently, the University’s delegations of authority do not delineate responsibility for dual degrees. The Deputy-Vice Chancellor (Education) has delegated authority to approve credit recognition agreements with other educational institutions, and it is proposed that this is clarified further by specifying oversight for the academic content and credit sharing arrangements of dual degree and pathway agreements. Reference to ‘Cotutelle’ agreements will also need to be updated in the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule 2016 to reflect the change to ‘joint PhD’ and ‘dual PhD’ terminology proposed in this paper.
Recommendations

Recommendation 1
The University establishes a Joint PhD model to be used to engage with key overseas research partners. A Joint PhD allows the award of a single research co-badged degree and testamur to a successful candidate. For compliance reasons, the University of Sydney will issue all joint PhDs on behalf of USYD and the partner institution.

Recommendation 2
The term ‘Cotutelle’ is replaced with ‘dual PhD’ to better reflect the universal nature of our degree offerings and partnerships. Although the University’s preference will be for Joint PhDs (rather than Dual PhDs), the option for a ‘Dual PhDs’ should also be established in policy for exceptional circumstances as determined by the Vice-Chancellor or Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (including for existing Cotutelle partners and for jurisdictions where Joint PhDs are not appropriate or available).

Recommendation 3
The University establishes a framework based on ‘collaboration tiers’ that will provide guidance on evaluating, prioritising, and approving new university partnerships related to coursework dual degrees, joint PhDs, and dual PhDs.

Recommendation 4
The University should pursue, where possible, university-wide Principal Joint or Dual PhD Agreements with current and potential priority partners to streamline the agreement process for joint and dual research degrees and deepen the University’s inter-institutional research collaboration with these partners.

Recommendation 5
All new Principal Joint and Dual PhD Agreements should be reviewed and endorsed by the University Executive Curriculum and Course Planning Committee to ensure the strategic alignment and sustainability of new joint and dual PhD partnerships.

Recommendation 6
All new coursework dual degrees are assessed through the usual course approval processes from expression of interest (EOI) to full course development through relevant University Executive and Academic Board Committees, with final approval by the University Senate.

Recommendation 7
An increase in the number of dual degrees would require appropriate resourcing to match growth in this area. As such, a Dual Degree Coordinator role should be introduced to support the development, coordination, and operation of the University’s dual degrees, joint PhDs, and inbound and outbound pathway arrangements.

Recommendation 8
The Cotutelle Scheme Policy is rescinded and replaced by a new Dual and Joint Degree Policy that covers both coursework and research degrees at all levels.

Recommendation 9
Amend the delegations of authority so as to establish the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) as the delegated authority to sign dual Degree Agreements, Principal Joint PhD Agreements and International Pathway Agreements.

Recommendation 10
Amend the delegations of authority so as to establish the Director, Graduate Research as the delegated authority to sign Student Joint/Dual PhD Agreements.
Dual and Joint Degrees Working Group

Purpose

The Dual and Joint Degrees Working Group has been established to develop and implement a strategic framework for dual degree and Cotutelle/joint PhD arrangements with a focus on streamlining the principal agreements governing international mobility experiences for staff and students. The working group will work to resolve internal and inter-institutional barriers to creating dual degree programs with Sydney’s priority partners. Once in place, the framework will provide clarity around:

− how the University will engage with dual degrees at all levels;
− the criteria by which international partners are chosen and evaluated;
− how the dual degree programs align with the University’s international engagement strategy, including the Office of Global Engagement’s priority partners, and key faculty-level partner universities.
− the relevant approval mechanisms at the University;
− how dual degrees are formalized by way of international agreements and registered on the Commonwealth Register of Institutions and Courses for Overseas Students (CRICOS);
− how dual degrees are operationalized and marketed to students; and
− governance of the University’s dual degrees programs.

Terms of Reference

− Investigate the capacity for joint PhD programs to contribute to the development of deep relationships with priority research institutions through joint research student supervision.
− Establish new university-wide policy to govern the University’s dual degree programs at all levels (with this new policy to supersede and replace the existing Cotutelle Scheme Policy).
− Formalise and introduce efficiencies to processes for creating and reviewing potential partnerships and introduce a mechanism for ensuring the quality and alignment potential of agreements and degree programs.
− Make recommendations around how a revitalised and expanded dual degree portfolio will be managed and funded by the University.

Membership

Table 1: Members of the Dual and Joint Degrees Working Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director, Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)</td>
<td>Ainslie Bulmer (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Vice-Chancellor, Education - Enterprise and Engagement</td>
<td>Prof. Richard Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Graduate Research</td>
<td>Prof. Ross Coleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Kylie Colvin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Partnerships, Office of Global Engagement</td>
<td>Amanda Sayan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Sydney Global Mobility, Global Student Recruitment &amp; Mobility</td>
<td>Leonie Patrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Agreements Manager, Global Student Recruitment &amp; Mobility</td>
<td>Thommy Gatling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Manager (Postgraduate Research), Global Student Recruitment</td>
<td>Dr Sean O’Reilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Mobility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Policy and Project Officer, Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor</td>
<td>Hugh O’Dwyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Education)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Project Officer, Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor</td>
<td>Julian Miller (Executive Support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Education)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Practice

Overview of dual courses at Sydney

Dual Degrees arrangements

Dual degree programs offer students the opportunity complete two degrees — one at their ‘home’ institution and another overseas (as distinct from a double degree program where both degrees are completed at the home institution). The two degrees are typically within the same discipline area and credit is applied across both degrees (again, distinct from double degrees). Across the University there are limited offerings of dual degree and dual pathway programs by various faculties.

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FASS) offers two dual degree programs with Sciences Po, whereby students complete either a Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Economics at Sydney and a Bachelor of Arts at Sciences Po by studying two years fulltime at each University. The faculty also recently entered into a partnership with Fudan University that provides students with the opportunity to earn a Master of Economics from Sydney and a Master of World Economy (Globalisation and Chinese Economy) from Fudan.

The University also has a number of partnerships between the Law School and Universities in China. For instance, there is a dual law degree pathway agreement between the Sydney Law School and Tsinghua University School of Law whereby students complete three years of undergraduate study at Tsinghua University and two years of graduate/Juris Doctor (JD) study at the University of Sydney. Upon completion of the program, students are awarded a Tsinghua Bachelor of Laws (LLB) and a Sydney JD. There are also partnership agreements between the School and the China University of Political Science and Law, Renmin University, and Zhejiang University, which operate as inbound pathway degrees. Additionally, the Law School provides an opportunity through its Peter Cameron Sydney Oxford Scholarship for students to complete a year of study at Oxford University where students graduate with Bachelor of Civil Law (BCL) from Oxford in addition to their LLB or JD from Sydney. While not strictly a dual degree program (as offered within Sydney courses and involving credit-sharing), University support is provided to a current or recently graduated student to complete an additional degree at a partner University. A similar scholarship arrangement is in place with Cambridge University, which (again) is not so much a dual degree but a pathways program for further study at a global partner.

Beyond the Law School and FASS offerings, there are limited dual degree arrangements with international partners at the University. A dual master’s program in Engineering/Project Management that involves a year of study at Sydney followed by a second year at Nanjing University is also available to eligible students. Further, an agreement between the Sydney Business School and Tsinghua University Graduate School, Shenzhen, to explore the implementation of a postgraduate dual degree program was announced in late 2016. The University’s policy and governance instruments make no reference to ‘dual degree’ programs, as such, their provision appears to be on an ad hoc basis and pursued by individual faculties. Going forward, greater definitional clarity will be required to ensure a clear differentiation between dual degrees (which require CRICOS registration) and dual pathway arrangements. See table 2 for further information about current offerings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Institution</th>
<th>Sydney Faculty</th>
<th>Sydney Degree</th>
<th>Partner Degree</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sciences Po</td>
<td>FASS</td>
<td>B Arts or B</td>
<td>B Arts</td>
<td>Students start at Sciences Po and then enrol at USYD</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Sciences,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or B Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fudan University</td>
<td>FASS</td>
<td>Master of</td>
<td>Master in World</td>
<td>Students start at USYD and then enrol at Fudan</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Economy (Globalisation and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese Economy) (Note: this is only available to USYD students who are not Chinese nationals).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. George Washington University</td>
<td>FASS</td>
<td>Master of</td>
<td>Master of International</td>
<td>Students start at USYD, then enrol at GWU.</td>
<td>Under renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Studies</td>
<td>Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. University of Oxford</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>LLB or JD</td>
<td>Bachelor of Civil</td>
<td>Students start at USYD, then enrol at Oxford.</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law or Masters in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law and Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. National University of Singapore</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>LLB or JD</td>
<td>LLM</td>
<td>Students start at USYD then enrol at NUS</td>
<td>Under Negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tsinghua University</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>JD</td>
<td>LLB</td>
<td>Students start at Tsinghua, then enrol at USYD, then return to Tsinghua.</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. China University of Political Science and Law</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>LLM</td>
<td>LLM</td>
<td>Students start at CUPL, then enrol at USYD.</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Paris Bar School</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Students start at PBS, then enrol at USYD.</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma in Law</td>
<td>accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Renmin University of China</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>JD</td>
<td>LLB</td>
<td>Students start at Renmin, then enrol at USYD, then return to Renmin</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Zhejiang University</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>LLM</td>
<td>LLM</td>
<td>Students start at Zhejiang, then enrol at USYD.</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Bergen University</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>LLM</td>
<td>LLM</td>
<td>Students start in Bergen and then</td>
<td>Under Negotiation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cotutelle and Joint PhDs

Across the HDR sector, there has been a renewed focus on increasing research partnerships with other universities, including greater provision of joint PhD programs where a student completes their research candidature at two universities. Unlike dual degrees which are offered at a faculty level, joint PhDs/Cotutelles are offered by the University. These joint PhDs are offered at numerous higher education providers in Australia and internationally (case studies of two particularly sound examples are be provided below). The University currently has fourteen Cotutelle arrangements with other universities. Given the research collaboration potential of these degrees, it is recommended that greater engagement with priority partners should be pursued in this space. The list of current Cotutelle agreements are listed in table 3.

The Cotutelle partnerships that are currently in place lack an overall strategic underpinning and have often been initiated following demand by individual students or supervisors. As a consequence, our existing partnerships are imbalanced (with typically more inbound than outbound mobility). The Working Group does not recommend termination of any existing partnerships. It is recommended however, that before any existing Cotutelle partnerships are renewed, that partnership be subject to evaluation in accordance with the framework established in this report.

Table 3: Principal Cotutelle Agreements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Institution</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year Established</th>
<th>Collaboration Type</th>
<th>University of Sydney Scope</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aix-Marseille University</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>University-wide</td>
<td>University-wide</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca’ Foscari University of Venice</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>University-wide</td>
<td>University-wide</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal University of Minas Gerais</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Faculty-specific</td>
<td>Health Sciences, Medicine (The University of Sydney Medical School)</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hokkaido University</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Faculty-specific</td>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>University-wide</td>
<td>University-wide</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumiere University Lyon 2</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Faculty-specific Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris Observatory</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Faculty-specific Science</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongji University</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Faculty-specific Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Limoges</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Faculty-specific Science</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Orleans</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>University-wide University</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Genoa</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>University-wide University</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilburg University</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Faculty-specific Law (The University of Sydney Law School)</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Paris Est</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Faculty-specific Science</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenoble Alpes University</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Faculty-specific Science</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Case studies of joint or dual PhD arrangements at other universities**

The Working Group considered case studies of existing practice at other Australian universities, two such examples are provided below. It should be noted that the typical shared PhD arrangement across the sector is the dual PhD model, and institutions that offer a joint PhD program also have a dual PhD pathway. This allows for flexibility when negotiating research degree partnerships with strategically important international institutions as not all jurisdictions permit co-badging on testamurs.

**Case Study: dual research degrees with partner tiers (Macquarie University)**

Macquarie University provides three programs that involve the completion of one or more degrees with another institution: dual degrees, joint PhDs, and Cotutelle arrangements. The latter two arrangements pertain to HDR and will be considered further. Joint and Cotutelle PhD programs occur when a candidate is jointly enrolled at two universities and conducts research/works on their thesis at each university. The candidate is jointly supervised by staff at each institution and upon successful completion of the program they graduate from both universities with a Doctor of Philosophy. The programs are only offered for the PhD, not other research degrees, and are offered in partnership with an international University. Despite these similarities, there are differences between the two programs.

Firstly, Cotutelle partner universities are assessed according to their research credentials and collaborative relationship with Macquarie University. They are assigned to one of the three 'priorities':

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lumiere University Lyon 2</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Faculty-specific Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris Observatory</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Faculty-specific Science</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongji University</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Faculty-specific Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Limoges</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Faculty-specific Science</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Orleans</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>University-wide University</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Genoa</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>University-wide University</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilburg University</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Faculty-specific Law (The University of Sydney Law School)</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Paris Est</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Faculty-specific Science</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenoble Alpes University</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Faculty-specific Science</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priority 1 (Priority Cotutelle and joint PhD partners) are research-intensive universities with strong research collaboration relationships with Macquarie University. For prospective joint PhD applicants from these universities, a Cotutelle or joint Scholarship can be approved for award at any time for qualified applicants.

Priority 2 (Preferred Cotutelle and joint PhD partners) are other preferred international partner institutions which have existing or are in the process of establishing a formal research collaboration relationship with Macquarie. Prospective joint PhD applicants from these universities are assessed competitively by a relevant HDR committee.

Priority 3 (Prospective Cotutelle and joint PhD partners) do not have an existing relationship with Macquarie and require special approval by the DVC (Research), via Macquarie’s HDR Office based on the merit of the proposed research relationship.

This is contrasted with joint PhDs, which are not accorded a ‘priority’ status and may be entered into only if the partner University has been approved by Macquarie University Academic Senate to offer a joint PhD with Macquarie. Moreover, an ‘umbrella framework’ agreement that establishes the program must be signed by relevant authorities of both universities for joint PhDs.

From the student perspective, discrepancies between the two programs include the fee arrangements, whether the progress assessments and thesis submissions are made to both Universities or the designated lead institution, if a separate or single examination is conducted, and whether there are dual or single testamurs and graduation ceremonies for successful HDR candidates. For Cotutelle programs, the student is required to pay fees to the ‘home’ university, while fees are payable to both institutions for joint PhDs. Additionally, a single thesis is submitted for independent examination by both universities under Cotutelle arrangements, whereby each university’s examination process is fully complied with and an award decision is made by each university. If successful at each university, the candidate can attend each universities’ graduation ceremony and receive two testamurs which include a comment line stating that the degree is awarded under a Cotutelle agreement. Whereas joint PhDs involve a single submission and examination of a thesis, however the examination process is agreed by both universities (which may be either one of the university’s own processes or a merged process containing elements of both). If successful, the candidate graduates and is able to attend a graduation ceremony at only one university. The testamur carries the crests and is signed by relevant authorities of both universities.

Table 4: summary of similarities and differences between Cotutelle and Joint PhDs at Macquarie University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cotutelle</th>
<th>Joint PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint enrolment at Macquarie and an overseas university.</td>
<td>Joint enrolment at Macquarie and an overseas university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student spends approximately half their time at each university, with a minimum of 12 months on each campus.</td>
<td>The student spends approximately half their time at each university, with a minimum of 12 months on each campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both universities appoint at least one of its staff as the supervisor and these supervisors jointly guide the student’s research program. The supervisors are encouraged to maintain contact with each other.</td>
<td>Both universities appoint at least one of its staff as the supervisor and these supervisors jointly guide the student’s research program. The supervisors are encouraged to maintain contact with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority institutional partner levels – but open to all universities subject to approval.</td>
<td>Institutional partners require approval of Macquarie’s Academic Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional MOU not compulsory.</td>
<td>Institutional MOU/Agreement required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees are payable to the ‘home’ institution.</td>
<td>Fees are payable to both universities (note some overseas universities only charge fees for the period of residence).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate progress assessments.</td>
<td>One university is designated as the lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate examination.</td>
<td>Joint examination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two testamurs. One joint testamur.
Two graduation ceremonies. One graduation ceremony.

Case Study: Joint Award and Dual Award PhDs (Australian National University)

Similar to the bipartite structure used at Macquarie University, ANU also separates its HDR partnership courses into two main degree types (‘joint award’ and ‘dual award’ PhDs), under which there are further tiers based on the nature of the institutional agreement between the higher education partners. At ANU, a joint award PhD is awarded by two collaborating institutions recognised by a single testamur, while a dual award results in the provision of two testamurs from each institution that recognise the dual nature of the degree.

ANU has a dedicated policy for joint and dual award PhDs that establishes the types of joint or dual degrees that can be offered, candidature requirements, and approval processes. The policy states that either an ‘institutional’ or ‘individual’/Cotutelle program can be undertaken by prospective candidates. An institutional joint or dual award PhD refers to a program ‘agreed at an institution-to-institution level, for an agreed period, for a cohort of students.’ Institutional joint or dual PhDs are typically covered by an overarching agreement for research cooperation between the institutions, signed by the Vice-Chancellor (or delegate). Where no general agreement on research cooperation is in force, the agreement to establish an institutional PhD program will be pursued further. Under the policy, ANU may establish an institutional PhD agreement with another university without a candidate being identified in advance. This ensures a streamlined approach to offering joint PhDs in place as candidates can undertake a program in which the liaison and formal agreement between two universities has already occurred.

Conversely, an individual dual award (including Cotutelle PhDs) refer to a one-off, non-continuing program arranged for a single individual without an institutional-level agreement. Note that ‘individual’ program only refers to dual PhDs, not joint awards. This approach allows for flexibility in situations where a candidate wishes to undertake an ANU dual PhD or Cotutelle at a specific international university. In addition to the policy, ANU has a procedures document that outlines the process for establishing and approving joint or dual PhDs at the University. The comprehensive nature of its policy architecture in this area reflects the importance of these offerings as unique research experiences for HDR candidates and conduits for greater collaboration with global higher education partners.
Future Model

Definitions

A wide array of terms are used across the sector to describe various inter-institutional degree partnership arrangements, including ‘dual degrees’, ‘joint degrees’, ‘Cotutelles’, and ‘joint PhDs’. The Working Group proposed a simplification and alignment of the language used to describe these various arrangements. Under this approach, the terminology for coursework and research degree programs offered in partnership with another institution will be termed ‘dual degrees’, ‘joint PhDs’, and ‘dual PhDs’. The nomenclature change from ‘Cotutelle’ to ‘dual PhD’ and introduction of a ‘joint PhD’ would ensure consistency across all degree types and assist in marketing and recruitment. The Working Group considered ‘joint PhD’ and ‘dual PhD’ to be more universal terms than ‘Cotutelle’, which would better support communication with potential international partners that Sydney offers shared degree programs across each cohort level. The proposed definitions are provided below.

Dual Degree: means a combination of two coursework degree programs, one offered at the University and the other at a partner institution, that are 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. Students can only be awarded each degree if they have satisfied the requirements of each institution.

Outbound pathway agreement: means a credit matching agreement between the University and another institution, whereby a student commences study at the University of Sydney and completes the second degree at the partner institution, resulting in the conferral of two degrees faster than if each degree had been completed consecutively and without transfer of credit.

Inbound pathway agreement: means a credit matching agreement between the University and another institution, whereby a student commences study at the partner institution and completes the second degree at the University, resulting in the conferral of two degrees faster than if each degree had been completed consecutively and without transfer of credit.

Joint PhD: means a degree program that: (a) consists of shared candidature in the Doctor of Philosophy at the University and a partner institution; (b) allows for a candidate to receive a single testamur with badges from the University and the partner institution issued by the University of Sydney; and (c) involves one examination process specified in the agreement between the University and the partner.

Dual PhD: means a degree program that: (a) consists of shared candidature in the Doctor of Philosophy at the University and a partner institution; (b) allows for a candidate to receive a doctorate from the University and the partner institution, with each testamur acknowledging the circumstances under which the award was made; and (c) involves one examination process specified in the agreement between the University and the partner.

Principal Joint or Dual PhD Agreement: means an agreement between the University and another institution to offer joint or dual PhD programs, which covers requirements pertaining to admission, intellectual property, tuition fees, and examination.

Student Joint or Dual PhD Agreement: means an agreement between the student and representatives from both universities offering the joint or dual PhD program, which covers terms relevant to the individual student candidature.

These definitions would be included in a new Dual Degree and Joint PhD Policy and updated in existing policies as required. Clause 1.4(1) of the HDR Rule includes a definition of a Cotutelle agreement as ‘an agreement between the University and another university or institution that: (a) permits joint candidature in the Doctor of Philosophy; and (b) allows a
candidate to receive a doctorate from the University and from the other university or institution, each testamur acknowledging the circumstances under which the award was made'. As rules take precedence over policy, the ‘Cotutelle agreement’ definition in the HDR Rule will need to be replaced to reflect the new ‘joint PhD’ terminology. As the University has an existing suite of course codes for Cotutelle PhD programs, the CRICOS, marketing, and recruitment implications would need to be factored into this nomenclature change. Additionally, the existing Principal Cotutelle Agreements would need to be updated to ‘Principal Dual PhD Agreements’ at the time of agreement renewal.

Table 5: Dual Degree Agreement Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Agreement type</th>
<th>Key Features of the Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.            | Dual Degree Agreement               | – Students can start studies at Sydney or at the partner, depending on the agreement.  
– Typically, separate application and eligibility requirements for Sydney degree and partner institution degree (however, institutions may want to agree upon consistent admissions requirements).  
– Successful students receive two degrees, one from USYD and one from the partner institution.  
– Students can only be awarded each degree if they have satisfied the requirements at each institution.  
– Dual degree to be CRICOS registered.  
– Credit matching allows participating students to receive the two degrees faster than if each degree had been completed consecutively.  
– Student pays tuition to institution they are enrolled in any given semester. |
| 2.            | Outbound Pathway Agreement          | – Students always start studies at Sydney and then move to the partner institution.  
– Separate application and eligibility requirements for Sydney degree and partner institution degree.  
– Successful students receive two degrees, one from Sydney and one from the partner institution.  
– Credit matching allows participating students to receive the two degrees faster than if each degree had been completed consecutively.  
– Student pays tuition to institution they are enrolled in any given semester. |
| 3.            | Inbound Pathway Agreement           | – Students always start studies at partner institution and then move to Sydney.  
– Separate application and eligibility requirements for Sydney degree and partner institution degree.  
– Successful students receive two degrees, one from Sydney and one from the partner institution.  
– Credit matching allows participating students to receive the two degrees faster than if each degree had been completed consecutively without credit or advanced standing. Agreement contains a credit matching table (preferred) and/or statement about how much credit is available in USYD degree.  
– Student pays tuition to institution they are enrolled in during any given semester. |
| 4.            | Principal Joint/Dual PhD Agreement  | – Establishes institutional framework for Joint/Dual PhD.  
– Establishes the principal that each participating student will need to be the subject of an individual Student Joint/Dual PhD Agreement. |
(currently Cotutelle)  
- Students can start studies at Sydney or at the partner.  
- Student applies separately to each institution.  
- Establishes the tuition fee structure to be applied to the joint/dual PhD arrangement.  
- Identifies the funding mechanism or body for scholarship or tuition where appropriate  
- Either the examination and thesis requirements of USYD or the partner university will apply (but not both).  
- There must be a balanced flow of inbound / outbound students under the Principal Joint/Dual PhD Agreement over its term.

5. Student Joint/Dual PhD Agreement  
(currently called a Student Cotutelle Agreement)  
- Addresses the candidacy of an individual student (not all Student Joint/Dual PhD Agreements need to sit under a current Principal Joint/Dual PhD Agreement).  
- Ideally this Agreement will be drafted as a “tick-box” document (legally-binding, but not drafted as an agreement).  
- Agreement details:  
  - area of research;  
  - the 2 (or more) co-supervisors;  
  - the university where tuition is payable at particular points in the candidacy (and where it is waived);  
  - which university shall conduct examination; and  
  - estimated travel / study dates;  
  - coursework requirements and any consequent processes for grant exemptions/credit for recognised prior learning;  
  - financial support for research activities and access to grant schemes;  
  - specific issues of intellectual property management related to the project; and  
  - expectations around publication/conference presentation.

Note: Inbound Pathway Agreements (Type 3 above) differ from Credit Recognition Agreements (CRA) only on the basis that the former expressly states what USYD credit can be credited back to the partner institution so as to allow the conferral of the specified partner institution degree. CRAs only address the conferral of a specified USYD degree(s). Additionally, none of the dual degree or PhD agreements in table 3 allow the conferral of a jointly-badged degree.

**Collaboration Tiers**

The Working Group recommends that the University establishes a framework based on 'collaboration tiers' that will provide guidance on evaluating, prioritising, and approving new university partnerships related to dual degrees of all types (coursework and PhD). The level of institutional support for new partnerships shall correspond to the tier (with Tier 1 accorded the highest priority, followed by tier 2, and then tier 3). Under this model, Tier 1 partners will be populated by OGE’s priority partners, Tier 2 will be based on aligning partnerships with University or faculty strategies with non-priority partner institutions, and Tier 3 allow for bespoke and tactical arrangements with research degree partners (though resourcing will not be dedicated towards these rare partnership types).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Coursework</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Priority Partner (university-wide only).</td>
<td>Comprehensive universities with complementary</td>
<td>Dual degrees with Priority Partner</td>
<td>Joint PhDs (or Dual PhDs). Principal Agreement could be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier</td>
<td>Priority partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tier 1 will be populated by OGE's priority partners. OGE's priority partners have been chosen because they are top ranked universities that share our ambitions and have complementary strengths. Currently, there are 18 priority partners universities that Sydney has agreements with. The Working Group recommends that discussions be held with OGE's existing priority partners to discuss the possibility of establishing new dual degree arrangements in the coming years. It is also anticipated that the depth of our relationship with priority partnerships will provide the best platform for a sustainable two-way flow of PhD students (and this will address the issue currently experienced with imbalanced Cotutelle partnerships). The Working Group also considers that engaging our priority partners in coursework dual degree arrangements would constitute a useful step in growing these relationships (and ensuring that our collaboration extends beyond joint research). As and when new priority partnerships are negotiated, or existing partnerships are renewed, the Working Group recommends that the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement) seeks to include broad language within the priority partner memoranda of understanding that lays the groundwork for future discussions around dual degree arrangements. The Working Group noted that not all shared degree agreements need to be concluded with priority partners, and opportunities for important joint or dual PhD partnerships or discipline-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2    | Strategic partners (primarily faculty based). | Focus on faculty collaboration and emerging university-to-university partnerships. Note: multiple Sydney faculties may be partners with same university. | Dual degrees that align with faculty strategic areas or internationalization plans. Coursework pathway arrangements (only if dual degrees are not an option). | Joint PhDs or Dual PhDs at a University or faculty-level (if there is a reciprocal flow of students and aligns with faculty strategic plans). Visiting scholar or researcher arrangements. |

| 3    | Focused partners (faculty, school, or individual researcher level). | Research collaboration agreements not linked to a faculty strategic plan, but a sustainable and balanced two way flow of students be provided via a research degree. Does not receive targeted support from the University. | None. | Joint PhD and Dual PhDs where a genuine two-way flow of students can be guaranteed. Provides partner with the opportunity to develop a research relationship and potentially move to Tier 2. Possible co-supervision opportunities. |

Tier 1 - Priority partners

Tier 1 will be populated by OGE's priority partners. OGE's priority partners have been chosen because they are top ranked universities that share our ambitions and have complementary strengths. Currently, there are 18 priority partners universities that Sydney has agreements with. The Working Group recommends that discussions be held with OGE's existing priority partners to discuss the possibility of establishing new dual degree arrangements in the coming years.

It is also anticipated that the depth of our relationship with priority partnerships will provide the best platform for a sustainable two-way flow of PhD students (and this will address the issue currently experienced with imbalanced Cotutelle partnerships). The Working Group also considers that engaging our priority partners in coursework dual degree arrangements would constitute a useful step in growing these relationships (and ensuring that our collaboration extends beyond joint research).

As and when new priority partnerships are negotiated, or existing partnerships are renewed, the Working Group recommends that the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement) seeks to include broad language within the priority partner memorandum of understanding that lays the groundwork for future discussions around dual degree arrangements.

The Working Group noted that not all shared degree agreements need to be concluded with priority partners, and opportunities for important joint or dual PhD partnerships or discipline-
specific dual degrees should be available as necessary. A diverse array of sustainable dual degree offerings is a positive development that the University should encourage. However, all new dual degree proposals (including those negotiated at a faculty level) should be provided to the delegated University committee(s) for review and approval. Two additional tiers comprised of non-priority partner institutions were identified by the Working Group and outlined below.

**Tier 2 – Strategic Partners**

Tier 2 partners apply to both research and coursework degrees. These institutions are potential degree partners that do not meet the OGE criteria for ‘priority partners’ (i.e. comprehensive existing collaboration, including joint publications and exchange agreements), but have a strong research or educational relationship existing with the University. These relationships will often be at a faculty to faculty level, rather than the university-wide basis of the Tier 1 institutions. The partnerships at this level will need to align with either faculty strategic plans, faculty internationalization plans, or University-wide strategic areas. The majority of dual degree offerings will occur in this tier, as will other global engagement initiatives, such as visiting researcher models, co-supervision arrangements, and exchange programs. The CCPC will be asked to oversee the strategic alignment potential of new dual degree courses and joint PhD agreements that occur under this tier.

**Tier 3 - Non-strategic faculty or school level collaboration**

Tier 3 partners involve a smaller scale institution-to-institution partnership that pertain to research degrees only. Principal Joint or Dual PhD Agreements not aligned with a strategic plan would be permitted within this tier, but only if a genuine two-way flow of students can be assured. This tier provides an opportunity for emerging global partners to demonstrate the potential for wider collaboration that aligns with faculty or the University’s strategic direction, and move to a Tier 2 partner. It also allows for flexibility as not all partnerships will strictly fit the first two tiers, however the resourcing dedicated to securing dual degree agreements will be dedicated to the first two tiers. Given the non-priority partner status and lack of strategic alignment for the Tier 3 Joint or Dual PhD Agreements, a stringent criteria should be established for assessing whether these agreements should be approved by the CCPC. Additionally, evidence of student exchange and bilateral movement should be provided if such arrangements are to be renewed.

Regardless of priority partner status, a key principle for dual degree arrangements going forward is that there should be balanced research or credit-sharing arrangements for both institutions. For instance, Sydney entered into an agreement with Shanghai Jiao Tong University to enable Sydney researchers to engage with a biomedical engineering research program at Shanghai Jiao Tong, which led to a supplementary joint supervision agreement that only proceeded once both institutions could demonstrate that there would be two-way movement of students in a genuine exchange partnership. As such, if there is evidence of an existing and successful relationship involving movement of students in both directions at the institutional level, then Sydney should look toward establishing a joint PhD scheme with that partner.

**Strategic Alignment**

**University Strategic Plan 2016-2020**

There are a number of strategic initiatives that are supported by increasing the University’s inter-institutional collaboration in research and education via dual degree agreements. In particular, the third strategy in the Plan is to ‘develop partnerships that enable our research to make a difference, locally and globally’, with the fifth initiative to ‘develop a focused approach to global engagement’. Ensuring a coordinated approach to developing collaborative degree programs and concluding agreements with new partners would support this deliverable.
China Strategy

Degree partnerships with existing and potential university partners in China could support the University’s strategic aims regarding international collaboration in this space. The fourth initiative of the University’s China Strategy is to ‘establish priority partnerships with select Chinese universities’. Encouraging dual degree and PhD partnerships supports the aims of the priority partnerships model proposed in the strategy, in particular promoting deeper and more diverse research collaborations, recruiting the best and brightest postgraduate students from China, and fostering the mobility of Australian students by offering them study destinations in China.

India Strategy

The strengthening of Sydney’s research environment under the Strategic Plan is delivering research projects that attract international HDR students. Within this context, OGE has advised that they are keen to develop either joint PhDs (award of a degree evidenced by two separate testamurs from each university) or joint degrees (single degree with two badges) as part of strategy to recruit talented students from India. There would need to be significant discussion with stakeholders across appropriate PSUs (e.g. GSRM) to ascertain the viability of this initiative and alignment with established student recruitment strategies.

Faculty strategies

Faculty strategies should also be taken into consideration when joint PhDs are agreed with non-priority partner institutions at a faculty level. Faculties will often need to inform a prospective partner that the agreement will need to accord with their strategic cycle and the timelines for creating an agreement (typically at least two years). Moreover, if faculties seek joint PhD agreements with non-priority institutions, they should also consider broader engagement with these universities through undergraduate programs. As such, extensive discussion between PSUs (e.g. GSRM) and Faculty leadership about strategic importance of the degree should occur before pursing an agreement with a Tier 2 partner at the faculty level. If there is faculty enthusiasm to engage in dual degrees (or cross-credit arrangements) with non-priority partner institutions, this should be written into the local strategic plan and be aligned with the University’s strategic framework. This would mean that locally, faculties may determine who their best partners are, but they must also ensure that there is alignment with their strategic priorities.

Visiting researcher programs

While out of scope for the development of a dual degree program, an area of priority for the Strategy Office is the establishment of short-term visiting researcher programs with an emphasis on incoming and outgoing mobility between partners. In particular, potential visiting researcher schemes with two-way mobility could benefit from strategic oversight and financial support from Chinese partner institutions.

At present, there is no institutional level oversight of visiting researcher programs and they are varied and ad-hoc. Current programs include:

- the University of Sydney (USYD) and the China Scholarship Council (CSC) Postgraduate Research Visiting Scholarship offered to Chinese scholars for up to 2 years;
- the USYD-CSC Visiting Scholars Scholarship (12 months) for Chinese academics with significant publications and experience;
- the USYD-CSC Visiting Scholars Scholarship for Postdoctoral Fellows (24 months) for early career researchers who have obtained a PhD degree recently;
- the University of Sydney Visiting Researcher Program (1 Year or 2 Years) for inbound international students complete a research period of one or two years under the
supervision of a University of Sydney academic staff member on a non-award basis (note, these programs are used primarily to onboard the CSC researchers); and
– faculty specific arrangements organised mainly on a student/supervisor basis (sometimes without faculty oversight).

There are issues with the USYD-CSC Visiting researcher schemes in that they are administered by Study Abroad and Scholarships on a makeshift basis with no dedicated staff and no scope for upscaling. Further, academic review of the schemes is inconsistent and relies on ownership and knowledge in faculties. As such, resourcing and governance processes would need to be reviewed and improved if there is a desire to develop a centralised scheme based on these models. Similarly, student/supervisor arrangements for visiting scholars can also run the risk of placing students in research teams without greater transparency and/or review at the faculty level.

The model of national schemes which require a MOU, such as the now defunct Brazilian student mobility program, ‘Science Without Borders’, could set a precedent for a formalised short-term visiting researcher schemes, though these schemes have come at high cost to the institution in the past, in terms of supervision and lack of tuition fees.

The Strategy Office’s preferred option would be strategic oversight at faculty level for visiting research schemes, written into their strategic plans and based on consultation with supervisors, Associate Deans, and Deans to establish the rationale for pursuing visiting researcher programs in terms of: long-term engagement, multiple student participation in priority areas, an agreement with the partner that they will fund the faculty for the scheme for a nominated number of years, and an agreement with the partner that they are prepared to take a specified number of students from Sydney for a period of 6 to 24 months.

Any developed proposals for this model by the Strategy Office or faculties would be subject to the CCPC approval process and further noting by the University Executive Research Committee.

Establishing new dual degree and joint or dual PhD agreements

Dual Degrees (Type 1)

All new dual degree course proposals will be assessed via existing University committees. The strategic alignment and academic quality of courses will be reviewed by the relevant committees of the University Executive and Academic Board, with the Academic Board having final approval of the course proposal. As such, the development of new dual degree programs will reflect the processes in place to assess single course proposals.

Under this model, an inter-institutional agreement and expression of interest (EOI) form for the new dual degree are submitted to University Executive Curriculum and Course Planning Committee (CCPC) to review the strategic alignment potential of the degree and recommend to University Executive whether a full course proposal (with a business case) should be prepared. If the EOI and agreement are approved, a course proposal is developed while consultation continues with the institutional partner.

This proposal and business case is submitted to CCPC who provide full consideration of the strategic alignment and resourcing implications (including marketing and communications, recruitment, admissions, and systems implications) of the new degree program. The CCPC would then make a recommendation to the University Executive as to whether the proposal should be forwarded to the Academic Board (via the Undergraduate Studies Committee or Graduate Studies Committee as appropriate). This reporting line is consistent with the committee’s current remit per item 8 of its terms of reference: ‘[the CCPC will] assess the strategic fit, business case and appropriateness of all new degree proposals and make
recommendations to University Executive as to whether these proposals should be sent to the Academic Board for approval'.

Following the endorsement of the University Executive, the dual degree course proposal would be provided to the Undergraduate Studies Committee for undergraduate dual degree proposals or the Graduate Studies Committee for postgraduate (coursework) degree proposals. These committees will be responsible for assessing the academic quality of the proposal and making a recommendation to the Academic Board. Again, this oversight is established in both committees’ existing remit per terms of reference 2 and 2.1 respectively. If the course is approved by the Academic Board it is then submitted to Senate for final approval. All new courses, including a dual degree course, require Academic Board and Senate approval for CRICOS registration in order to be offered by the University.

In addition to reviewing and making recommendations to the University Executive and Academic Board regarding new dual degree proposals, amendments to existing dual degree courses will be provided to CCPC and the relevant Academic Board committee for review. The standard course management template provided to committees for regular degrees will be used for dual degree amendments.

**Inbound and Outbound Pathway Agreements (Type 2 and Type 3)**

Agreements for one-way credit sharing arrangements, while not a new course as per the Type 1 full dual degree, will still require University oversight for quality assurance and sustainability purposes. Under this process, the faculty identifies desired partner institution and partner institution degree(s) and prepares a ‘Proposal to Negotiate’ that outlines the details of the proposed arrangement, including underlying strategy, resource requirements, and benefits to the University. This proposal will need to include a credit matching table(s) between Sydney and partner institution degree(s). The faculty agreement sponsor will also be required to obtain approval of the relevant Dean for proposal. As an additional quality assurance step, the proposals are submitted to the International Agreements Manager for review and feedback. Once the proposal to negotiate is signed, it is recorded on Records Online so that the outcomes of the agreement can be evaluated against the stated objectives and desired outcomes outlined in the Proposal.

International Agreements Manager to prepare a draft pathway agreement with the agreement sponsor. The draft agreement, including any amendments made by the partner institution, will be reviewed by the Office of General Counsel. The pathway agreement is then provided to the CCPC for endorsement to ensure the strategic alignment potential of the agreement. After this, the Deputy-Vice Chancellor (Education) signs the pathway agreement. New CRICOS registration is not required for degrees achieved via a pathway agreement (as the courses already exist).

**Principal Joint/Dual PhD Agreements (Type 4)**

The Cotutelle partnerships that are currently in place lack an overall strategic underpinning and have often been initiated following demand by individual students or supervisors. As a consequence, our existing partnerships are imbalanced (with typically more inbound than outbound mobility). The Working Group does not recommend termination of any existing partnerships. However, it is recommended that before any existing Cotutelle partnerships are renewed, that partnership be subject to evaluation in accordance with the framework established in this report. The University should also identify institutions that have significant overlapping areas of research and establish a Principal Joint/Dual PhD Agreement with the partner University. As referenced above, this would mean that the overarching agreement is already in place, and only student-specific terms would need to be agreed for each case, thus streamlining the process and ensuring an ongoing collaboration with the partner university. Indeed, a foundation of these Principal Agreements is that there would need be a sustainable and balanced two-way flow of students over at least a five year period.
Alternatively, if a two-way flow of students is not deemed practical or achievable, the Principal Joint/Dual PhD Agreement must attest to an alternative and measurable strategic imperative for either the University or the Faculty (e.g. growth or diversification of international PhD cohort).

Throughout the negotiation process, the parties will need to confirm what will be awarded to successful students (e.g. a jointly awarded degree with two separate testamurs) and establish a clear pathway for students to participate in the program. Ideally, the Principal Joint/Dual PhD Agreement would also address reciprocity requirements, intellectual property, indemnity/liability, tuition charges, a single examination, separate enrolments for each institution, and confirming that students will be subject to admissions requirements of each University. Additionally, copies of rules, policies and procedures that will apply to Sydney students being jointly supervised by the Joint/Dual PhD partner and/or submitting a PhD for examination by the partner will need to be obtained. The Agreement should also provide clarity on joint supervisory arrangements and processes for registration of partner academics as auxiliaries on the Sydney Supervisor Register and vice versa as required.

Once this information is collated, it would need to be provided to CCPC with the proposed agreement, who would consider strategic alignment and resourcing implications of the agreement and provide a recommendation to the University Executive. If the agreement is approved by the University Executive, it is then provided to the Deputy-Vice Chancellor (Education) to be signed on behalf of the University. The individual student agreement that sits under the principal agreement would not need to go to University Executive or Academic Board Committees. However, if either the principal or student agreement requires examination at the partner institution, then the Higher Degree by Research Subcommittee of the Academic Quality Committee should review the examination component of the agreement as part of the approval process and be notified when the examination commences and is completed. The individual student joint/dual PhD agreement is also provided to the student and Director Graduate Research.

Delegations of Authority

Following the committee review process, the proposed inter-institutional agreement will need to be signed by a delegated authority on behalf of the University. There are two components to this, the strategic decisions regarding the institutional partnerships concluded by the University, and the academic element pertaining to credit and dual research education candidature. The strategic decisions pertaining to research partnerships, student placements, and priority partners will remain with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research), Vice-Principal (External Relations), and Pro Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement) respectively. Additionally, delegations pertaining to international agreements for research and student exchange are already established under relevant delegations of authority, and as such, no change is required. While the delegations for research and external relations strategy are formalised in existing University rules, the authority for signing educational agreements in the dual degrees space will need further clarification. Currently, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) has delegation for credit recognition agreements in 6.1.2 of the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016. Moreover, 13.5.1 and 13.5.2 of the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule 2016 specify that the appointed delegate for signing institutional Cotutelle agreements and individual student Cotutelle agreements is the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education). However, dual degrees are not mentioned. For consistency purposes, it is proposed that the appointed delegate for signing dual degree, Principal Joint/Dual PhD, and pathway agreements is the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), and the relevant Delegations of Authority Rule is amended accordingly. While many pathway dual degrees will be negotiated and concluded on a faculty to faculty level, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor would need to approve the credit sharing arrangement and sign the pathway agreement. The reference to institutional and individual Cotutelle agreements will also need to be updated to reflect the nomenclature change recommended in this paper (‘principal Joint/Dual PhD agreement’ and ‘Student Joint/Dual PhD agreement’).
student Joint / Dual PhD agreements, the Director Graduate Research would have delegated authority for signing the agreement on behalf of the University. Additionally, the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement) is best placed to make high-level, inter-institutional decisions for establishing the research exchange parameters of Principal Joint/Dual PhD Agreements, and this should be reflected in policy.

**Student Admission**

Following the inter-institutional negotiations, committee review process, and final signature on the relevant agreement by the delegated authority, the dual degree or joint PhD is promoted to prospective students at each institution. GSRM and Marcomms will work with faculty on promoting the collaboration arrangements as new dual degrees and joint PhDs could be utilised as effective recruitment tools for top quality students.

For dual coursework degrees, eligible students will need to apply via the normal application process for the Sydney degree. The order of study (i.e. which university first) and credit requirements will vary based on each dual degree arrangement. The student will also need to meet the admission requirements of the partner institution. Typically, dual degree programs consist of two separately priced tuition fee components.

To participate in a Joint/Dual PhD program, prospective candidates need to be the subject of a proposal that outlines the key details of the arrangement (including identifying a supervisor at each institution), and confirms faculty support (by way of signature by the relevant Dean or Associate Dean Research Education). A Student PhD Agreement will then be prepared and signed by the student and appropriate representatives from each institution (for Sydney, this would be the Director Graduate Research). The Student PhD Agreement formalizes the arrangement for the individual student’s candidature, including coursework requirements and tuition arrangements. The Student PhD Agreement does not need to be provided to either University Executive or Academic Board Committees for approval. Once the Student Joint/Dual Agreement has been finalised, the student will need to submit a PhD application via Sydney Student (there are established PhD degree codes) and the equivalent enrolment process at the partner institution (Note that the student will typically need to meet the admissions requirements of both Universities). If the student meets the admissions and eligibility requirements for a joint/dual PhD, the student will receive an unconditional offer from Sydney (and a separate offer from the partner institution).

**Immediate Support Requirements**

The Working Group considers that the implementation of the processes outlined in this paper and the scaling up of our dual degree and joint PhD offerings with international institutions cannot occur without additional resourcing and coordination dedicated to this area. At first instance, a dedicated dual degree coordinator role will need to be created (see proposed position description below). The work carried out by this role necessitates close collaboration with an array of University areas, including OGE, GSRM, faculty teams, DVC (Education) Portfolio, CCPC, HDRESC, Admissions and the DVC (Research) Portfolio. The Working Group proposes that the incumbent report to the International Agreements Manager in GSRM and provides ongoing feedback and advice to the various portfolios to ensure alignment and oversight. Depending on the success of the scaling up of USYD’s dual degree programs, the Working Group shall monitor workflow and will be responsible for recommendations around additional resourcing requirements should the need arise.
### Table 7: Dual Degree Coordinator – Level HEO7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Key Accountabilities</strong></th>
<th><strong>Frequency</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide advice and a level of decision making regarding the development, coordination, and operation of the University’s dual degrees, and inbound and outbound pathway arrangements, in conjunction with relevant University experts.</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provide advice and a level of decision making regarding the development, negotiation and maintenance of the University’s dual degrees agreements, and inbound and outbound pathway agreements, in conjunction with relevant University experts.</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work with Faculty to develop EOIIs and full course proposals for new dual degrees, for consideration by CCPC and other relevant committees.</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Work with Office of General Counsel to review proposed amendments by partner universities to USYD template documents, and to review partner university templates to ensure alignment with USYD requirements.</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coordinate approvals process through University committees and Academic Boards (as relevant) for dual degree and pathway arrangements.</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Work with Faculty and relevant University experts to ensure dual degrees receive CRICOS registration.</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Coordinate approvals process for new dual PhD students (including approval of student agreements), and ensure communication between key stakeholders, including Admissions, HDRESC, HDRAC, PhD supervisors, and participating students.</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Work with key stakeholders to ensure that dual PhD arrangements are reciprocally balanced and compliant with obligations under Higher Education Support Act (2003).</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Independently relate and interpret existing university policy, and a level of understanding of the university departments and faculties/schools critical issues and priorities to incorporate in draft agreements for review by the Office of General Counsel.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Foster key relationships with international and external stakeholders, and seek to ensure continuous business improvement.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Other duties as appropriate to this classification.</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Process Maps

**Figure 1: Proposed process for establishing Dual Degrees (Type 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Identify partner and negotiate agreement | - Faculty identifies desired partner institution and partner institution degree(s).  
- Faculty begins liaising with potential partner institution.  
- International Agreements Manager / Dual Degree Coordinator (new role) prepares a draft agreement using USYD template (note: the preference is to use the Sydney template documents as the base document for any proposed agreement, however, if circumstances require, a partner’s preferred document may be used as long as Sydney can make any appropriate amendments to bring it in line with our legal or procedural requirements).  
- The draft agreement will be shared with the partner institution for its review and comment. Any proposed amendments will be considered, with appropriate input from the Office of General Counsel.  
- As part of the negotiations, the institutions will need to agree upon how proposed Dual Degree arrangement will be managed/operationalised (e.g. what is application process and timeline? How are students to be identified in SydneyStudent? How will the program be marketed?). |
| 2. EOI committee process   | - The faculty prepares an EOI for the CCPC with support from Dual Degree Coordinator (new role).  
- Faculty sends EOI with draft agreement (for assessing strategic alignment potential) to CCPC.  
- If supported, the committee recommends the EOI to the University Executive for endorsement after which the faculty can continue development of the full and detailed course proposal.  
- The Undergraduate Studies Committee or Graduate Studies Committee receives the EOI and draft agreement and endorses partnership. |
| 3. Agreement signed        | - Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) approves inter-institutional credit sharing arrangement.  
- Vice-Chancellor or Deputy-Vice Chancellor (Education) signs the Dual Degree Agreement with partner University. |
| 4. Final approval committee process | - Full course proposal and business case provided to CCPC for review and endorsement.  
- CCPC provides course proposal and business case to the University Executive.  
- University Executive reviews and recommends the approval of the course to the Academic Board (via relevant committee).  
- Undergraduate Studies Committee or Graduate Studies Committee recommends to the Academic Board that a new course is introduced.  
- Academic Board recommends to Senate that the new dual degree is approved.  
- Senate approves new course.  
- Dual Degree to be registered on CRICOS. |
| 5. Promote to students     | - Once a dual degree is in place, the arrangement can be promoted to current and prospective students at each institution.  
- GSRM and Marcomms to advise on promotion of the new Dual Degree. |
**Figure 2: Proposed process for establishing new Inbound and Outbound Dual Degree Pathway Agreements (Type 2 and Type 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Complete a Proposal | - Faculty or School identifies desired partner institution and partner institution degree(s).  
- An “Agreement Sponsor” at the Faculty or School prepares a “Proposal to Negotiate” which sets out the details of the proposed arrangement, including underlying strategy, resource requirements, benefits to university. This should also include market analysis to detail projected student demand and the potential cohort.  
- Proposal to include credit matching table(s) between Sydney and partner institution degree(s).  
- Agreement Sponsor to obtain approval of Dean for Proposal.  
- Signed Proposals are submitted to the International Agreements Manager / Dual Degree Coordinator (new role) for review and feedback.  
- DVC (Education) portfolio approves the proposed arrangement at the Proposal stage.  
- As a quality assurance step, signed Proposals are recorded on Records Online so that prior to any renewal of an agreement, the outcomes of the agreement can be evaluated against the stated objectives and desired outcomes outlined in the Proposal. |
| 2. Negotiate agreement | - International Agreements Manager / Dual Degree Coordinator (new role) to prepare a draft agreement for review by the agreement sponsor. (Note: The preference is to use USYD template documents as the base document for any proposed agreement. However, if circumstances require, a partner’s preferred document may be used as long as USYD can make any appropriate amendments to bring it in line with our legal or procedural requirements).  
- The draft agreement will be shared with the partner for its review and comment.  
- Any proposed amendments to agreement by institutional partner will be considered with input from the Office of General Counsel.  
- As part of the negotiations, the institutions need to agree upon how proposed Dual Degree arrangement will be managed and operationalised (e.g. what is application process and timeline? How are students to be identified in SydneyStudent? How will the program be marketed?). |
| 3. Arrange formal approvals | - Pathway Agreement proposal is provided to CCPC for endorsement.  
- Deputy-Vice Chancellor (Education) approves credit-sharing arrangements per existing delegations of authority and signs pathway agreement. |
| 4. Promote to students | - Once a dual degree is in place, the arrangement can be promoted to current and prospective students at each institution.  
- GSRM and Marcomms to advise on promoting Dual Degree arrangement. |
**Figure 3: Proposed process for establishing Joint and Dual PhDs (Type 4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Identify desired Joint PhD partner institutions | - USYD to identify desired partners with whom there is significant overlapping areas of research.  
- Dual PhDs need to be able to support a sustainable and balanced two-way flow of students over (at least) a 5 to 10 year period.  
- Alternatively, where this is impractical, the Joint/Dual PhD must align with an alternative strategic imperative (e.g. diversification of the international PhD cohort) (note: tuition cannot be waived at USYD unless inbound matches outbound mobility).  
- From 2019, the priority will be to seek to establish Joint/Dual PhDs linked with OGE’s ‘priority partners’ in Tier 1. |
| 2. Negotiate Joint PhD partnership | - Engage with partner institution to negotiate the overall framework of the Dual PhD, which will be formalised in what USYD will call a Principal Dual PhD Agreement (alternatively, USYD can seek to include framework of Dual PhD into the MOUs / Collaboration Agreements entered into with OGE’s priority partners).  
- As far as possible, Joint PhD Partnerships should be entered into on a university-wide basis.  
- As part of the negotiations:  
  - The parties need to confirm what will be awarded to successful students (e.g. for joint PhDs a co-badged testamur issued by the University of Sydney; for dual PhDs, a jointly awarded degree with two separate testamurs).  
  - The parties should work on establishing a simple and clear pathway for students to participate in the program. Any required student paperwork should be simple and scalable.  
  - USYD should obtain and review copies of rules / procedures that will apply to USYD students being jointly supervised by the partner and / or submitting a PhD for examination by the partner.  
  - USYD’s preference is that (as far as possible) the Principal Dual PhD Agreement addresses:  
    - the reciprocity requirement  
    - Intellectual property  
    - The tuition fee structure  
    - The principle that a student will only be examined once  
    - The principle that students need to separately enrol at both institutions, and will be subject to admissions requirements of each  
    - ESOS language  
    - Indemnity / liability language |
| 3. Arrange formal approvals | - Principal Dual PhD Agreement and partner’s examination rules procedures submitted to Higher Degree by Research Examinations Sub-Committee for consideration and approval.  
- Principal Dual PhD Agreement submitted to CCPC for consideration of strategic alignment and resourcing implications, and for a recommendation to be made to the University Executive.  
- University Executive to endorse the agreement for signature by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).  
- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) to sign the agreement. |
| 4. Promote to students | - Once a Principal Joint/Dual PhD Agreement is in place, the partnership can be promoted to students / potential students at each institution.  
- For compliance with the Higher Education Support Act 2003 (Cth) and if it is the intention to ‘waive’ fees at Sydney, there needs to be a balanced reciprocity of inbound and outbound students with a partner institution over the term of the Agreement. Otherwise, tuition fees must be charged. |
To participate in the Joint or Dual PhD Program, students need to submit a PhD application via Sydney Student (there are established PhD degree codes).

Prior to being able to receive an Unconditional Offer, each student, and appropriate representatives from each institution will need to have signed a document called a ‘Student Dual PhD Agreement’ (currently called a ‘Student Cotutelle Agreement’) that addresses issues relevant to the individual student’s candidature. The document confirms: (1) student name, (2) supervisors, (3) key dates, (4) research area, (5) which institution receives tuition fees (and which one waives tuition fees) (6) language of thesis, (7) Which institution conduct the examination.

Director, Graduate Research signs the Student Dual PhD Agreement on behalf of the USYD.

---

**Figure 4: Proposed process for establishing Student PhDs Agreements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Check that Principal Dual PhD Agreement exists</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>Confirm support for student</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>Negotiate Dual PhD partnership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>Arrange formal approvals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>Facilitate student participation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Dual Degree and Joint PhD Policy

To support the shift to a consistent 'dual' and 'joint' messaging for coursework and research degrees respectively, it is proposed that a new Dual Degree Policy is introduced which covers all courses offered in partnership with another institution. To achieve this, the Cotutelle Scheme Policy would need to be rescinded and replaced with a new policy that better clarifies existing arrangements, fills policy gaps, ensures strategic alignment of partnerships, and reflects the dual degree committee and approval process outlined above.

Existing Arrangements

The Cotutelle Scheme Policy was established in 1999 in response to an initiative of the French Government to establish and develop partnerships between French and other research institutions. The policy’s application has since broadened beyond its original inspiration, with half of the University’s existing Cotutelle arrangements with non-French universities. Upon reviewing the arrangements currently established in the policy it becomes apparent that there are a variety of issues that need to be addressed, with the current format of the policy not sufficient to cover a potential broadening of provisions surrounding joint PhDs or to cover non-research dual degrees.

Firstly, the Cotutelle Scheme Policy is not established in the current format of University policies. This is not merely an aesthetic issue, but results in the omission of key policy information and inclusion of gratuitous contextual clauses. For instance, the policy does not contain a definitions section, and as such, is without a clear definition of what a Cotutelle is beyond a context clause which states that ‘[i]n February 1998, Senate approved amendments to the PhD resolutions providing for the establishment of cotutelle agreements whereby, if the necessary conditions for joint candidature had been met, a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy could also receive a doctorate from another University in respect of that candidature, each testamur acknowledging the circumstances under which the award was made.’ Aside from the HDR Rule 2011 determining that resolutions cannot be created for the PhD (clause 1.4(1)), meeting ‘the necessary conditions for joint candidature’ is not clearly delineated in the policy. The only clause that gives guidance for completing the unique candidature arrangements of a Cotutelle is 2.3.4, which states that a thesis should be written ‘in either English or the language of instruction at the other participating institution, with an abstract provided in the other language’. Moreover, the document has to be read in full to determine what the definition of a ‘Cotutelle’ is, and even then it becomes rather opaque given the various background clauses (such as references to the role of the French Government in establishing these degrees in clause 1.2).

The policy also contains references to documents that no longer exist, such as the Guidelines for Inter-Institutional Agreements 1997. Whereas relevant policies, such as the Educational Services Agreements Policy 2017, are not linked to the Cotutelle Scheme Policy. From an operational perspective this is problematic as OGE research agreements that include international education provisions are provided to the DVC (Education) portfolio to assess the alignment potential in accordance with the principles of the Educational Services Agreement Policy 2017, however this policy does not contain clauses pertaining to Cotutelle agreements. This is further compounded by the Cotutelle Scheme Policy not providing direction for the relevant assessors on the educational, research, or strategic alignment of potential agreements.

The Cotutelle Scheme Policy is limited in its current scope, applying only to Cotutelle arrangements, without reference to any other potential form of inter-institutional research degree arrangements, partnership levels, or dual coursework degrees. Indeed, this policy is the only existing University policy that focuses on dual and joint degrees, although there are disparate references to various degree arrangements and Cotutelles throughout the University’s policy and procedural documents. Given the format and intent of the policy to only cover Cotutelle agreements, inserting new provisions into the existing policy is not a feasible
policy option, with a new policy required if all degree partnership types are to be covered in a single and easily identifiable document. For a policy rewrite to be conducted, agreement on the type and strategic alignment of these degrees would need to be achieved, with relevant scaffolding in place that delineates the types of degree and partnerships available.

**New Policy – Dual Degree and Joint PhD Policy**

The Working Group recommends that the Cotutelle Scheme Policy is rescinded and replaced with a Dual Degree and Joint PhD Policy that incorporates the relevant provisions regarding joint PhDs and formalises new clauses pertaining to undergraduate and graduate coursework dual degrees. As such, this policy would cover not only research-based joint degrees, but also dual coursework degrees offered in partnership with another university. This will provide a clear and up-to-date policy framework for the University's dual degree programs.

Outside of the preliminary and universally-applicable sections, the Dual Degree and Joint PhD Policy would be separated into two main parts (Part x: Coursework, Part y: Research). The new policy will cover the approval processes for dual degrees and Principal Joint/Dual PhD Agreements, strategic alignment, academic quality, and the types of and limits on educational/research agreements with University partners. The policy would also reflect the definitions provided earlier in this paper.

It is proposed that the administrator of the new policy is the Chair of the Academic Board. This provides continuity given the Chair is the delegated authority over the Cotutelle Scheme Policy, while reflecting the University-wide nature of the dual degree and joint PhD arrangements. As such, the new policy will encourage such arrangements to be concluded at an institution-to-institution level, rather than between faculties.

Additionally, the policy would ensure dual degree agreements are not entered into or removed unless: the relevant delegate established in the Delegations of Authority (Administrative Functions) Rule has approved the agreement; the delegate considers whether the partnership aligns with the University’s global engagement strategy; the agreement is consistent with the University’s obligations under the Higher Education Standards Framework; and the agreement complies with the terms of other relevant University policies and procedures, including the Educational Services Agreements Policy and Intellectual Property Policy.
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RECOMMENDATION

That the AB Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the University’s draft submission on the proposed legislation for prohibiting the provision and advertisement of commercial cheating services.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Australian Government released draft legislation on Sunday 7 April 2019 for prohibiting the provision and advertisement of commercial (or “contract”) cheating services.\(^1\) The legislation would make it an offence to provide or advertise cheating services to students, carrying a penalty of up to two years imprisonment or a fine of up to $210,000. The legislation would also grant TEQSA new powers to take action against academic cheating services, including investigation and prosecution of identified offenders, and to seek Federal Court injunctions to prevent access to domestic and international websites promoting cheating services.

In its response, the University of Sydney has offered its support for the draft legislation, particularly in relation to the strong message of deterrence that making the provision of contract cheating services illegal will communicate to students, be they providers or consumers of such services. However, as with an earlier submission to the Australian Government on tackling contract cheating, the University’s submission notes that additional actions should also be taken to augment a national approach for assuring the academic integrity of the Australian higher education sector (Attachment 1). This includes: establishing a national code of academic integrity in higher education; introducing a mandatory education module for completion by all inbound international students; facilitating the creation of a national network of academic integrity practitioners; and instituting a national system of mandatory reporting and information sharing.

DRAFT RESPONSE

The University of Sydney supports, and welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on, the Australian Government’s proposed legislation for prohibiting the advertisement and provision of commercial cheating services.

We do so based on our commitment to not only protecting the academic integrity and reputation of our own educational programs and qualifications, but also the world-class reputation of the Australian higher education sector generally.

The unchecked growth of the commercial cheating services industry and the relative ease with which its players have been able to promote their services contributes to the normalisation of cheating behaviours and the outsourcing of academic work by students. In our view, making it an offence to provide or advertise commercial cheating services provides a strong response to this trend.

\(^{1}\) For the draft legislation and the earlier advice of the Higher Education Standards Panel regarding contract cheating, see: [https://www.education.gov.au/tackling-contract-cheating](https://www.education.gov.au/tackling-contract-cheating)
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We do not expect that any national legislation will immediately curb the activities of all commercial cheating providers on account of the extraterritorial manner in which many such providers conduct their operations. Nonetheless, our view is that constituting the provision of commercial cheating services as an offence will give higher education providers an even stronger message to send to students – be that as providers or consumers of such services – about our strong opposition to cheating in all its forms.

We note and support giving TEQSA the power to seek Federal Court injunctions to prevent access to domestic and international websites promoting cheating services and hope it will be appropriately resourced for this task. To the extent that it is feasible, we would also support initiatives to encourage or require the cooperation of carriage service and search engine providers in preventing access by students studying in Australia to services outlawed under Australian law.

Though there is precedent legislation elsewhere, we believe that the passage of this legislation will also establish Australia as a leader in the fight against contract cheating and promoting the academic integrity of higher education globally. We believe the Australian Government should seek to build on this status by advocating for an internationally consistent framework for addressing the extraterritorial provision and promotion of commercial cheating services through the various education fora in which it routinely engages.

The University of Sydney views the proposed legislation as an important first step toward establishing a national framework for deterring contract academic cheating. However, consistent with our previous submission on the Government’s proposed actions for tackling contract cheating (attached), we believe that additional actions should be taken to further assure the academic integrity of the Australian higher education sector. These are to:

- establish a national code on academic integrity in higher education
- introduce a compulsory educational module for all incoming international students
- facilitate the establishment of a national network of academic integrity practitioners and
- instituting a national system of mandatory reporting and information sharing.

We reiterate our strong support for the action the Australian Government is taking against commercial cheating services and would be happy to provide further information or comment in its efforts to finalise the draft legislation.

CONSULTATION

The University’s submission on the proposed legislation is due by Friday 28 June 2019. The draft submission has been submitted for noting to the UE Education Committee and the Academic Board’s Academic Quality and Academic Standards and Policy Committees. Expert advice on the submission is also being sought from the Higher Education Policy and Projects team in the Office of the Vice-Chancellor.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – The University of Sydney submission on the Higher Education Standards Panel’s advice regarding commercial (or ‘contract’) cheating in higher education

---

Dear Minister,

The Higher Education Standards Panel’s advice regarding commercial (or ‘contract’) cheating in higher education

The University of Sydney strongly supports the advice provided by the Higher Education Standards Panel (HESP) on tackling contract cheating and the Australian Government’s response.

Academic integrity is a core value of the University of Sydney, and we share with the Australian Government and counterpart institutions a deep commitment to preserving the academic integrity of the sector. Since 2015 we have been involved in a range of endeavors with other Australian universities to address issues around educational integrity and welcome this initiative for collective action between governments, the regulator and higher education providers.

The University’s commitment to academic integrity, along with its unequivocal opposition to all forms of academic dishonesty and misconduct, is enshrined in the University’s Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015, which in Section 9(1) states:

The role of the University is to create, preserve, transmit and apply knowledge through teaching, research, creative works and other forms of scholarship. The University is committed to academic excellence and integrity as the cornerstones of scholastic achievement and quality assurance.

This commitment is further underwritten by a broader institutional framework comprised of a suite of rules, binding codes of conduct for students and staff, and institutional procedures and guidelines for addressing alleged breaches of academic integrity. Insofar as they relate to the University’s educational programs and the threat of contract cheating, these include the:

1. Academic Honesty Procedures 2016
2. Code of Conduct for Students
3. Research Code of Conduct 2013
4. University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016
5. Educational Integrity Decision-Making and Penalty Guidelines 2018
The University undertook a comprehensive review of its approach to mitigating and minimising threats to educational integrity following the recommendations of a taskforce established by the Vice-Chancellor in 2015. Among the recommendations of the taskforce was the establishment of an Office of Educational Integrity in the University’s central education portfolio. Working under the oversight of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), this office leads institutional efforts to educate students in academic honesty and to develop strategies for deterring, detecting and investigating academic dishonesty and misconduct.

The University of Sydney supports the recommendations of the HESP on tackling contract cheating and the Australian Government’s response. We are particularly encouraged by the HESP’s emphasis on developing a consistent approach for communicating the sector’s commitment to academic integrity to students. We are equally encouraged by the Australian Government’s allocation of additional funding to the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) to establish and enforce legislation for prohibiting and prosecuting the provision or advertisement of commercial cheating services.

Observations on a standardised statement of personal commitment to academic integrity
(Recommendation 1)

We support the initiative to create a standardised template for a statement of personal commitment to academic integrity and believe that crafting such a statement as a unified message from higher education institutions, the regulator and the Australian Government will be beneficial. Many universities, including the University of Sydney, already require such commitments from commencing students but we believe a collective, unambiguous signal from the sector will be stronger and more effective.

We also note the HESP’s consideration of the different circumstances of international and domestic students regarding whether additional legislative mechanisms are necessary for addressing contract cheating in each of the respective cohorts. Our view is that the specific risks for international students require attention, particularly in relation to those students for whom English is an additional language.

We believe that the educational potential of the proposed statement for inbound international students would be even stronger if linked with a mandatory, government-authorised education module as discussed in more detail under Additional Proposals, Option 2 below. At the University of Sydney, a commitment by all commencing undergraduate and postgraduate coursework students is made at the completion of the mandatory Academic Honesty Education Module. Our most recent revision of this module (2019) included additional educational content on contract cheating as a result of additional risks to students that we became aware of during the second half of 2018. Placing the statement as the final task in completing the module maintains the educational emphasis of such statements and ensures that students enter into the commitment with an understanding of the issues. We believe a module for international students endorsed by the Australian Government and all providers would amplify the benefits of a combined statement of commitment.

Observations on a legislative approach for tackling commercial cheating services
(Recommendations 2 and 3)

The University of Sydney is keen to see legislative action taken against the provision and advertisement of commercial cheating services and views the legislation in place in New Zealand as a useful starting point. We would, however, draw attention to the limitations of the New Zealand legislation as identified by
Michael J. Draper and Philip M. Newton of Swansea University in the United Kingdom. In particular, they point out that successful prosecution of commercial cheating services under the New Zealand legislation is predicated on proving intent on the part of the defendant. Draper and Newton propose that any such legislation would be more effective if based on principles of ‘strict liability’. This would mean that the provision and advertising of commercial cheating services would be illegal regardless of whether the service provider has knowledge of its wrongfulness or recklessness. Ascertaining intent is notoriously difficult, so we encourage the regulator to consider Draper and Newton’s analysis in its pursuit of legislation in this area.

In terms of the promotion of commercial cheating services, we note that the New Zealand legislation prohibits the advertising of commercial cheating services and publication of any such advertisements. We suggest that the New Zealand approach does not go far enough in that it fails to address the significant part that global media platforms such as Google, YouTube, Facebook, Twitter and WeChat play in facilitating the advertisement of commercial cheating services.

We are aware that the United Kingdom’s Quality Assurance Agency has committed to approaching Google, Facebook and other media companies to ask that they not accept advertisements for commercial cheating services and to have the websites of these services blocked. We note that YouTube took steps in late 2018 to remove content published by commercial cheating services, albeit only after the publication of an investigation conducted by the BBC. The high degree of visibility commercial cheating services have achieved has inevitably been tied to the growth of these global media companies and their associated platforms, so we do not see relying on the goodwill of these companies as sufficient for curbing the threat of contract cheating. The ease (and relative invisibility) with which Chinese-language cheating services have been able to target students coming to us from China through WeChat and other Chinese social media platforms has also emerged as a significant concern. Our view is that any future Australian legislation should seek to address these issues by making it an offence to facilitate the advertisement of commercial cheating services.

Additionally, we suggest consideration be given to empowering the regulator through the legislation to investigate and, where appropriate, take action in the entirely unregulated market in commercial tutoring services where there is evidence that these services are compromising the educational integrity of the higher education sector. In 2018, for instance, we linked potential breaches of academic integrity to three Chinese-language “tutoring colleges”, each of which had claimed an affiliation with the University. Also re-emerging in 2018 was the tutoring college linked to the My Master incident, Yingcredible. Yingcredible was found to have been promoting its services through the illegal use of the trademarks of a number of Sydney-based universities, including our own. These universities undertook coordinated action to have our trademarks and illegal use of our intellectual property removed from the company’s promotions.

We are concerned that these kinds of services may escape the reach of the proposed legislation through their continued blurring of the boundary between legitimate and illegitimate assistance and by operating in the shadows. Having linked a number of these companies to potential breaches of integrity last year, we also have serious concerns about the quality of the information and instruction they are providing to our students and students across the sector.

Additional proposals for consideration by the Australian Government

In addition to supporting the initiatives proposed by the HESP and the Government, we submit the following suggestions to further consolidate the sector’s efforts for consideration.

1. **Establish a national code for assuring the academic integrity of the sector**
   Establishing a national code on academic integrity in higher education would promote a more consistent, sector-wide approach for assuring and communicating the sector’s commitment to academic integrity. By establishing a common footing, a national code also has the potential to promote closer collaboration between institutions and across the sector generally. To ensure compliance with the code, universities and other higher education providers would be required to recalibrate their existing institutional codes of conduct and policies, such as is the case with the [Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, 2018](https://www.auric.edu.au/research/australian-code-for-the-responsible-conduct-of-research-2018). The code could be informed by the proposed statement of personal commitment to academic integrity or, *vice versa*, the code could inform development of the statement. Once a national code is established, it could also be extended to cover the activities of the tutoring colleges we have indicated above.

2. **Introduce a compulsory educational module for international students**
   Modelled on the [British Council’s ‘Study UK’ MOOC](https://www.britishcouncil.org/), the Australian Government could consider developing a compulsory online module that all students offered a visa to study in Australia must complete. The module would seek to educate inbound international students about their obligations under the proposed national code, as well as other issues pertinent to commencing study in Australia, such as their obligations under the ESOS Act and the nature of the Australian healthcare system. Such a module could also be linked with the personal statement as detailed above. Both domestic and international students would still continue to receive education in academic integrity at the institutional level as required under the Higher Education Standards Framework.

3. **Facilitate the creation of a national network of academic integrity practitioners**
   Through our respective offices of academic (or educational) integrity, the University of Sydney and the University of Wollongong having been seeking to establish a national network comprised of staff with a strong academic or professional interest in academic integrity. The University of Sydney and the University of Newcastle were also involved in an earlier initiative to create such a network through the Committee of Chairs of Academic Boards/Senates in NSW and ACT, and we understand the DVC Academic group within Universities Australia has also considered activity in this area. We have found strong support for such initiatives but locating such a structure outside of an institutional framework creates coordination and logistical challenges. We propose that the Australian Government considers providing an additional allocation of funding to establish this network and support a (part-time) national coordinator appointed through an expression of interest process.
4. **Institute a national system of mandatory reporting and information sharing**

With some precedent in the Provider Registration and International Student Management System (PRISMS), introducing a mandatory system for reporting findings of serious academic misconduct has the potential to achieve the kind of deterrence that we believe the statement of personal commitment cannot achieve alone. Unlike PRISMS, the proposed system would be designed to communicate information between institutions and between the sector and the regulator.

A system of this nature would enable the sector to share intelligence about common threats to academic integrity and address the current ease with which students accused of academic misconduct can seek transfer to another institution without facing the consequences of their actions. Though a finding of academic misconduct should not preclude admission elsewhere, universities would be in a better position to impose appropriate conditions on their enrolments to mitigate risks to academic integrity. Enacting any such system would require that agreement be reached on what constitutes serious academic misconduct, which we suggest could be achieved by way of a common classification system developed through the practitioner network proposed above. Consideration would also need to be given to an appropriate framework for addressing privacy concerns, although we note that there are already examples of exemptions being granted to certain agencies in relation to their ability to properly exercise their complaint handling and investigative functions.\(^4\)

We have found that our adoption of a centralised reporting system across our University in 2016 has vastly improved our understanding of the prevalence of academic misconduct and our ability to respond to emerging threats to the University’s educational integrity. This system is now also supporting our ability to identify the services seeking to exploit the vulnerabilities of our students for commercial gain. We believe that the adoption of a sector-wide system would yield similar benefits and could provide the regulator with one means by which to identify commercial cheating services for prosecution under the legislative approach it is now pursuing.

We hope that the information and suggestions we have provided in this response will be of assistance and look forward to working with the Government, the regulator and colleagues across the nation to protect the academic integrity of the sector and the welfare of our students.

Yours sincerely,

**Professor Pip Pattison AO**

Deputy Vice-Chancellor Education

\(^4\) See, for instance, *Division 3 of the Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998 (New South Wales)*.
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee consider and note this addendum to the report for submission to Academic Board and the University Senate as fulfilment of the reporting requirement of clause 8.4 of the University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

The report detailing all 2018 allegations of student misconduct received was considered by the ASPC and a request was made for additional information on the completion times of misconduct matters. This addendum is intended to supplement the primary report and fulfil this request.

ADDENDUM

Completion times of student misconduct cases closed in 2018

The completion times of misconduct cases are provided in the Table 1 and Fig. 1 below. These detail the proportions of case taking less and more than two months respectively to complete. It is noteworthy that the longest completion times on average are cases involving fraud; and given that this is the majority of all misconduct cases at 56% and is therefore a significant driver of the overall rate of completion. The compilation of plagiarism matters together with contract cheating and fake medical certificates into the ‘fraud category’, has an effect of increasing the time frames, particularly as allegations of plagiarism contained within PhD theses can involve lengthy assessments and/or engagement for remediation.

Of the 245 cases, nearly 80% took more than two months to complete. Apart from the 56% of cases involving fraud - which can be administratively complex - nearly a quarter of all cases with completion times exceeding two months involve interpersonal matters and were frequently related to student safety. These cases can be very complex and can involve a significant number of consultations, particularly in instances with multiple participants. In some cases, an extensive period of police and/or court proceedings has resulted in delays in case completion by the University. External notifications made by police or legal practitioners to the University to suspend misconduct proceedings generally arises in instances where an internal investigation is likely to prejudice legal proceedings.

Impediments to turn-around times include, examination periods for students as being unavailable for engagement, holiday and University shut-down periods, in addition to extensions of time sought by students to engage with legal representatives, or requested by legal representatives.
Table 1 – Case completion times of misconduct cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Breach</th>
<th>Completed in less than 2 months</th>
<th>% completed in less than 2 months</th>
<th>Completed in more than 2 months</th>
<th>Total Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual and Indecent Assault</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach of Privacy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – completion times for all student misconduct cases completed in 2018

Table 1 shows the percentage of cases by type that take less than two months to complete.

Fig. 1 – Proportions of case completions times

Fig. 1 – the relative proportion of less and more than two months completion times by misconduct case type.

Figure 1 shows the relative proportions of less than and more than two months to complete by misconduct type.