NOTICE OF MEETING

Meeting 2016/2 of the Undergraduate Studies Committee will be held at 10 am on Wednesday 27 April in the Senate Room, Quadrangle. The agenda for the meeting is attached.

Natalie Zawerucha
Committee Officer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AGENDA</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>WELCOME AND APOLOGIES</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>PROCEDURAL MATTERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Minutes of Meeting 2016/1 (16 March 2016)</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Actions Arising</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Verbal update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>STANDING ITEMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 Report of the Chair</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Verbal update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Report of the Academic Board meeting 30 March 2016</td>
<td>Tony Masters</td>
<td>Attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>ITEMS FOR APPROVAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Major Course Proposals</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Minor Course Proposals</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 Bachelor of Nursing (Honours)</td>
<td>Christina Aggar</td>
<td>Attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Bachelor of Education (Early Childhood)</td>
<td>Wayne Cotton/ Marianne Fenech</td>
<td>Attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Other items</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Faculty of Medicine: Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery – Progression requirements</td>
<td>Rebekah Jenkin</td>
<td>Attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>ITEMS FOR NOTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1 Education Strategy – Implementation Update</td>
<td>Peter McCallum</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Curriculum Framework – Policy Amendments</td>
<td>Peter McCallum</td>
<td>Attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016</td>
<td>Peter McCallum</td>
<td>Attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4 Academic Honesty Procedures 2016</td>
<td>Peter McCallum</td>
<td>Attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>OTHER BUSINESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1 Any Other Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next meeting – 10:00am-12:00pm, Wednesday 15 June 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Room, Quadrangle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Undergraduate Studies Committee

Terms of Reference

Purpose

The Undergraduate Studies Committee assists the Academic Board in ensuring the maintenance of the highest standards and quality in teaching, learning and scholarship at the University of Sydney and, in this context, advises the Academic Board about resolutions, policy and procedures relating to undergraduate study at the University and acts as the Academic Board's agent in determining undergraduate matters, including the approval of new and amended courses, in accordance with the resolutions of the Senate: Delegations of Authority: Academic Functions.

Terms of Reference

1. To monitor issues relating to quality in relation to undergraduate award courses, and to make recommendations to the Academic Board as detailed below.
2. To advise the Academic Board on resolutions, policy and procedures relating to all undergraduate studies in the University, including the pattern of undergraduate courses in the University.
3. To make recommendations to the Academic Board in relation to proposals to introduce new undergraduate award courses and amendments to existing undergraduate award courses.
4. To make recommendations to the Academic Board regarding requirements to be satisfied by candidates for the award of a degree, diploma or certificate.
5. To act for the Academic Board in determining procedures for the consideration, and deadline for submission of proposals for new and amended undergraduate award programs and courses in consultation with the Course Profiles Steering Committee.
6. To contribute to the development of the University’s strategic objectives in relation to undergraduate study and to formulate, recommend to the Academic Board, and regularly review resolutions, policy and procedures supporting those strategic objectives.
7. To receive reports from, and provide advice to, the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education) and, where appropriate the Deputy Vice Chancellor (International) on quality assurance and other matters relating to undergraduate study.
8. To obtain information or reports from any faculty, school or department, the Library or other academic unit on academic matters relating to undergraduate studies.
9. To ensure proper communication channels are established with other committees of the Academic Board and SEG to promote cross-referencing and discussion of matters concerning undergraduate students.
10. To determine the terms and conditions of undergraduate awards, scholarships and prizes established within the University.
11. To receive annual reports on the awarding of Honours and the University Medal from Faculties.
12. To provide regular reports on its activities under its terms of reference to the Academic Board.
13. To consider and report on any matter referred to it by the Academic Board, or its committees, the Senior Executive Group or the Vice Chancellor.
MINUTES

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The Board noted apologies as recorded above.

Resolution UGSC2016/1-1
The Undergraduate Studies Committee resolved to note that apologies have been received from the members above and that they be excused for their absence.

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

2.1 Minutes of Previous Meeting

Resolution UGSC2016/1-2
The Undergraduate Studies Committee resolved that the minutes of meeting 7/2015 on 8 November 2015 be confirmed as a true record.

2.2 Actions Arising

Resolution UGSC2016/1-3
The Undergraduate Studies Committee noted that there were no outstanding actions.

3 ITEMS FOR ACTION

3.1 Report of the Chair

The Chair outlined the role of the Undergraduate Studies committee and requested that new members familiarise themselves with the Terms of Reference.

The Chair noted that major changes to undergraduate degrees were to be expected following implementation of the new Education Strategy 2016-20.

Resolution UGSC2016/1-4
The Undergraduate Studies Committee resolved to note the report of the Chair.

3.2 Report of the Academic Board meetings

Associate Professor Masters, Chair of the Academic Board congratulated Associate Professor Davis on her appointment as Chair of the Undergraduate Studies Committee.

Resolution UGSC2016/1-5
The Undergraduate Studies Committee noted the report of the Academic Board meetings.

Respect is a core value of the Academic Board
4 ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

Major Course Proposals

There were no major course proposals received.

Minor Course Proposals

4.1 Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Major in Internet of Things)

A proposal was received from the Faculty of Engineering to introduce a new major ‘Internet of Things’ to the Bachelor of Engineering Honours. The new major will be available to all students commencing in 2017 and beyond. New units of study for the third and fourth year of study will be proposed and developed in 2016 and 2017, before these students commence their third and fourth years of their study in 2018 and beyond.

The Undergraduate Studies Committee endorsed the proposal subject to the following amendments:

• Proposal to take effect from 1 January 2017;
• Major to be asterisked with a footnote in the Bachelor of Engineering Honours course resolutions under clause 7(3) to clarify that the major will be available from 2017 (or 2018, as the case may be).

Following the meeting, the outlines for the two new units of study in the major were circulated to members.

Resolution UGSC2016/1-6
The Undergraduate Studies Committee agreed to recommend that the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours to introduce new major (the Internet of Things) and the consequent amendments to the course resolutions with effect from 1 January 2017.

4.2 Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Major in Humanitarian Engineering)

A proposal was received from the Faculty of Engineering to introduce a new major ‘Humanitarian Engineering’ to the Bachelor of Engineering Honours. The new major will be available to all students commencing in 2017 and beyond. New units of study for the third and fourth year will be proposed and developed in 2016 and 2017, before these students commence their third and fourth years of their study in 2018 and beyond.

The Undergraduate Studies Committee endorsed the proposal subject to the following amendments:

• Proposal to take effect from 1 January 2017;
• Major to be asterisked with a footnote in the Bachelor of Engineering Honours course resolutions under clause 7(3) to clarify that the major will be available from 2017 (or 2018, as the case may be);
• A further clause 7(4) be inserted to advise students that majors may not be available in some years and that entry to some majors (i.e. Humanitarian Engineering may be on a competitive basis (to limit numbers for the field work component).

Following the meeting, the outlines for the four new units of study in the major were circulated to members.

Resolution UGSC2016/1-7
The Undergraduate Studies Committee agreed to recommend that the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours to introduce new major (Humanitarian Engineering) and the consequent amendments to the course resolutions with effect from 1 January 2017.
Other items
There were no other items received.

5 ITEMS FOR NOTING

5.1 Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 – report on implementation
The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences has developed a local provision regarding the provision of credit. A review of an earlier version of the document by the Office of General Counsel and the Chair of the Academic Board resulted in the recommendation that one clause be removed from the local provision and inserted into the Faculty Resolutions. The Faculty has made this amendment and is seeking approval to amend the Faculty Resolutions as an erratum to the 2016 faculty handbook.

The Undergraduate Studies Committee endorsed the proposal.

Resolution UGSC2016/1-8
The Undergraduate Studies Committee agreed to recommend that the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to clarify the provision of credit involving units of study for majors in undergraduate courses and the consequent amendment of the faculty resolutions with immediate effect.

6 OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 Any other business
There was no further business.

6.2 Next meeting
10:00am-12:00pm, Wednesday 27 April 2016, Senate Room, Quadrangle
RECOMMENDATION

That the Undergraduate Studies Committee note the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 30th March 2016.

REPORT OF ACADEMIC BOARD MEETING

Items related to the Undergraduate Studies Committee
The Academic Board:
- approved the appointment of academic staff members to the Undergraduate Studies Committee, noting that the term of membership will be until 31 December 2017;
- approved proposals from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours to include majors in Humanitarian Engineering and Internet of Things; and
- approved a proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend its Faculty Resolutions.

Other matters
The Academic Board also:
- discussed the composition of the Academic Board under the University’s proposed new organisational structure;
- approved the appointment or co-option of academic staff and student members to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee, Admissions Committee, Graduate Studies Committee and Undergraduate Studies Committee, noting that the term of membership will be until 31 December 2016 for student members and until 31 December 2017 for staff members, and the amendment of the terms of reference for the Admissions Committee;
- noted the report on the Inherent Requirements 2016 Renewal, and the invitation to faculties to make recommendations to the Inherent Requirements Advisory Committee (IRAC) by 11th April 2016;
- noted the report from Dr Saleeba on the formation of the Equity and Diversity working group;
- noted the report of the student members of the Academic Board on anonymous marking, simple extensions, the centralised University phone line and the NTEU and Student Rally;
- noted the report of the Vice-Chancellor on the approval of the 2016-2020 Strategic Plan by Senate and current national debates in the Higher Education sector;
- approved the request from the University of Sydney Business School to amend its semester dates for 2017 for the Master of Business Administration;
- approved amendments to the Dux Entry Scheme to broaden the scheme to become the Future Leaders Scheme;
- approved a proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to correct the assumed knowledge details for the Bachelor Information Technology/Bachelor of Commerce combined degree;
- approved proposals from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Development Studies and the Master of US Studies;
- approved a proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Engineering to include a major in Risk Management; and
- approved proposals from the Faculty of Science to amend the Board’s resolution made at its meeting of 2 July 2014 to allow the Faculty of Science to continue offering the Graduate Diploma in Psychology with its existing table of units of study until 2018, and to amend the Board’s resolution made at its meeting of 24
February 2016 to allow the Faculty of Science to introduce amendments to the Master of Nutrition and Dietetics from 1 January 2018, and changes to the Bachelor of Science/Master of Nutrition and Dietetics from 1 January 2017;

- accepted the findings of the Simple Extensions Working Group, including related amendments to the Coursework Policy 2014 and the Assessment Procedures 2011; and
- noted the Academic Standards and Policy Committee’s advice that it supports the use of anonymous marking for examinations.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Professor Trudy Rudge, Professor of Nursing (Social Sciences and Humanities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer/Approver</td>
<td>Professor Donna Waters, Dean, Sydney Nursing School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper title</td>
<td>Bachelor of Nursing (Honours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To request the Undergraduate Studies Committee recommend that Academic Board approve i) the change to credit points and ii) the course resolution change for the Bachelor of Nursing (Honours)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

That the Undergraduate Studies Committee recommend Academic Board approve:

1. The change in credit points for Bachelor of Nursing (Honours) UoS:
   NURS4020 (from 6cp to 12cp) and
   NURS4021 (from 18cp to 12cp);

2. Changes to the course resolutions for the Bachelor of Nursing (Honours) relating to the updated title from Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching) to Associate Dean (Education).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Sydney Nursing School wishes to advise the Undergraduate Studies Committee of a change in credit points for NURS4020 and NURS4021.

NURS4020 Theory, Method and Ethics in Research, 2016, currently awards 6 credit points. This unit of study is to be deleted and replaced by NURSxxxx Theory, Method and Ethics in Research, to award 12 credit points (commencing semester 1, 2017).

NURS4021 Honours Thesis A, 2016, currently awards 18 credit points. This unit of study is to be deleted and replaced by NURSxxxx Honours Thesis A, to be awarded 12 credit points (commencing semester 1, 2017).

The twelve (12) credit points for each unit of study is due to equal distribution of assessments across NURS4020 and NURS4021.

The course resolution change is to advise the Undergraduate Studies Committee of the updated title from Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching) to Associate Dean (Education).
Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Sydney Nursing School

Contact person: Trudy Rudge

1. Name of award course

Bachelor of Nursing (Honours)

2. Purpose of proposal

To advise the Undergraduate Studies Committee of a change in credit points for NURS4020 and NURS4021. NURS4020 is currently a 6 credit point unit, while NURS4021 is an 18 credit point unit. Both content and assessment have been moved out of NURS4021 and into NURS4020. This includes an increased emphasis on completion of a comprehensive literature review and an assessable presentation outlining the proposed study. A further justification for the change in weighting is that 18 credit points equates to full time study. We are anticipating more part time BN (Hns) students as they transit into the workforce. In order to be consistent and avoid enrolment issues Sydney Nursing School would like to amend the credit points for both units of study to 12 credit points each. This will require deletion of the current unit of study codes and new unit of study codes created with the new distribution of credit points for the Bachelor of Nursing (Honours).

The twelve (12) credit points for each unit of study is due to equal distribution of assessments across NURS4020 and NURS4021.

The resolution change is to advise the Undergraduate Studies Committee of the updated title from Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching) to Associate Dean (Education).

3. Details of amendment

Bachelor of Nursing (Honours).

NURS4020 Theory, Method and Ethics in Research, 2016, currently awards 6 credit points. This unit of study is to be deleted and replaced by NURSxxxx Theory, Method and Ethics in Research, to award 12 credit points (commencing semester 1, 2017).

NURS4021 Honours Thesis A, 2016, currently awards 18 credit points. This unit of study is to be deleted and replaced by NURSxxxx Honours Thesis A, to be awarded 12 credit points (commencing semester 1, 2017).

Course resolutions

3. Candidature

(1) Appointment of supervisor

(a) the Chair of the Honours Degrees Sub-Committee will appoint a research supervisor in consultation with the Associate Dean (Education, Learning and Teaching) and notification to the Associate Dean (Academic).

9. Transitional provisions

(1) These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature after 1 January, 20167, and students who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 20167 who elect to proceed under these resolutions.

(2) Candidates who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 20167 may complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions in force at the time, provided they complete requirements within the maximum period of candidature specified in those resolutions. The Faculty may specify a later date for completion or specify alternative
requirements for completion for students whose candidatures extend beyond the maximum period of candidature specified in the resolutions under which they were enrolled.

4. **Transitional arrangements**

There will be no impact on student.

5. **Other relevant information**

6. **Signature of Dean**

Under Graduate Committee meeting 27/04/2016
Academic Board meeting 15/05/2016
RECOMMENDATION

That the Undergraduate Studies Committee recommend Academic Board approve the changes to the course resolutions for the Bachelor of Education (Early Childhood), to take effect from 1 January 2017 for all new students entering the Bachelor of Education (Early Childhood).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A new accrediting body, the Australian Children’s Education and Care Quality Authority requires approved early childhood degree programs to meet a total of 37 curriculum specifications. The proposed changes ensure that the proposed revised program will meet these specifications. The faculty wishes to amend the course resolutions for the above listed award course to include new Early Childhood core units of study, required for accreditation.
1. **Name of award course**

   Bachelor of Education (Early Childhood)

2. **Purpose of proposal**

   To amend the Faculty resolutions for the above listed award course to include new Early Childhood core units of study, required for accreditation purposes. A new accrediting body, the Australian Children's Education and Care Quality Authority requires approved early childhood degree programs to meet a total of 37 curriculum specifications. The proposed changes ensure that the proposed revised program will meet these specifications.

3. **Details of amendment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements for award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) To qualify for the award of the Bachelor of Education (Early Childhood), a candidate must complete 192 credit points of units of study comprising:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 36 credit points of units of study from the Early Childhood Education Table, including 12 Credits of Education One units and 24 credit points of Curriculum and Professional Studies units; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 12 credit points of junior (level 1000) units of study in one subject area chosen from Arts and Social Sciences Table A or Table B or Science Table 1 or Section 2 of the Business School Table;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 36 48 credit points of units of study from the Early Childhood Education Table, including 12 credit points of Education Two units and 24 36 credit points of Curriculum and Professional Studies units; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 12 credit points of Senior (level 2000) units of study, chosen from Arts and Social Sciences Table A or Table B or Science Table 1 or Section 2 of the Business School Table;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 credit points Curriculum and Professional Studies units of study from the Early Childhood Education Table, including 6 credit points of Education Three units, 6 credit points of Education Four units and 36 credit points of Curriculum and Professional Studies units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 credit points of units of study from the Early Childhood Education Table, including 12 6 credit points of Education Three Optional units, 6 credit points of Education Three units and 36 credit points of Curriculum and Professional Studies units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Transitional provisions**

   (1) These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature after 1 January 2015 and students who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January 2015 who elect to proceed under these resolutions.

   (2) Candidates who commenced prior to 1 January, 2015 2017 may complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions in force at the time of their commencement provided that the requirements are completed by 1 January, 2020 and provided that there is no suspension of candidature, in which case the candidature for any period shall proceed under the by-laws and resolutions in force at the time of re-enrolment. The Faculty may specify a later date for completion or specify alternative requirements for completion of candidatures that extend beyond this time.
4. **Transitional arrangements**

The proposed amendments will be introduced in 2017. Students will enrol in the new core Early Childhood units of study in 2017, which directly replace the old core Early Childhood units of study.

5. **Other relevant information**

To take affect from 1\textsuperscript{st} January 2017 for all new students entering Bachelor of Education (Early Childhood).

6. **Signature of Dean**

\[
\text{Signature}
\]

Friday, 8 April 2016
Non-Confidential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Ria Deamer, (Operations and Project Manager)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer/Approver</td>
<td>Professor Inam Haq, Co-Director Sydney Medical Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper title</td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine: Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery – Progression requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To request the Undergraduate Studies Committee recommend that Academic Board approve the amendment of the progression requirements for the Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery (MBBS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

That the Undergraduate Studies Committee recommend Academic Board approve:
1. the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine to amend the progression requirements for the Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery; and
2. the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal with effect from 1 January 2017.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Faculty of Medicine is proposing to amend the progression requirements for the Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery (MBBS). The purpose of the amendments is to provide more clarity to students and staff around the requirements for progression, including the decision making process and the condition and timelines for repeating. The current resolutions are not prescriptive enough and are open to interpretation. It is expected that the amendments will avoid appeals on the basis of ambiguities of the resolutions.

Similar changes will also be made to the Doctor of Medicine (MD) which replaced the MBBS in 2014.
Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery

These resolutions must be read in conjunction with applicable University By-laws, Rules and policies including (but not limited to) the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014 (the 'Coursework Rule'), the Coursework Policy 2014, the Resolutions of the Faculty, the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended) and the Academic Board policies on Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism. Up to date versions of all such documents are available from the Policy Register: http://www.sydney.edu.au/policies.

Course resolutions
1 Course codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BGMEDSUR-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Attendance pattern

(1) The attendance pattern for this course is full time only for Stages 1 and 2.
(2) The attendance pattern for this course is normally full time for Stage 3 however this stage may be undertaken part-time with the Dean's approval.

3 Admission to candidature

(1) Available places will be offered to qualified applicants based on merit, according to the following admission criteria.
(2) Admission to the Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery (MBBS) requires:
   (a) completion of a bachelor degree comprising at least three full-time equivalent years of study from either:
      (i) an Australian university or self-accrediting higher education institution listed in the Australian Qualifications Framework;  
      or 
      (ii) an overseas university listed in the National Office of Overseas Skills Recognition Guide;
   (b) demonstrated sustained academic performance to a standard considered satisfactory by the Dean or Deputy Dean of the Faculty of Medicine. In assessing sustained academic performance the Dean or Deputy Dean may, at his or her discretion, consider performance in the Bachelor's degree(s) and/or performance in any graduate diploma, master or doctoral degree (or equivalent); and
   (c) performance in an admissions test approved by the Dean or Deputy Dean of the Faculty of Medicine to a standard considered satisfactory by the Faculty; and
   (d) performance in an interview to a standard considered satisfactory by the Dean or Deputy Dean of the Faculty of Medicine.
(3) If the bachelor's degree was completed more than 10 years before 1 January of the year for which the applicant is seeking enrolment, the applicant must, in addition, have completed within this 10 year period a postgraduate degree or postgraduate diploma (or equivalent), from either:
   (a) an Australian university or self-accrediting higher education institution listed in the Australian Qualifications Framework; or
   (b) an overseas university listed in the National Office of Overseas Skills Recognition Guide.
(4) An applicant will not be admitted to candidature for the MBBS unless he or she has completed a bachelor degree prior to 1 January of the year in which the applicant intends to commence the MBBS.
(5) The official results listed on an applicant's transcript, and his or her admission test results, will be taken as the awarding and testing authorities’ assessment of the academic standards reached by the applicant, taking due account of illness and misadventure according to the authorities’ policies.
(6) A person who has commenced the MBBS in a fee-paying or bonded place at the University will not be eligible for admission or transfer to a Commonwealth supported or non-bonded place in the MBBS.
(7) The Dean may, in exceptional circumstances, admit to the MBBS an applicant who has commenced studies in medicine at another University, provided that the applicant:
   (a) has not previously applied unsuccessfully for admission to the MBBS at the University of Sydney; 
   (b) would have met the requirements for admission to the MBBS that were in place at the time the applicant was admitted to his or her previous course in medicine; and
   (c) will complete at least 50 per cent of the MBBS at the University of Sydney.
(8) Prior to admitting an applicant to the MBBS in accordance with subclause 3(7), the Dean will consider:
   (a) the circumstances leading to the applicant’s request for admission;
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(b) whether the curriculum undertaken by the applicant in his or her previous course in medicine is comparable to the MBBS;
(c) the academic performance of the applicant in his or her previous course in medicine; and
(d) the availability of places in the MBBS in the relevant year.
(9) The Dean may, prior to admitting an applicant to the MBBS in accordance with subclause 3(7), require the applicant to undertake a barrier examination that permits entry into the relevant year.
(10) Subject to the approval of the Academic Board, the Faculty of Medicine may establish special admission schemes for defined classes of applicant, including:
(a) applicants who are of rural origin;
(b) Indigenous applicants.
(11) The Faculty of Medicine may establish a maximum quota for the number of applicants for admission as candidates for the MBBS within a special admission scheme.
(12) The Faculty of Medicine will publish details of any special admission schemes approved by the Academic Board.
(13) A committee consisting of the Dean, Deputy Deans and Head of the Medical Program may confirm or withdraw any offer of admission that is not in accordance with the resolutions relating to admissions current at the time. This committee may seek advice in reaching its decision.

4 Deferment

(1) Deferral of enrolment following the offer of a place in the Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery is permitted only in the following circumstances:
(a) progression to honours, masters or a PhD; or
(b) under exceptional circumstances which could not be foreseen at the time of application; or
(c) for completion of "professional years" where awarding of a bachelor's degree is dependent upon such completion only.
(2) Deferral will only be granted one year at a time and will not be expected to last longer than two years.

5 Requirements for award

(1) The units of study that may be taken for the course are set out in the Table of Undergraduate Units of Study for the Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery.
(2) To qualify for the award of the pass degree, a candidate must successfully complete 192 credit points of core units of study in the order prescribed by the faculty.

6 Progression rules

(1) Satisfactory progress
(a) Continued enrolment in the SMP is based upon compliance with all applicable University and Faculty policies including the SMP Statement of Expectations.
(b) Significant or repeated unprofessional behaviour may trigger a Show Good Cause process which may lead to exclusion from the SMP.
(c) Students deemed Not Satisfactory in a Summative Barrier Assessment may be offered further assessment.
(d) The responsible Examination Committee will determine eligibility for further assessment, considering all relevant information including attendance, performance in current and previous Barrier Assessments, and adherence to the SMP Statement of Expectations.
(e) Students may normally only repeat each year once, as per section 11, Time Limits.
(f) Students who fail a repeat year will be required to Show Good Cause in accordance with Part 15 of the University of Sydney Coursework Policy 2014.
(2) Stage 1
(a) Successful completion of Stage 1 and eligibility to progress to Stage 2 requires successful completion of all four Themes.
(b) Students who fail two or more Themes will be required to repeat Stage 1 in its entirety.
(c) Students who fail one Theme may be offered further assessment in the scheduled reassessment period.
(d) The decision of the Stage 1 Examination Committee in relation to eligibility for further assessment is final subject to the University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006. In making that decision, the Examination Committee will consider all relevant information including attendance, completion of required formative assessments, performance in current and previous Barrier assessments, and adherence to the SMP Statement of Expectations.
(e) Students who are offered further assessment must complete that further assessment in the scheduled reassessment period. No further opportunity for reassessment will be provided.
(f) Students who cannot complete the reassessment in the scheduled period and who have an approved application for special consideration will be permitted to repeat Stage 1 without academic penalty.
(g) Students who repeat Stage 1 must attend Stage 1 Orientation, and must repeat all Themes in the repeat year.

(h) Students who cannot complete both semester 1 and semester 2 of Stage 1 in one academic year will normally be required to repeat Stage 1 in its entirety when they return to the SMP.

(i) Students who are deemed not satisfactory in the Stage 1 RSA1 and Stage 1 RSA2 Summative Examinations will be required to withdraw from semester 2, Stage 1 without academic penalty and may be permitted to repeat the entirety of Stage 1 the following academic year.

(j) Students whose results in the Stage 1 RSA1 and Stage 1 RSA 2 Summative Examinations represent a significant failure (greater than or equal to two standard errors of measurement less than the pass mark) may be required to Show Good Cause in accordance with Part 15 of the University of Sydney Coursework Policy 2014.

(k) Students who are not satisfactory in either the Stage 1 RSA1 or the Stage 1 RSA2 and who have not met the attendance requirements as set out in the SMP Attendance Provisions 2016 will usually be required to withdraw from semester 2, Stage 1 and return to repeat the entirety of Stage 1 the following academic year or may be required to Show Good Cause as to why they should be permitted to continue their enrolment in the SMP.

(3) Stage 2

(a) Successful completion of Stage 2 and eligibility to progress to Stage 3, Year 3 requires successful completion of all four Themes.

(b) Students who fail two or more Themes will be required to repeat Stage 2 in its entirety.

(c) Students who fail one Theme may be offered further assessment in the scheduled reassessment period.

(d) Students who do not satisfactorily complete the requirements for the MD Project Development unit of study are not normally eligible to progress to Stage 3, Year 3. The MD Project Sub Deans will determine whether a student has satisfied the requirements of this unit of study, and any remediation required.

(e) The decision of the Stage 2 Examination Committee in relation to eligibility for further assessment is final subject to the University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006. In making that decision, the Examination Committee will consider all relevant information including attendance, completion of required formative assessments, performance in current and previous Barrier Assessments, and adherence to the SMP Statement of Expectations.

(f) Students who are offered further assessment must complete that further assessment in the scheduled reassessment period. No further opportunity for reassessment will be provided.

(g) Students who cannot complete the reassessment in the scheduled period and who have an approved application for special consideration will be permitted to repeat Stage 2 without academic penalty.

(h) Students who repeat Stage 2 must repeat all Themes, the MD Project Development unit of study and all assessments in the repeat year.

(i) Students who repeat Stage 2 will have their eligibility to continue with their existing MD project determined by the MD Sub Deans on a case-by-case basis.

(j) Students who cannot complete both semester 1 and semester 2 of Stage 2 in one academic year will normally be required to repeat Stage 2 in its entirety when they return to the SMP.

(k) Students who are deemed not satisfactory with a significant failure (greater than or equal to two standard errors of measurement less than the pass mark) in the Stage 2 RSA1 Summative Examinations will be required to withdraw from semester 2, Stage 2 without academic penalty and may be permitted to repeat the entirety of Stage 2 the following academic year.

(l) Students whose results in the Stage 2 RSA1 Summative Examinations represent a significant failure (greater than or equal to two standard errors of measurement less than the pass mark) and who have not met the attendance requirements as set out in the SMP Attendance Provisions 2016 will be required to withdraw from semester 2, Stage 2 and may be required to Show Good Cause in accordance with Part 15 of the University of Sydney Coursework Policy 2014.

(4) Stage 3, Year 3

(a) Successful completion of Stage 3, Year 3 and eligibility to progress to Stage 3, Year 4 requires passing the Written Barrier Examination, successful completion of four blocks (Core and Specialty Blocks as determined by Stream allocation) and all four Themes.

(b) Students should normally have completed two Core Blocks successfully to be eligible to take the scheduled Stage 3, Year 3 Written Barrier Examination (unless exceptional circumstances as agreed by the Director of the Sydney Medical Program).

(c) Students who have failed a Core Block will be required to complete the Core Block in the same academic year if possible. The student will normally be expected to repeat the Core Block in Term E and will not be permitted to complete a Specialty Block in Term E. The Specialty Block will be completed in Term J. The student will be permitted to sit the written Barrier Examination that will cover all other blocks in Year 3 other
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than the failed Core Block. The assessment of the failed block will be taken after remediation at the end of term E ONLY if the student achieves at or above the passing standard in the Barrier Examination covering the other Year 3 Blocks. If the passing standard is not reached, the student will normally have to repeat Year 3 in its entirety.

(d) Students who fail a Specialty Block will be permitted to repeat that Specialty Block in Term J of Stage 3 Year 4 and will complete a delayed PRINT (pre-internship term).

(e) Students who fail the Written Barrier Examination may be offered remediation and reassessment. If they fail reassessment or are not offered remediation and reassessment, they may be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 3 in its entirety.

(f) Students who fail any two or more of the following in any combination: Block(s) (Core or Specialty) and the four Themes will be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 3 in its entirety and may be required to Show Good Cause in accordance with Part 15 of the University of Sydney Coursework Policy 2014.

(g) Students who fail the Written Barrier Examination and one Theme will be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 3 in its entirety.

(h) Students who fail the Written Barrier Examination and a Specialty Block will be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 3 in its entirety.

(i) A repeat Year 3 consists of 40 weeks of clinical placement – 5 x 8 week Core and/or Specialty Blocks.

(j) The decision of the Stage 3 Examination Committee in relation to eligibility for further assessment is final subject to the University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006. In making that decision, the Examination Committee will consider all relevant information including attendance, completion of required formative assessments, performance in current and previous Barrier assessments, and adherence to the SMP Statement of Expectations.

(k) Students who are offered further assessment will be offered remediation after Term E has finished. If they fail reassessment they will be required to complete Stage 3, Year 3 in its entirety.

(l) Students must complete that further assessment in the scheduled reassessment period. No further opportunity for reassessment will be provided.

(m) Students who cannot complete the reassessment in the scheduled period and who have an approved application for special consideration will be permitted to repeat Stage 3, Year 3 without academic penalty.

(n) Students who have not met in full the academic progression requirements of Stage 3, Year 3 are not eligible to undertake the Elective Term.

(o) Students who have required remediation to complete Stage 3, Year 3 will not normally be considered eligible for an overseas Elective Term placement.

5 Stage 3, Year 4

(a) Successful completion of Stage 3, Year 4 and eligibility to graduate requires passing the Written Barrier Examination, successful completion of all Core and Specialty Blocks, the Long Case, all four Themes, successful completion of the MD Project unit of study academic requirements and PRINT.

(b) Students who have failed a Block in Year 4 or are carrying a Block from Year 3, will be expected to complete their remaining Core or Specialty Block in Term J, and if successful in passing the Block and associated Barrier Examination, will progress to P3, PRINT term.

(c) Students who fail two or more Themes will be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 4 in its entirety.

(d) Students who fail two (Core and/or Specialty) Blocks will be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 4 in its entirety and will not be permitted to continue any Block or to take any Barrier Examination in the current academic year.

(e) Students who fail any (Core and/or Specialty) Block in Year 4 or the Written Barrier Examination or one or more of the Themes, AND who are carrying a Block from Stage 3, Year 3 will be required to repeat Year 4 in the following academic year in its entirety and will not be permitted to complete any additional Core or Specialty Block in the current academic year.

(f) Students who fail the Stage 3, Year 4 Written Barrier Examination may be offered further reassessment in the scheduled reassessment period. Students who pass the Written Barrier reassessment will progress to P2 PRINT Term. Students who fail further written reassessment will be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 4.

(g) Students who fail the Written Barrier Examination and one Theme will be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 4 in its entirety.

(h) Students who fail a Core Block and one Theme will be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 4 in its entirety.

(i) Students who fail two attempts at the Long Case Examination may be offered remediation during the first four weeks of Term J, then may be offered a further Long Case Examination. If students fail the Long Case, they will be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 4 in its entirety.

(j) Students who fail the Elective Term may be offered remediation and further assessment. A repeat directed domestic Elective in Term J may be required, and if successfully completed, students may progress to P3 PRINT.
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(k) Students who do not successfully complete the Elective Term and who are delayed by previous failure or leave of absence, must repeat Stage 3, Year 4 in its entirety.
(l) A repeat Year 4 consists of 36 weeks of clinical placement – four 8 week Core and/or Specialty Blocks and a 4 week PRINT. Repeating Year 4 students will not normally be required to repeat their Elective Term if they have previously satisfied the academic requirements.
(m) The decision of the Stage 3 Examination Committee in relation to eligibility for further assessment is final subject to the University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006. In making that decision, the Examination Committee will consider all relevant information including attendance, completion of required formative assessments, performance in current and previous Barrier assessments, and adherence to the SMP Statement of Expectations.
(n) Students must complete that further assessment in the scheduled reassessment period. No further opportunity for reassessment will be provided.
(o) Students who cannot complete the reassessment in the scheduled period and who have an approved application for special consideration will be permitted to repeat Stage 3, Year 4 without academic penalty.
(p) Students who do not satisfactorily complete the requirements for the Research Project/MD Project unit of study are not eligible to progress to PRINT and will normally be required to remediate in Term J. The MD Project Sub Deans will determine whether a student has satisfied the requirements of this unit of study and any remediation required.
(q) Students who have not met in full the academic progression requirements of Stage 3, Year 4 at the end of Term I will be required to complete a delayed PRINT after they remediate in Term J and are successful in that remediation.
(r) Students who fail PRINT will be required to repeat the 4-week PRINT in P2 or P3. Students who fail PRINT requirements will be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 4 in its entirety.

7 Requirements for the honours degree

(1) Honours is available to meritorious candidates who complete an alternative set of units of study in the final year of the program. Candidates enrolled in the degree part-time are not eligible to enrol in Honours.
(2) To qualify for admission to the honours program a candidate should, without repeating a Stage, achieve:
   (a) a satisfactory result in the Stage 1 written exam; and
   (b) a satisfactory result in Stage 1 and 2 portfolios on Personal and Professional Development; and
   (c) a minimum result of 75% in the Stage 2 written exam; and
   (d) a satisfactory result in the Stage 2 practical exam.
(3) To qualify for the award of the honours degree a candidate must successfully complete the requirements for the degree in the minimum standard full time duration and:
   (a) complete the 12 credit point research unit of study described in the table of units for the degree with a minimum mark of 70; and
   (b) achieve a minimum average mark of 75% in the Years 3 and 4 written exams.

8 Honours weighted average mark (HWAM)

(1) The HWAM in the Faculty of Medicine is calculated from the results in the 80 credit points of core units of study in Stage 3, plus the honours mark which will be given double weighting.
(2) The HWAM is calculated using the following formula:

\[
\text{HWAM} = \frac{\sum(Wc \times Mc)}{\sum(Wc)}
\]

Where Wc is the Stage 3 unit of study credit points x the Stage 3 unit weighting and Mc is the mark achieved for the Stage 3 unit. The mark used for units with a grade AF is zero.
(3) All Stage 3 units are weighted 1 except the research unit of study which is weighted 2.

9 Award of the degree

(1) The Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery is awarded as either Pass or Honours. The honours degree is awarded in classes ranging from First Class to Second Class, Division Two. The class of honours is awarded on the basis of a student's HWAM as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>HWAM Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class I</td>
<td>80 &gt;= HWAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class II (Division 1)</td>
<td>75 &lt;= HWAM &lt; 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class II (Division 2)</td>
<td>70 &lt;= HWAM &lt; 75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) An honours candidate who obtains a mark of less than 70 in a research unit of study, or a HWAM of less than 70, will not be awarded honours and will be awarded the pass degree.

(3) An honours candidate who fails the research unit of study will be required to undertake the elective unit of study at the end of the program as an additional unit in order to achieve the correct number of credit points required for the award of the pass degree.

10 University medal
A student with an HWAM of 90 or above may be awarded a university medal. The medal is awarded at the discretion of the faculty to the highest achieving students who in the opinion of the faculty have an outstanding academic record.

11 Time Limits
(1) Subject to sub-clause 11(2), a candidate for the MBBS must complete the requirements for the degree within five calendar years.

(2) The Dean may, in exceptional circumstances, extend the time limit for completing the requirements for the MBBS to a maximum of 10 years.

12 Credit for previous study
Advanced standing and credit for previous study is not available in this degree except where approved by the Dean for the purposes of subclause 3(7).
Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Medicine

Contact person: Professor Inam Haq

1. **Name of award course**
   Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery

2. **Purpose of proposal**
   The purpose of the amendments is to provide more clarity to students and staff around the requirements for progression, including the decision making process and the condition and timelines for repeating. The current resolutions are not sufficiently prescriptive and open to interpretation. It is expected that the amendments will avoid appeals on the basis of ambiguities.

3. **Details of amendment**

   **Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery**

   **6 Progression rules**

   (1) Candidates in Stage 1 must pass all units of study designated for that year before proceeding to Stage 2. Candidates in Stage 2 must pass all units of study designated for that year before proceeding to Stage 3. Failure in any single unit of study in Stages 1 or 2 will result in a failure of the year and will require the candidate to re-enrol and successfully complete the units designated for the entire year, without credit or exemption for work previously completed.

   (2) Candidates in Stage 3 who fail one unit of study, may be permitted to proceed to units designated for the subsequent year of study providing that the failed unit of study is repeated before commencement of the PrInt (pre-internship) Term. Candidates who fail more than one unit of study and/or their barrier (summative) examination will be required to repeat the whole year, without credit or exemption for work previously completed.

   **(1) Satisfactory progress**

   (a) Continued enrolment in the MBBS is based upon compliance with all applicable University and Faculty policies including the SMP (Sydney Medical Program) Statement of Expectations.

   (b) Significant or repeated unprofessional behaviour may trigger a Show Good Cause process which may lead to exclusion from the SMP.

   (c) Students deemed Not Satisfactory in a Summative Barrier Assessment may be offered further assessment.

   (d) The responsible Examination Committee will determine eligibility for further assessment, considering all relevant information including attendance, performance in current and previous Barrier Assessments, and adherence to the SMP Statement of Expectations.

   (e) Students may normally only repeat each year once, as per section 11. Time Limits.

   (f) Students who fail a repeat year will be required to Show Good Cause in accordance with Part 15 of the University of Sydney Coursework Policy 2014.

   **(2) Stage 1**

   (a) Successful completion of Stage 1 and eligibility to progress to Stage 2 requires successful completion of all four Themes.

   (b) Students who fail two or more Themes will be required to repeat Stage 1 in its entirety.

   (c) Students who fail one Theme may be offered further assessment in the scheduled reassessment period.
(d) The decision of the Stage 1 Examination Committee in relation to eligibility for further assessment is final subject to the University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006. In making that decision, the Examination Committee will consider all relevant information including attendance, completion of required formative assessments, performance in current and previous Barrier assessments, and adherence to the SMP Statement of Expectations.
(e) Students who are offered further assessment must complete that further assessment in the scheduled reassessment period. No further opportunity for reassessment will be provided.
(f) Students who cannot complete the reassessment in the scheduled period and who have an approved application for special consideration will be permitted to repeat Stage 1 without academic penalty.
(g) Students who repeat Stage 1 must attend Stage 1 Orientation, and must repeat all Themes in the repeat year.
(h) Students who cannot complete both semester 1 and semester 2 of Stage 1 in one academic year will normally be required to repeat Stage 1 in its entirety when they return to the SMP.
(i) Students who are deemed not satisfactory in the Stage 1 RSA1 and Stage 1 RSA2 Summative Examinations will be required to withdraw from semester 2, Stage 1 without academic penalty and may be permitted to repeat the entirety of Stage 1 the following academic year.
(j) Students whose results in the Stage 1 RSA1 and Stage 1 RSA2 Summative Examinations represent a significant failure (greater than or equal to two standard errors of measurement less than the pass mark) may be required to Show Good Cause in accordance with Part 15 of the University of Sydney Coursework Policy 2014.
(l) Students who are not satisfactory in either the Stage 1 RSA1 or the Stage 1 RSA2 and who have not met the attendance requirements as set out in the SMP Attendance Provisions 2016 will usually be required to withdraw from semester 2, Stage 1 and return to repeat the entirety of Stage 1 the following academic year or may be required to Show Good Cause as to why they should be permitted to continue their enrolment in the SMP.

(3) Stage 2
(a) Successful completion of Stage 2 and eligibility to progress to Stage 3, Year 3 requires successful completion of all four Themes and the Independent Learning Activity (ILA).
(b) Students who fail two or more Themes will be required to repeat Stage 2 in its entirety.
(c) Students who fail one Theme may be offered further assessment in the scheduled reassessment period.
(d) The decision of the Stage 2 Examination Committee in relation to eligibility for further assessment is final subject to the University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006. In making that decision, the Examination Committee will consider all relevant information including attendance, completion of required formative assessments, performance in current and previous Barrier Assessments, and adherence to the SMP Statement of Expectations.
(e) Students who are offered further assessment must complete that further assessment in the scheduled reassessment period. No further opportunity for reassessment will be provided.
(f) Students who cannot complete the reassessment in the scheduled period and who have an approved application for special consideration will be permitted to repeat Stage 2 without academic penalty.
(g) Students who repeat Stage 2 must repeat all Themes, the ILA unit of study, and all assessments in the repeat year.
(h) Students who cannot complete both semester 1 and semester 2 of Stage 2 in one academic year will normally be required to repeat Stage 2 in its entirety when they return to the SMP.
(i) Students who are deemed not satisfactory with a significant failure (greater than or equal to two standard errors of measurement less than the pass mark) in the Stage 2 RSA1 Summative Examinations will be required to withdraw from semester 2 Stage 2 without academic penalty and may be permitted to repeat the entirety of Stage 2 the following academic year.
(j) Students whose results in the Stage 2 RSA1 Summative Examinations represent a significant failure (greater than or equal to two standard errors of measurement less than the pass mark) and who have not met the attendance requirements as set out in the SMP Attendance Provisions 2016 will be required to withdraw from semester 2, Stage 2 and may be required to Show Good Cause in accordance with Part 15 of the University of Sydney Coursework Policy 2014.

(4) Stage 3, Year 3
(a) Successful completion of Stage 3, Year 3 and eligibility to progress to Stage 3, Year 4 requires passing the Written Barrier Examination, successful completion of four blocks (Core and Specialty Blocks as determined by Stream allocation) and all four Themes.
(b) Students should normally have completed two Core Blocks successfully to be eligible to take the scheduled Stage 3, Year 3 Written Barrier Examination (unless exceptional circumstances as agreed by the Director of the Sydney Medical Program).
(c) Students who have failed a Core Block will be required to complete the Core Block in the same academic year if possible. The student will normally be expected to repeat the Core Block in Term E and will not be permitted to complete a Specialty Block in Term E. The Specialty Block will be completed in Term J. The student will be permitted to sit the written Barrier Examination that will cover all other blocks in Year 3 other than the failed Core Block. The assessment of the failed block will be taken after remediation at the end of Term E ONLY if the student achieves at or above the passing standard in the Barrier Examination covering the other Year 3 Blocks. If the passing standard is not reached, the student will normally have to repeat Year 3 in its entirety.
(d) Students who fail a Specialty Block will be permitted to repeat that Specialty Block in Term J of Stage 3 Year 4 and will complete a delayed PRINT (pre-internship term).
(e) Students who fail the Written Barrier Examination may be offered remediation and reassessment. If they fail reassessment or are not offered remediation and reassessment, they may be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 3 in its entirety.
(f) Students who fail any two or more of the following in any combination: Block(s) (Core or Specialty) and the four Themes will be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 3 in its entirety and may be required to Show Good Cause in accordance with Part 15 of the University of Sydney Coursework Policy 2014.
(g) Students who fail the Written Barrier Examination and one Theme will be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 3 in its entirety.
(h) Students who fail the Written Barrier Examination and a Specialty Block will be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 3 in its entirety.
(i) A repeat Year 3 consists of 40 weeks of clinical placement – 5 x 8 week Core and/or Specialty Blocks.
(j) The decision of the Stage 3 Examination Committee in relation to eligibility for further assessment is final subject to the University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006. In making that decision, the Examination Committee will consider all relevant information including attendance, completion of required formative assessments, performance in current and previous Barrier assessments, and adherence to the SMP Statement of Expectations.
(k) Students who are offered further assessment will be offered remediation after Term E has finished. If they fail reassessment they will be required to complete Stage 3, Year 3 in its entirety.
(l) Students must complete that further assessment in the scheduled reassessment period. No further opportunity for reassessment will be provided.
(m) Students who are offered further assessment will be offered remediation after Term E has finished. If they fail reassessment they will be required to complete Stage 3, Year 3 in its entirety.
(n) Students who have not met in full the academic progression requirements of Stage 3, Year 3 are not eligible to undertake the Elective Term.
(o) Students who have required remediation to complete Stage 3, Year 3 will not normally be considered eligible for an overseas Elective Term placement.
2. Stage 3, Year 4
(a) Successful completion of Stage 3, Year 4 and eligibility to graduate requires passing the Written Barrier Examination, successful completion of all Core and Specialty Blocks, the Long Case, all four Themes, successful completion of the Elective Term/Research Project unit of study academic requirements and PRINT.
(b) Students who have failed a Block in Year 4 or are carrying a Block from Year 3, will be expected to complete their remaining Core or Specialty Block in Term J, and if successful in passing the Block and associated Barrier Examination, will progress to P3, PRINT term.
(c) Students who fail two or more Themes will be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 4 in its entirety.
(d) Students who fail two (Core and/or Specialty) Blocks will be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 4 in its entirety and will not be permitted to continue any Block or to take any Barrier Examination in the current academic year.
(e) Students who fail any (Core and/or Specialty) Block in Year 4 or the Written Barrier Examination or one or more of the Themes, AND who are carrying a Block from Stage 3, Year 3 will be required to repeat Year 4 in the following academic year in its entirety and will not be permitted to complete any additional Core or Specialty Block in the current academic year.

(f) Students who fail the Stage 3, Year 4 Written Barrier Examination may be offered further reassessment in the scheduled reassessment period. Students who pass the Written Barrier reassessment will progress to P2 PRINT Term. Students who fail further written reassessment will be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 4.

(g) Students who fail the Written Barrier Examination and one Theme will be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 4 in its entirety.

(h) Students who fail a Core Block and one Theme will be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 4 in its entirety.

(i) Students who fail two attempts at the Long Case Examination may be offered remediation during the first four weeks of Term J, then may be offered a further Long Case Examination. If students fail the Long Case, they will be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 4 in its entirety.

(j) Students who fail the Elective Term/Research Project may be offered remediation and further assessment. A repeat directed domestic Elective in Term J may be required, and if successfully completed, students may progress to P3 PRINT.

(k) Students who do not successfully complete the Elective Term/Research Project and who are delayed by previous failure or leave of absence, must repeat Stage 3, Year 4 in its entirety.

(l) A repeat Year 4 consists of 36 weeks of clinical placement – four 8 week Core and/or Specialty Blocks and a 4 week PRINT. Repeating Year 4 students will not normally be required to repeat their Elective Term if they have previously satisfied the academic requirements.

(m) The decision of the Stage 3 Examination Committee in relation to eligibility for further assessment is final subject to the University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006. In making that decision, the Examination Committee will consider all relevant information including attendance, completion of required formative assessments, performance in current and previous Barrier assessments, and adherence to the SMP Statement of Expectations.

(n) Students must complete that further assessment in the scheduled reassessment period. No further opportunity for reassessment will be provided.

(o) Students who cannot complete the reassessment in the scheduled period and who have an approved application for special consideration will be permitted to repeat Stage 3, Year 4 without academic penalty.

(p) Students who have not met in full the academic progression requirements of Stage 3, Year 4 at the end of Term I will be required to complete a delayed PRINT after they remediate in Term J and are successful in that remediation.

(q) Students who fail PRINT will be required to repeat the 4-week PRINT in P2 or P3. Students who fail PRINT requirements will be required to repeat Stage 3, Year 4 in its entirety.

4. **Transitional arrangements**

   The proposed amendments represent clarification only, there are no new requirements for students.

5. **Other relevant information**

   The last intake of students into the MBBS was in 2013.

6. **Signature of Dean**
RECOMMENDATION

That the Undergraduate Studies Committee note the report on policy amendments required to implement the curriculum framework outlined in the University’s Strategic Plan 2016-2020. The Committee is further asked to note that a final set of amendments will be presented to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee and the Academic Board in June 2016.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The discussion paper “Towards a distinctive undergraduate education” (June 2015) canvassed 5 proposals on undergraduate education which, following consultation were further refined in the follow-up paper A Distinctive Undergraduate Education: Next Steps. These proposals were:

- The adoption of a common set of Graduate Qualities
- The development of a common set of definitions for course components and course rules for liberal studies degrees
- A proposed curriculum framework for bachelor degrees
- A four-year combined-degree model for liberal studied education
- Development of vertical double degree pathways

Proposals 1 and parts of proposal 3 were adopted by the Academic Board in December 2015, in the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015. This paper recommends the adoption of common definitions of course components and course rules (proposal 2) and of a four-year combined degree model (proposal 4). Proposal 5 on vertical double degrees is contingent of wider consultation with government and will be the subject of a later paper.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

In December 2015, the Academic Board approved the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015, incorporating the graduate qualities and some elements of the curriculum framework enunciated in the discussion paper “Towards a distinctive undergraduate education” (June 2015) and in the follow-up paper A Distinctive Undergraduate Education: Next Steps. The curriculum framework was discussed and it was noted that further details of the curriculum framework were the subject of ongoing development and would be brought back for further discussion and approval in the first half of 2016. Those elements have been developed further in the Generalist Undergraduate Degree Working Party and the Specialist and Professional Undergraduate Degree Working Party established by the SEG in 2015 after the release of the first discussion paper. As a result of those consultation amendments to the Coursework Policy and the Learning and Teaching Policy are proposed in order to adopt a common set of definitions (proposal 2) and a four-year combined degree model (proposal 4). Those elements are contained in the attached amendments to the Coursework Policy and the Learning and Teaching Policy as set out below.

The categorisation of bachelor Towards a Distinctive Undergraduate Coursework Policy.
degrees into two broad categories: Liberal Studies, and Specialist/Professional

*Education* proposed a degree architecture based on Liberal Studies and Specialist/Professional degrees. While both degree would achieve the Graduate Qualities, the different educational demands necessitated a different curriculum framework. The Coursework Policy currently contains requirements for different types of Masters by Coursework (Advanced Learning and Professional). This proposal adopts a comparable framework for Bachelor degrees.

Combined degrees with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies

*Towards a Distinctive Undergraduate Education* proposed a combined degree model. Incorporating a common framework for the four-year combined degree model flexibility to students and allows efficiency and responsiveness in the creation of new programs, tailored to student needs.

Curriculum components (Stream, Program, Major, Minor, Degree Core)

*Towards a Distinctive Undergraduate Education* proposed the adoption of common definitions for curriculum components which were developed further in *A Distinctive Undergraduate Education: next steps* and in consultation with the Generalist Undergraduate Degree working group of SEG.

Definitions now include Bachelor of Advanced Studies

Specify two types of Bachelor Degree

Part 17, Clause 84 (p. 62) gives requirements for both types

Coursework Policy

Clause 84 specifies that Liberal Studies and Professional/Specialist degrees may be combined with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies

Learning and Teaching Policy

Definitions of both types of undergraduate degree in Coursework Policy included in Learning and Teaching Policy Part 18 of the Policy gives detailed definitions of the components.

An earlier draft of these policies was discussed at the SEG - Education committee of 11 April and some changes have been made. The changes include:

- improvements to wording suggested by Megan Kemmis
- clarification that graduates of liberal studies degrees must also demonstrate the graduate qualities (Coursework Policy 84, (1) (b): the same stipulation is already made for Professional/Specialist degrees at 84 (2) (b)
- Note: a whether a bachelor degree i
- a draft definition of the concept of "1000" level, "2000" level, etc. units (L & T Policy Part 18 (11), (f))
- definitions for graduate qualities and changes to the definition of unit of study, major, minor

**ISSUES**

Governance. The interdisciplinary aspects of the new curriculum (the governance and administration of the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, the governance of the shared pool of majors, minors and electives, and the Open Learning Environment) will be through the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies and this is canvassed in a separate proposal.

Review of Existing Programs. Review of existing programs to align with common curriculum components and degree architecture. The Education Portfolio will consult with faculties during April/May to revise existing programs to align with the curriculum framework and four-year combined model. Part of this consultation will be agreement on support and resources needed to implement the framework for 2018. Ongoing coordination and consultation will take place through the Generalist Undergraduate Degree Working Party and the Specialist and Professional Undergraduate Degree Working Party.

Creation of Bachelor of Advanced Studies. The Bachelor of Advanced Studies is an interdisciplinary degree and will be administered by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies. Development will take place as part of the consultations described above and will be managed by the Education Portfolio. Consultation will take place through the SEG Education Committee, the SEG, the Generalist Undergraduate Degree Working Party and the Specialist and Professional Undergraduate Degree Working Party and the Academic Board.
Common components. The Discussion Paper *Towards a Distinctive Sydney Undergraduate Education* (2015) Proposed the development of common components as part of the curriculum framework. The follow-up paper *A Distinctive Undergraduate Education: Next Steps* refined the definition of program, major, minor for liberal studies degrees. During the next consultation round it is proposed that the question of whether these definitions can also be adopted for professional/specialist degrees that use majors, minors and/or programs as part of their curriculum framework.

These changes are reflected in the revised Coursework Policy at **Attachment 1** and the revised Learning and Teaching Policy in **Attachment 2**.

**CONSULTATION**

There was university-wide and widespread stakeholder consultation and market research following release of the discussion paper, *Towards a Distinctive Undergraduate Education*. The Academic Board gave in-principle support to the curriculum framework including the development of common components and four-year combined degree model in December 2015, noting that further proposals would come back for approval in the first half of 2016. These elements have now been developed further by the Generalist Undergraduate Degree and Specialist/Professional Undergraduate Degree working parties established by SEG in 2015 and the results of this consultation are presented for discussion and approval.

**IMPLEMENTATION**

Following discussion at SEG Education and the SEG, this proposal will be forwarded to the ASPC, Undergraduate Studies Committee and Academic Board for approval. Once agreement has been reached, the Education Portfolio will consult with faculties, and assist and provide resources for the development of revised and new degree resolutions reflecting the graduate qualities, common curriculum components and four-year combined degree model. These will be brought to CCPC, SEG Education, SEG, the Undergraduate Studies Committee and the Academic Board in August 2016 for approval by the end of the year, with the intention to introduce the new degrees in 2018. This recommendation provides the policy framework for the development of those programs.

**COMMUNICATION**

The new curriculum framework will be discussed at the Academic Board and in ongoing consultation between the Education Portfolio and faculties in revision of existing programs, creation of the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, writing of revised and new Degree Resolutions, and the embedding and assessment of the Graduate Qualities.

**ATTACHMENTS**

**Attachment 1** – Proposed amendments to the Coursework Policy  
**Attachment 2** – Proposed amendments to the Learning and Teaching Policy
5 Definitions

(1) In this policy:

**Bachelor of Advanced Studies** means the Bachelor degree available as a combined degree with every Liberal Studies and Specialist/Professional bachelor degree as set out in the degree resolutions.

**major** means a defined sequence of units of study, which develops depth of expertise in a field of study program of study, generally comprising specified units of study from the later stages of an award course as specified in Clause 18 of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

**minor** means a defined set of units of study, which develops coherent knowledge and skills in a field of study as set out in Clause 18 the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

**open learning environment** means a shared pool of units of study of 0, 2 or 6 credit points approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies and available to all students according to the degree resolutions of the award in which they are enrolled.

**program** each award course is composed of various units of study. The way the units are put together for an award course is referred to as a student’s ‘program’. Means a combination of units of study that develops expertise in a multi-disciplinary domain or professional or specialist field and includes at least one recognised major in a field of study as set out in clause 18 of the Learning and Teaching Policy.

**undergraduate degree** means an undergraduate award course at Bachelor level that achieves at least the earning outcomes specified for level 9 of the AQF. The University offers two types of Bachelor degrees:

- Liberal Studies Degrees: a program of study at Bachelor level of three years developing disciplinary expertise and broader skills
- Professional/Specialist Bachelor Degrees: a program of study at Bachelor level developing disciplinary or professional expertise for a specific profession or career specialisation and broader skills.

**unit of study** means the smallest stand-alone component of an award course that is recordable on a student’s transcript. Units of study have an integer credit point value, normally 6 credit points (except in the case of units in the open learning environment as defined in the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015).

Units of study are offered at different levels indicated by the first integer of the numeric part of the alpha numeric code, and are referred to as ‘1000’ level, ‘2000’ level.

**Note:** Further discussion of units of study and levels is contained in clause 18 of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.
PART 17 AWARD COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Note 50: To qualify for the award of a degree, diploma or certificate, a student must:
- complete the award course requirements prescribed in any relevant faculty resolutions and the course resolutions; and
- satisfy the requirements of the Coursework Rule and any applicable policy
See clause 5.1 of the Coursework Rule.

84 Bachelor degrees

(1) The Bachelor degree:
(a) is a program of liberal, specialist or professional learning and education; and
(b) builds on prior secondary or tertiary study.

(2) All Bachelor award courses will meet the requirements for Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees, or Specialist/Professional Bachelor Degrees, or the requirements of the Bachelor of Advanced Studies as set out in the degree resolutions.

(3) Award course requirements for Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees
(a) All students enrolled in a Liberal Studies Bachelor Degree must complete a total of 144 credit points including
   (i) the units of study in the degree core (to a maximum of 24 credit points);
   (ii) a major or a program from the degree’s list of available majors in degree resolutions;
   (iii) elective modules from the open learning environment (12 credit points); and
   (iv) a minor from a shared pool of minors offered across Liberal Studies degrees.
(b) Every Liberal Studies degree should offer the opportunity for students to complete:
   (i) a second major from a shared pool of majors offered across Liberal Studies degrees;
   (ii) elective units of study from a shared pool available across all Liberal Studies degrees;
   (iii) elective modules from a shared on-demand pool in the open learning environment (0-2 credit points, recognised on transcript); and
   (iv) combine the Liberal Studies degree with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies as set out in the degree resolutions for the Bachelor of Advanced Studies.

(4) Award course requirements for Specialist/Professional Bachelor Degree
(a) Every student must achieve a minimum of 144 credit points and demonstrate the graduate qualities.
(b) Specialist/Professional Bachelor degrees may offer the opportunity for students to complete a combined degree program with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies as set out in the degree resolutions for the Bachelor of Advanced Studies.

84A Masters by coursework

The Masters by coursework degree:...
6 Definitions

(1) In this policy:

**Bachelor of Advanced Studies** means the Bachelor degree available as a combined degree with every Liberal Studies and Specialist/Professional bachelor degree as set out in the degree resolutions.

**graduate qualities** are the qualities the University has agreed are necessary to contribute effectively to contemporary society as set out in Part 2 Section 7 of this policy.

**major** means the outcomes of a University of Sydney education. It is synonymous with the term graduate attributes.

**minor** means a defined set of units of study, which develops coherent knowledge and skills in a field of study.

**open learning environment** means a shared pool of units of study of 0, 2 or 6 credit points approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies and available to all students according to the degree resolutions of the award in which they are enrolled.

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

**undergraduate degree** means an undergraduate award course at Bachelor level that achieves at least the learning outcome specified for Level 7 of the AQF. The University offers two types of Bachelor degrees:

- **Liberal Studies Degrees**: a program of study at Bachelor level of three years developing disciplinary expertise and broader skills;
- **Professional/Specialist Bachelor Degrees**: a program of study at Bachelor level developing expertise and skills for a specific profession or career specialisation.

**unit of study** means the smallest stand-alone component of an award course that is recordable on a student’s transcript. Units of study have an integer credit point value, normally 6 credit points (except in the case of units in the open learning environment).

Units of study are offered at different levels indicated by the first integer of the numeric part of the alpha numeric code, and are referred to as ‘1000’ level, ‘2000’ level.

**Note:** Further discussion of units of study and levels is contained in clause 18.
16 Curriculum framework for undergraduate education

(1) The curriculum framework for new and revised undergraduate awards must include the following core components:…..

18 Components of award courses for undergraduate degrees

(1) A stream consists of a program of related units of study which are structured to provide the student with a depth of specialist knowledge of a discipline or field.

(2) Streams:
   (a) are identified by the name of the stream of the award;
   (b) are recorded on the testamur upon graduation;
   (c) apply to both senior and junior levels; and
   (d) are not restricted to a specific number of credit points.

(3) Streams can be conceptualised as separate pathways within an award course for admission purposes but are linked to a set of other streams within the award course through shared nomenclature, shared course components and/or shared rules. Examples of specialist award courses include: Civil Engineering; Physiotherapy; Music Performance; and Oral Health.

(4) A program must develop expertise in a multi-disciplinary domain or a professional field and include at least one major in a field of study.

Programs:
   (a) are a combination of units of study that develops expertise in a multi-disciplinary domain or a professional or specialist field and includes a recognised major in a field of study.
   (b) in undergraduate degrees, a program comprises up to $4 \times 1000$-level + $4 \times 2000$-level + $4 \times 3000$-level + $8 \times 4000$-level units ($\leq 24+24+24+48$ credit points) and includes:
      (i) an embedded major; and
      (ii) at least 2 units in any core degree block.
   (c) are recorded on the student transcript upon graduation.

(5) Majors:
   (a) comprise a defined number of units in a field of study including, for undergraduate award courses, at a minimum 36 credit points at 2000 and 3000 level; and
   (b) in undergraduate degree programs, comprise 8 units of study (48 credit points), of which two are at 1000-level and the eight units overall fit within the envelope of a major template of $2 \times 1000$-level + $3 \times 2000$-level + $4 \times 3000$-level units and include:
      (i) 1 unit at 3000-level involving completion of a project requiring the integration and application of disciplinary knowledge and skills; and
      (ii) 1 unit at 3000-level requiring the application of disciplinary skills and knowledge in an interdisciplinary context; and
      (iii) are recorded on the student transcript upon graduation.

(6) Minors:
   (a) comprise a defined number of units of study in a field of study sequence of units of study that develops foundational expertise in a field of study.
   (b) in undergraduate degree programs, comprise 6 units of study (36 credit points), of which two are at 1000-level and the six units overall fit within the envelope of a major template of $2 \times 1000$-level + $3 \times 2000$-level + $2 \times 3000$-level units; and
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(c) are recorded on the student transcript at the completion of the award course.

(7) **A Degree core**

(a) is a set of units of study that develops required knowledge and skills for the degree.

(b) in Liberal Studies undergraduate degree, comprises no more than 4 units of study at 1000-, 2000 or 3000-level (≤ 24 credit points).

(8) **A capstone experience** should be integrative, foster student autonomy and, where appropriate, include a cross-disciplinary perspective.

**Note:** See [Coursework Policy 2014](#).

(9) **Combined degrees and double degrees** must meet the learning outcomes of both component award courses.

(a) All Liberal Studies and Specialist/Professional bachelor degrees may be combined with the Bachelor of Advanced studies as set out in the degree resolutions.

(10) Award courses may achieve depth and breadth of learning by the specification of core units and elective units.

(a) Units of study may be specified as core units if the faculty determines them to be essential to achieve the learning outcomes of the award course, major or specialisation. Core units must be completed by all students enrolled in the award course, relevant major or specialisation.

(b) Elective units are units chosen by students in order to extend their degree requirements according to their need or interests and contribute to graduate qualities. Electives are chosen from a list defined by the faculty and approved by the Academic Board.

(11) **Units of study**

(a) Units of study follow a programmed set of coherent learning experiences that lead progressively to the achievement of the learning outcomes for the unit.

(b) Units of study must be completed over one or two teaching sessions.

(c) Faculties must define learning outcomes for each unit of study which are aligned with those of the award courses in which the unit of study is offered and those of other components of award courses of which it is a part.

(d) Except in the case of ‘shell’ units, used for students undertaking study at another institution and other purposes, the learning outcomes, requirements and assessment of a unit of study must be the same for all students taking that unit of study, regardless of the award course in which they are enrolled.

(e) Student transcripts and student record files must record a single result and a single credit point value for each unit of study attempted by a student.

(f) Units of study are given an alpha-numeric code of which the first four letters indicate are a code assigned to the school, department or discipline with responsibility for offering the unit, and the final four integers are a unique number identifying the unit and the level at which it is offered.

(g) The final four integers of the alpha-numeric code commence with a number that indicates the level.

(i) ‘1000’ level units are units with the generic alphanumeric code ****1xxx and indicate a unit with learning outcomes of a foundational or introductory nature designed for students in the first year of an undergraduate degree.

(ii) ‘2000’ level units are units with the generic alphanumeric code ****2xxx and indicate a unit with learning outcomes which build on prior foundational or introductory study designed for students who have completed in the first year of an undergraduate degree.

(iii) ‘3000’ level units are units with the generic alphanumeric code ****3xxx and indicate a unit with learning outcomes designed for students in the final or third year of an undergraduate degree.
degree. Such units should enable students to demonstrate learning outcomes at a level expected for those completing an initial undergraduate degree.

(iv) ‘4000’ level units are units with the generic alphanumeric code ****4xxx and indicate advanced or honours units with learning outcomes designed for students who have already achieved the learning outcomes of students for a pass-level bachelor degree.

(v) ‘5000’ and ‘6000’ level units are units with the generic alphanumeric code ****5xxx and ****6xxx and indicate units with learning outcomes for the first and second year respectively of a postgraduate award course.

(12) Credit points and student workload

(a) Credit points measure the relative quantitative contribution of a unit of study to an award course.

(b) The full time credit point load for undergraduate and postgraduate coursework award courses is 24 credit points per semester, or 12 credit points for summer session and six credit points for the winter session. A full time credit point load for a year is 48 credit points equating to a student workload of 1500 -1800 hours per year including class time, private study and assessment preparation.

(c) The normal credit point load for a unit of study is six credit points (except in the case of units offered in the open learning environment).

(d) Units of study shared across different award courses and between different faculties must have the same credit point value in every course.

(e) Where units of study are core units in more than one award course, faculties must design units of study to meet the learning needs of students in all award courses for which the unit is a core unit.

(f) The relationship between the level of student effort in a unit of study and the credit point value of that unit must take account of all courses sharing that unit of study.

(g) Faculties must consider overall student workload in assigning credit point value as follows:

(h) 24 credit points equates to the effort expected of a full-time student, studying 36 – 48 hours per week or pro-rata for part-time students.

(i) A single credit point should therefore equate notionally to a minimum expectation of 1.5 – 2 hours of student effort per week for units of study offered over a semester.

(j) Flexibility between different units may be exercised in the allocation of credit point value to accommodate any tensions between the duration of core learning experiences and their perceived importance in achieving learning outcomes for the award course.

(k) Faculties introducing new units of study with a credit point value other than six must inform the Academic Board, explaining the rationale for deviating from the standard and addressing issues of compatibility.

(13) On academic grounds, a faculty may propose to the Undergraduate or Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board units of study with 0, 1 or 2 credit points.

(14) Units offered in the open learning environment must be 0, 2 or 6 credit points.

(15) Teaching sessions

(a) Teaching and learning in award courses must take place in standard teaching sessions or in special teaching sessions determined by faculties in a faculty calendar and approved by the Academic Board.

(b) The standard teachings sessions are first semester, second semester summer session and winter session.

(c) A semester comprises 13 weeks of programmed learning, one study week and 1 - 2 weeks for examination and assignment preparation.

(d) University semester dates, and dates for summer and winter sessions and teaching blocks must be approved by the Academic Board.
(e) A faculty may offer teaching in sessions that vary from those specified in the University Calendar, subject to the approval of the Academic Board.
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**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Undergraduate Studies Committee note the proposed Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016, and further note that a final version will be submitted to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee and Academic Board in June 2016.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In December 2015, the Academic Board approved the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 and noted that Procedures accompanying the Policy would be forthcoming. The Procedures update course approval processes in line with procedure agreed by the Academic Board.

**BACKGROUND / CONTEXT**

In December 2015, the Academic Board approved the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 drawing together a range of prior policies including the Management and Evaluation of Teaching Policy and the Creation, Variation and Deletion of Award Courses and Units of Study Policy. The Learning and Teaching Policy also incorporated the graduate qualities and some elements of the curriculum framework enunciated in the discussion paper “Towards a distinctive undergraduate education” (June 2015).

The Procedures were considered by the SEG Education Committee on 11 April along with proposed changes to the Coursework Policy and the Learning and Teaching Policy made in line with the Education Strategy 2016-2020. Following that discussion the current procedures have been amended to clarify that the decision as to whether a Bachelor degree is of the Liberal Studies type or the Professional/Specialist type is one which is made by the faculty and approved by the Academic Board. A final version of the procedures will come to the June meeting of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee.

**ISSUES**

The Procedures update course approval process to include a description of the role of the Curriculum Course and Profile Committee of SEG. This was agreed by the Academic Board but had not previously been described in Policy. Some parts of the Learning and Teaching Policy have been moved to the Procedures in line with recommendations made at the time of approval of the Policy in December 2015. If adopted consequent changes to the Policy deleting those items will be presented. Since other changes are being proposed to the Learning and Teaching Policy as part of implementing the curriculum framework of the Education Strategy, these have not been included in this proposal in order not to confuse the other issues with procedural changes.

The proposed Procedures accommodate changes in governance made under a separate proposal relating to governance of the Bachelor of Advanced Studies and interdisciplinary components in the undergraduate curriculum framework of the strategic plan.
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These changes are in Attachment 1.

CONSULTATION

The Learning and Teaching Policy was developed by a working party and approved by the Academic Board in December 2015. This paper is part of the consultation for the development of the Procedures for that policy.

IMPLEMENTATION

Following discussion at the SEG Education Committee, the proposed Procedures will be forwarded to the original Learning and Teaching Working Party, the Academic Standards and Policy Committee, the Undergraduate Studies Committee and the Graduate Studies Committee and Academic Board for endorsement. After this process they will be adopted by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education) as the Policy Manager.

COMMUNICATION

The Procedures will be communicated as part of the communication strategy for the revisions to the Learning and Teaching Policy 2014.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Learning and Teaching Procedures
LEARNING AND TEACHING PROCEDURES 2016

Part 1 Preliminary

1 Purpose and application

(1) These procedures are to give effect to the Learning and Teaching Policy ("the policy").

(2) Except to the extent that a contrary intention is expressed, these procedures bind the University, staff, students and affiliates.

2 Commencement

These procedures commence on the day after the date on which they are registered.

3 Interpretation

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

Note: See Clause 6 of the policy.

Award name stem means

CCPC means the Curriculum and Course Planning Committee

Part 2 The nature of education at the University of Sydney

4 Learning environment

(1) Standards are monitored and set by the DVC Education portfolio. At the time of writing, learning space standards were available at http://sydney.edu.au/elearning/learningSpace/standards.shtml

Part 3 Curriculum Structure

5 Award courses

(1) The title of an award course must include the qualification type and the discipline.

(2) All award course titles must include an award name stem giving the qualification type and discipline.

(3) Award course titles may also include a stream in brackets following the stem title.
Bachelor award courses must be either Liberal Studies degrees or Professional/Specialist degrees: Masters award courses must be either advanced learning degrees by coursework, professional degrees by coursework, or degrees by research.

6 Role of the Curriculum and Course Planning Committee

(1) The Curriculum and Course Planning Committee (CCPC):
   (a) reviews the business case for all new course proposals from faculties with a view to encouraging collaboration between faculties and assessing financial viability, load implications and fit for the wider University strategy.
   (b) provides advice to SEG to assist in its deliberations over whether to endorse the course for consideration by the Academic Board.

(2) In reviewing and recommending a new course proposal the CCPC must consider:
   (i) strategic positioning,
   (ii) how a proposal will meet faculty and University goals,
   (iii) how it maximises potential internal collaborations,
   (iv) its load implications and
   (v) financial sustainability; and
   (b) recommends the endorsement of new courses to the Senior Executive Group.

7 Role of Academic Board

(1) Subject to endorsement by Senate, the Academic Board approves award courses and other matters as determined in the Coursework Policy 2014 and set out in award course resolutions and tables of units of study

(2) The Academic Board may provide advice on all matters relating to the University courses and units of study.

(3) In approving a course, the Academic Board must consider the:
   (a) academic need for and merit of the proposed change;
   (b) aims of the program;
   (c) the learning outcomes of the program, and the effectiveness of the plan for the outcomes to be developed and assessed.
   (d) the alignment of the learning outcomes with the graduate qualities approved by the Academic Board, and the manner by which the graduate qualities will be developed and assessed.
   (e) extent to which a proposed change has been the subject of appropriate consultation and approval within faculties and between all faculties having an academic interest in the proposed change, and with external bodies regarding accreditation;
(f) consistency of the proposal with relevant university and other relevant policies and regulation;

(g) potential impact of the proposed new course or change on university resources including the library, central information technology resources and the resources of other faculties and schools department; and

(h) presence of appropriate mechanisms to evaluate the quality delivery and academic outcomes of the proposal and to make any improvements if required.

(4) The Academic Board will normally receive proposals from its standing committees with a recommendation to approve the new course or changes.

(5) Chairs of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies Committees of Academic Board may form small working parties to consider proposals.

8 Creation, amendment and deletion of award courses and units of study

(1) When considering the introduction of a new course, the amendment of an existing course, or the deletion of an existing course or unit of study, faculties must:

(a) give adequate notification of changes given to all other faculties, including those which are offering award courses in which the unit of study is listed in the unit of study table;

(b) submit the proposal for new courses by the deadlines specified by the Academic Board and the Course and Curriculum Planning Committee

Note: the deadlines for new course submissions are given at:


(c) submit proposal that are not for new courses in time to meet requirements for inclusion in

(i) the following year’s faculty handbook;

Note: see also Clause 9 (9)

(d) consult the Curriculum and Course Planning Committee website for submission requirements, the approval process, and relevant dates; and

(e) use the approved templates for:

(i) expression of interest; and

(ii) course management.

(2) Faculties must also consider the implications for students enrolled in existing courses who may be affected by the changes and include detailed information the transitional arrangements which will apply for student already in the course in the proposal.

(3) No student can be disadvantaged by the deletion of an existing course.

9 Levels of approval

(1) The following approval process relates to all coursework award courses.
(2) Units of Study
(a) Unit coordinators recommend and faculties approve all additions, modifications or deletions to units of study under the academic direction of the faculty as they relate to award courses governed by the faculty (including interdisciplinary units within this category).
(b) Faculties recommend and the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies approves the inclusion of units of study that are under the faculty’s academic direction in the shared pool of units of study available across all liberal studies degrees.
(c) The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education) recommends, and the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies approves units of study that are not under the direction of a faculty, and the inclusion of such units in the shared pool of units of study available across all liberal studies degree.
(d) Faculties or the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education) recommend, and the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies approves units of study in the Open Learning Environment, the Sydney Research Seminars and interdisciplinary units offered to students in all liberal studies degrees, or to all students in any degree.
(e) Faculties and the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies must report approved variations to units to the shared pool of units available across all generalist degrees to the Undergraduate or Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board as appropriate.

(3) Majors and Minors
(a) Faculties recommend and the Academic Board approves the creation or deletion of a major or minor within an award course governed by the faculty.
(b) The Board of Interdisciplinary Studies recommends and the Academic Board approves the list of majors and minors available in the Bachelor of Advanced Studies or in the shared pool of majors and minors available to all generalist degrees

(4) Faculties or the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies recommend and the Academic Board approves:
(a) new award courses, including combined and double degrees;
(b) in the case of bachelor and masters degrees, the type of bachelor degree (liberal studies or professional/specialist degrees) or the type of masters degree (advanced learning by coursework, professional by coursework, research);
(c) alterations to existing award courses;
(d) Tables of Units of Study referred to in Degree Resolutions;
(e) substantial revision to the academic content of an award course;
(f) changes having an impact on the study options available to prospective students; and
(g) changes to the mode of delivery of a course or unit of study.

Note: Changes to the mode of delivery include changes from face to face, or blended learning to fully online learning; changes of location from a University campus to an campus operated by a third party, and changes from onshore to offshore delivery.

(5) The terms of reference of Academic Board Standing Committees must specify

(a) the functions it has the authority to approve
(b) the functions it has the authority to recommend to faculty board
(c) monitoring and oversight responsibilities
(d) any other functions

(6) The Academic Board only considers course proposals that have been endorsed by faculty boards or standing committees and by SEG.

(7) Faculty approved variations must be reported to the Undergraduate or Graduate studies Committee as appropriate and simultaneously with the finalisation of unit of study master file for the following year.

(8) Preliminary approval may be requested for new award course or changes to existing award course where proposed changes may affect students’ subject choices for Year 11 and year 12 (for example, the establishment of a pre-requisite). This provision reflects the long lead time required to give notice to year 10 students about changes to University admission requirements.

10 Course approval process

(1) All proposals for new courses require the early submission of an Expression of Interest to the SEG Curriculum and Course Planning Committee.

(2) The University has established the following process for the approval of new courses:

(a) submission by the faculty of an Expression of Interest (EOI) prior to commencement of course development. The EOI will

(i) include the strategic rationale for introducing the course and a brief outline of the business case; and

(ii) assist in flagging potential issues at the commencement of the development phase.

(b) the Dean of the faculty or their delegate presents the Expression of Interest to the CCPC;

(c) the CCPC considers the Expression of Interest and recommends it to SEG for endorsement;

(d) the faculty proceeds with the development of the full course proposal, using the Course Management Template.

Note: the Course Management Template is available on the Academic Board website at [http://sydney.edu.au/ab/committees/courses.shtml](http://sydney.edu.au/ab/committees/courses.shtml)
(e) the Dean of the faculty, or their delegate, submits the full business case for the proposal to CCPC for review;

(f) the proposal, including strategic alignment, maximising internal collaboration, financial viability, and load impacts is reviewed by the CCPC who make a recommendation to SEG;

(g) the proposal is reviewed and endorsed by SEG;

(h) the proposal is reviewed by either the Undergraduate Studies Committee or the Graduate Studies Committee and referred to the Academic Board for review and approval.

(i) the proposal is reviewed and approved by the Academic Board.

(3) Course amendments and deletions are approved by the Academic Board after consideration by the relevant standing committee of the Academic Board.

(4) Major course amendments are considered by the Academic Board and its standing committees according to the same procedure as for new course proposals but are not required to be considered by CCPC and SEG.

(5) No course or unit of study may be advertised or offered until it has been approved.

11 Time scales and key dates

(1) Proposed changes requiring approval by the Academic Board will be considered at any time.

(2) The time scale for approval is dependent upon the calendar of meeting dates for the Curriculum and Course Planning Committee, and of the relevant Academic Board standing committee (Undergraduate or Graduate Studies) and the following meeting of the Academic Board. The Calendar of meeting dates is published on the internet at:

(a) Academic Board: http://sydney.edu.au/ab/about/dates.shtml

(b) Undergraduate Studies Committee: http://sydney.edu.au/ab/committees/UG_studies/meeting_dates.shtml

(c) Graduate Studies Committee: http://sydney.edu.au/ab/committees/grad_studies/grad_studies_mtg_dates.shtml

(d) Curriculum and Course Planning Committee (CCPC): http://s1.sydney.edu.au/staff/planning/internal/ccpc/index.php

(3) It is the responsibility of faculty managers and deans to monitor the calendar of meeting dates, to take account of the consideration of proposals by working parties, and to ensure that approvals are in place by appropriate key dates.

(4) Key dates are normally established by the Academic Board and the CCPC, and include:

(a) cut-off date for notification to Year 10 students of changes that may impact on the selection of HSC subjects (e.g. changes to, or introduction of, assumed knowledge, recommended studies and/or flexible entry criteria). Proposals of this kind may be the subject of Preliminary Approval by the Provost [normally, 34 months prior to the introduction of the change];
(b) cut-off date for the UAC Guide for admissions in the subsequent calendar year [normally, 10 months prior to the introduction of the change]; and

(c) finalisation of the Units of Study Master File for the subsequent year [normally, by the end of September in the year preceding the year in which the change will apply]. After this date the Units of Study Master File may be altered only with the approval of the Registrar.

12 Course approval documentation

(1) Faculties are required to complete the Academic Board approved templates for:

(a) Expressions of Interest for new and amended courses; and

(b) Course management proposals for new courses of study, amendments to existing courses of study and the deletion of a course of study are submitted.

(2) Templates and information about the completion of the templates can be found at http://s1.sydney.edu.au/staff/planning/internal/ccpc/index.php#expofint

Part 4 Management and evaluation of learning and teaching

13 Roles and responsibilities

(1) Academic Performance and Development supervisors are responsible for the management of the overall performance of academic staff within their academic area. They ensure that academic staff are achieving the expected standards of performance, including teaching.

(2) Unit of study coordinators

(a) There is one named unit of study coordinator per unit of study.

(b) Unit of study coordinators must be available for the whole of the teaching period in which a unit of study is being provided.

(c) The unit of study coordinator who is intending an absence of one month or more must ensure that the head of department is informed that alternative arrangements should be put in place.

(d) Where an absence is foreseeable, the unit of study coordinator must notify the head of department at least one month before the intended departure date so that appropriate alternate arrangements can be put in place.

(e) If the unit of study coordinator is leaving the University, the head of department must appoint another unit of study coordinator and inform all members of academic staff who teach the unit in question.

14 Documentation and communication

(1) This part of the procedures states

(a) the standards for institutional record keeping;

(b) appropriate standards for communicating with students and staff; and

(c) managing the development of units of study, curricula and award courses.

(2) The University will publish at least annually:
(a) a University Calendar, which must publish at a minimum:
   (i) Rules made by Senate; and
   (ii) Resolutions of Senate relating to faculties and award courses.

(b) faculty handbooks, which must contain, at a minimum:
   (i) the faculty teaching calendar for the year;
   (ii) a description of the requirements for each award course offered by the faculty, including learning outcomes and curriculum;
   (iii) award course resolutions approved by the Academic Board for each award course offered by the faculty;
   (iv) faculty resolutions approved by the Academic Board for each award course offered by the faculty;
   (v) any local provisions in the faculty relating to University policy and procedures;
   (vi) a brief description of assessment and pre- and co-requisites for each unit of study offered by the faculty; and
   (vii) a description of the faculty structure, including schools, disciplines and departments.

(3) The University will maintain and publish a register of all current university policies and procedures.

Note: See the Policy Register and the University of Sydney (Policies Development and Review) Rule 2011.

(4) The Academic Board may make course resolutions which must specify, as a minimum:
   (a) the course code;
   (b) attendance patterns;
   (c) requirements for admission to candidature;
   (d) requirements for the award course, including credit point values, units of study that may be taken for credit, mandatory units of study;
   (e) streams available in the award course;
   (f) programs available in the award course;
   (g) majors available in the award course;
   (h) minors available in the award course;
   (i) degree core for the award course;
   (j) requirements for streams, majors and minors;
   (k) progression rules;
(l) restrictions on enrolment;
(m) time limits, if different from those specified in the faculty resolutions;
(n) cross institutional study or exchange, if not as specified in the faculty resolutions;
(o) requirements for admission to, and for the award of honours, if available;
(p) award of the degree including grades of the degree or grades of honours that may be awarded; and
(q) any transitional arrangements relating to the resolutions.

(5) Subject to Academic Board approval, faculties may make resolutions applying to all degrees within a certain category awarded by the faculty. These may include resolutions on:
(a) course enrolment, including enrolment restrictions, time limits, suspension, discontinuation and lapse of candidature, and recognition of prior learning;
(b) unit of study enrolment, including cross-institutional study, and international exchange;
(c) study and assessment, including attendance and participation, late submission, and arrangements, if any, for assessment;
(d) progression and award, including satisfactory progress, awards, award and grades of honours, medals, weighted average marks used in addition to the provisions of the Coursework Policy 2014; and
(e) transitional arrangements.

(6) The faculty must provide a degree outline for inclusion in the faculty handbook which contains at a minimum:
(a) the degree’s intended learning outcomes;
(b) the approved minimum learning commitments;
(c) the approved learning experiences;
(d) the assessment process and standards for the degree; and
(e) the expected prior learning.

(7) The faculty must provide a description of the award for the Australian Higher Education Statement (AHEGS).

(8) Unit of study coordinators, together with the faculty, must provide a unit of study website on the Learning Management System (LMS) which contains, at a minimum, the unit of study outline and relevant curriculum resources.

(a) Unit of study outlines and the LMS website must be available to students enrolled in the unit no later than one week prior to the commencement of the teaching session in which the unit is offered.

(b) The LMS website must contain the following information regarding the unit of study:
   (i) an introduction and rationale for the unit;
(ii) the aims and learning outcomes;

(iii) the contribution that the aims and learning outcomes of the unit make to the learning outcomes and graduate qualities for the award course;

(iv) an outline of the curriculum for the unit and a schedule of learning activities (lectures, seminars, tutorials, workshops, practicals, laboratories, online learning, field trips, work placement, independent study, other);

(v) minimum learning commitments and attendance requirements for learning activities, and guidelines on time to be allowed for private study and assessment preparation;

(vi) the assessment process, standards and criteria, including a detailed breakdown of each assessment task, its contribution to the final mark, deadlines and closing dates for submission of work;

(vii) any relevant expectations relating to group work, professionalism in work-integrated learning situations and other matters;

(viii) any penalties that apply for poor attendance, late submission;

(ix) mandatory or recommended prior learning;

Note: This information should also be provided to prospective students as early as possible through the University’s Find a course website.

(x) reference to relevant University policies, including as a minimum, procedures for Special Consideration in the Coursework Policy, Assessment Procedures, and Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy;

(xi) a notification to students indicating that participation in the unit of study permits their learning analytics to be used for the purpose of improving their experience of learning;

(xii) information, where relevant, about the recording of lectures delivered and automatically recorded in University owned lecture theatres;

(xiii) the use of the text-matching tool [similarity detecting software] on the University’s LMS for student text-based assignments;

(xiv) changes made to the unit as a result of student feedback and student experience from the previous time the unit was offered; and

(c) The LMS must be designed to include a capacity for the online submission of written assignments and, for text-based assignments, a capacity for these to be checked with similarity detection software.

(d) Unit of study outlines may also contain, where appropriate, assignment questions and assessment tasks.

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

(f) Read-only access to LMS sites for units of study must be given to:
(i) students;
(ii) unit of study coordinators;
(iii) all teachers and tutors in the course;
(iv) any others specified by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).

Note: the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) has determined that the following shall be by given access to unit of study LMS sites. Access by such staff is limited to the purpose stated.

(v) Library staff to facilitate availability of library resources related to the unit of study;

(vi) Educational Integrity Coordinators for purposes of conducting an investigation under the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy and Procedure

(vii) Staff of the Disability Support Office for purposes of recommending adjustments to students registered with the Office as having a disability.

(g) Editing access to LMS sites for units of study must be provided to those specified by the unit of study coordinator.

(9) The faculty office must:

(a) communicate the unit of study curriculum as documented in the unit of study outline to relevant colleagues;

(b) communicate the unit of study curriculum to prospective students through a handbook that contains:
   (i) a brief description;
   (ii) assessment;
   (iii) pre- and co-requisites;
   (iv) the relationship of the unit of study to the overall degree learning outcomes and experience.

15 Unit of study outlines

(1) Schools are responsible for providing information about a unit of study to all students and prospective students.

(2) Unit of study outlines will be available prior to the commencement of the teaching session in which it is being taught.

(3) The minimum standard requirement for a unit of study outline is:
   (a) a concise statement of the learning outcomes of the unit of study;
   (b) a list of unit objectives expressed in terms of how that knowledge will be assessed;
   (c) a concise statement of the links between learning outcomes and graduate qualities;
(d) a brief description of the contribution to the unit of study of the different programs of study in which the students may be enrolled;

(e) information about academic integrity and the checking of written assignments through similarity detection software;

(f) links to compulsory modules relating to academic honesty;

(g) advice on attendance and class requirements, the methods of assessment to be used and the weighting of each assessment;

(h) basic factual information regarding names and contact details of teaching and administrative staff.

16 Academic records

(1) Upon each student’s graduation the University provides:

(a) a graduation statement (Australian Higher Education Graduation Statement) which must contain, at a minimum:

   (i) a description of the award;

   (ii) any industry or professional accreditation; and

   (iii) any other relevant outcomes.

(b) an academic transcript which is a complete record of a student’s studies at the university. It states:

   (i) the award course;

   (ii) any specialisation, stream, major or minor achieved;

   (iii) each unit of study attempted with the semester and year of the attempt, the credit point value, the mark and the grade; and

   (iv) where relevant, the grade of the degree and the grade of Honours awarded.

(c) a certificate of graduate status which lists the degree name and graduation date but not the units of study.

(d) a degree statement (testamur) which is the legal certification of the student’s degree. It states:

   (i) the degree awarded;

   (ii) the authority under which it is awarded

   (iii) the title of the award

   (iv) the name of the student to whom it is awarded;

   (v) the date of conferral;

   (vi) any specialisation or major; and

   (vii) where relevant, the grade of the degree or of honours awarded.

17 Learning environment management for third-party learning technologies.

(1) Third-party learning technologies:
(a) are web-based and mobile applications that are not managed through a contract between the University and technology suppliers;
(b) allow individuals and groups to create, engage, and share their learning experience and outcomes in the context of their programs and units of study; and
(c) are used to trial new educational functions for the improvement of the student experience.

(2) Ownership, use and influences of third-party learning technologies

(a) The appropriate ownership, use and influence of third-party learning technologies in the curriculum depends on the content in which they are employed.
(b) Ownership and risk management strategies are shared by those responsible for the introduction and use of the third-party learning technology: the University, teachers and students.

(3) Risk management of third-party learning technologies

(a) Third-party learning should not be used for assessment purposes.
(b) When the University introduces a third-party learning technology as part of the students' learning environment, it will be responsible for:
   (i) an appropriate strategy to deal with support of the system; and
   (ii) the retrieval and storage of student activity generated by the system.
(c) When unit of study co-ordinators introduce a third-party learning technology, they:
   (i) will be responsible for an appropriate strategy to deal with support of the system and for the retrieval and storage of student activity generated by that system;
   (ii) should provide information to students on the educational purpose for the use of the system; and
   (iii) register the use of that system with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) portfolio.

(4) Trialling and evaluation strategies must accompany the use of third-party learning technologies to inform the progress and use of such systems at local, faculty and University levels of operation.

Part 5 Quality assurance processes

18 Evaluation of the student experience

(1) Excellence of the student experience is evaluated through surveys of the student experience at three levels:

(a) the degree or program level;
(b) the unit of study level; and
(c) the individual teacher level.
Degree or program level feedback is captured from both current students and recent graduates through two national surveys, the Student Experience Survey (SES); and the Australian Graduate Survey (AGS). Educational data analytics from these surveys are reported by the Education Portfolio Quality and Analytics Team to the wider university community, including, but not limited to:

(a) Senior Executive Group Education and Research Training Committees;
(b) Academic Board;
(c) Graduate Studies Committee of Academic Board;
(d) Undergraduate Studies Committee of Academic Board;
(e) Faculty Deans, Associate Deans and appropriate boards and committees.

Unit of study level feedback is captured through the Unit of Study Survey (USS).

(a) The USS is administered online, using Sydney Student data to generate the list of units of study to be surveyed each teaching session, and to access the contact details of students enrolled in them.

Note: Units with less than five students enrolled will not be surveyed. This is to protect student anonymity.
(b) The USS includes 6 common quantitative items, and 2 common qualitative items and up to four faculty specific quantitative item and one qualitative item.
(c) For each unit of study, a faculty administrator is responsible for
   (i) checking that the unit of study coordinator details are correct;
   (ii) setting appropriate open and close dates for the survey; and
   (iii) indicating which faculty specific variant of the USS is to be used.
(d) Unit of study coordinators must check the details of the survey (sent as a pre-notification email two weeks prior to the survey open date. Changes should be requested through the faculty administrator.
(e) Students are emailed an invitation to participate in the USS on the survey open date. A reminder email will be emailed to all students who have not already completed the survey one week after the survey opens.
(f) Teachers may allow time in class for students to complete the survey on their smartphone, tablet or laptop.
(g) Unit of study coordinators will receive an email notification on the survey open date, and then an update one week later.
(h) Results are made available to the unit of study coordinators, the Dean, the Associate Dean, Education and other nominees of the Dean via the USS results portal.
(i) Results are made available to students. Coordinators can write a comment in response to the ratings and comments given by their students before results are released to students.
(j) Changes made to the unit as a result of student feedback and student experience from the previous time the unit was offered must be included in the LMS website for the unit of study.

19 Reviews of faculties and academic units

(1) The Academic Board and the Senior Executive Group jointly oversee reviews of faculties and academic units.

(2) One of the foci of the reviews is teaching and learning, including curriculum development and research training.

(3) The review process consists of the following stages:

(a) Initiation of the review
(b) Appointment of a review panel
(c) Review visit preparation
(d) Submission by the faculty of a self-evaluation report
(e) Review panel meetings
   (i) Preliminary
   (ii) Consensus
   (iii) Review
(f) Report of the review meeting, prepared by the Provost’s Office, in consultation with the review panel
(g) Development of an implementation plan.

Note: At the time of writing, information about Faculty Review visits is available at http://sydney.edu.au/ab/faculty_review/abr_phase4.shtml

(4) Terms of reference for Academic Board/SEG reviews of Faculties

(a) The aim of this review is to ensure the capacity of faculties to deliver teaching and learning, research and the best outcomes for society at the highest possible standard, and in a manner that is academically and financially sustainable and aligned with the University’s strategic goals.

(b) To achieve these aims the panel is asked to:

   (i) review and report on the faculty’s goals, strategy and achievements in relation to:
   (ii) teaching and learning, including curriculum development and research training,
   (iii) research and development,
   (iv) external relations,
   (v) equity issues, and
(vi) internationalisation;
(vii) assess and report on the alignment of the faculty’s goals with the University’s strategic plan;
(viii) assess and report on the allocation of resources within the faculty and the faculty’s strategies for managing and/or improving its financial performance in relation to teaching, research, other sources of income and controls on expenditure;
(ix) assess and report on the effectiveness of its organisational structure in delivering upon strategy and achieving the faculty’s goals;
(x) make recommendations on the optimisation of teaching, research and benefit to society with respect to the faculty’s goals, strategy, resource allocation and sustainability; and
(xi) assess and make recommendations on the faculty’s course profile in terms of academic excellence, demand, quality, and sustainability.

(5) Membership of the review panel

(a) The review panels will contain five members, plus the chair, and be appointed jointly by the Provost and the Chair of the Academic Board (who reserve the right if they so choose to sit on a review committee or appoint their nominee for the committee). If appropriate an additional two members may be appointed.

(b) Three senior academics with disciplinary knowledge and/or management knowledge relevant to the faculty under review, at least two of whom should be external to the University of Sydney.

(c) A senior academic from within the faculty under review who is not the dean or an associate/pro-dean.

(d) A member of the Academic Board nominated by the Chair of the Academic Board.

20 Evaluation of learning environment

(1) The quality of the educational environment is measured through student and teacher evaluations of learning spaces.

(2) Information about the evaluation of learning spaces can be found at http://sydney.edu.au/elearning/metrics/evaluation.shtml
RECOMMENDATION

That the Undergraduate Studies Committee consider and provide comment on the attached Academic Honesty Procedures 2016.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy was approved in 2015. In 2016 a working party was established to develop accompanying procedures to this policy. Whereas the Policy related to coursework students, and those higher degree by research students undertaking coursework units of study, the procedures have been expanded to cover academic honesty, code breaches and academic integrity in relation to higher degree by research students and their theses.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

One of the recommendations of the taskforce into Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism last year was to write a single set of Procedures that would encompass both Coursework Policy (the new Academic Honesty Policy in Coursework which was approved by the Academic Board last December) and Procedures relating to HDR students. The taskforce identified the current separation of academic honesty provisions for HDR students in several different policies as a risk and Margaret Faedo pointed us to some research which identified policy fragmentation as a demonstrated risk factor.

The Policy Manager made recommendations to the Working Party regarding the movement of parts of the existing policy to procedures.

Work on assessment types risk evaluation in relation to academic integrity, and the work of the SEG Research Training Committee sub-group on academic integrity was incorporated into the procedures.

Work on drafting the procedures commenced in February 2016.

NOTES TO ACCOMPANY PROCEDURES

The Working Party is pleased to present to the Committee the Academic Honesty Procedures. As recommended in the task force report, these procedures include procedures specific to higher degree by research students.

When reading the procedures, members of the committee should note the following clauses that are highlighted for consideration and discussion:

Clause 15: Process for handling suspected academic dishonesty, code breaches or research misconduct at probationary milestone or during candidature:

15 (1) Note 21 (1) of the Research Code: “Allegations of research misconduct should be made to the Director of Research Integrity and if received elsewhere must be referred to the Director of Research Integrity.” 15 (1) –(3) proposes that allegations are made on the online reporting tool and considered in the first instance by the Associate Dean, although the Associate Dean is still required to forward any case of suspected research misconduct to the Director of Research Integrity. An individual still
Non-Confidential

has the right to report a case direction to the Director of Research Integrity but this is not specifically stated Question: is this clause compliant with the Research Code of Conduct?.

Note: adopting this clause will require some adjustment to the Thesis and Examination Policy. At the moment the reason given for declining to examine (13 (7)) of the Thesis and Examination Policy does not include academic dishonesty and the Associate Dean does not have authority to recommend it. This will require an adjustment if adopted.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee consider and discuss the attached Academic Honesty Procedures and provide feedback to Rachel Symons (rachel.symons@sydney.edu.au) by May 20th 2016
ACADEMIC HONESTY PROCEDURES
2016
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PART 1 - PRELIMINARY

1 Purpose and application

(1) These procedures are to give effect to the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy ("the policy").

(2) These procedures apply to:

(a) staff and affiliates;
(b) all students enrolled in a coursework award course;
(c) all higher degree by research students; and
(d) non-award students, exchange students and study abroad students in a unit of study at the University.

2 Commencement

These procedures commence on [date] or the day after the date on which they are registered.

PART 2 - DEFINITIONS

3 Interpretation

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

Note: see clause 6 of the policy.

Note: In these procedures, the term “the Policy” refers to the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy. All other policies mentioned in the procedures will be referred to by their title.
administrative unit means the central University administrative unit responsible for the processes of candidature management

Associate Dean Research means the Associate Dean of a faculty with authority for matters relating to higher degrees by research within the faculty, or the Deputy Chairperson of a Board of Studies, or a person appointed by the Dean to have authority for matters relating to higher degrees by research within the faculty.

Submission check means

PART 3 – COURSEWORK STUDENTS

4 Education in academic honesty and discipline specific requirements

(1) Students should be educated in the academic writing and referencing conventions of their discipline at an early stage in the first semester of the award course in which they are enrolled.

(2) All students commencing a new coursework degree code after 1 January 2016 must complete an online education module on Academic Honesty in their first semester of enrolment, unless they have completed the module or an equivalent course approved by the Office of Educational Integrity in the previous ten calendar years.

(3) For the purpose of these procedures, a new degree code includes:

(a) students commencing a new degree;
(b) students transferring degrees within the University or from another institution;
(c) exchange students;
(d) non-degree students;
(e) students commencing honours, where honours is a different code; and
(f) students in a combined degree program where the degree code changes during candidature.

(4) Students who do not complete the module in their first semester of enrolment:

(a) must undertake the module in a subsequent semester; and
(b) will have the result recorded on the academic transcript as a fail.

(5) Students who do not complete the module in the second or subsequent semesters of enrolment will:

(a) have the result recorded as a fail on their transcript; or
(b) have the results suppressed; and
(c) be unable to complete subsequent assessment tasks until the module is completed.

Note: Faculties may put their own processes in place for dealing with students who fail to complete the module.
5 Requirements for assessment

(1) Where there is a possibility that ghostwriting (that is, commissioning another person to write all or part of an assessment) might occur the unit of study coordinator must take reasonable steps to eliminate or minimise the opportunity to do so, so that examiners can be satisfied, as far as reasonably possible, that the submitted work was written by the student without assistance except for reasonable cooperation. Such measures may include, but are not limited to:

(a) requiring an oral presentation of the work as part of the assessment;
(b) assessing outlines, drafts and other iterations of the written work as it is developed;
(c) requiring that students demonstrate their ability to produce unaided work in a supervised examination, where the student is required to pass, or reach a reasonable threshold in, the examination in order to pass the unit of study;
(d) conducting an oral examination.

(2) If a quiz or online assessment contributes significantly to the assessment mark for the unit, the unit of study coordinator must take appropriate steps to assure the academic integrity consistently with the policy and these procedures.

(3) If a quiz or online assessment contributes a small percentage of the overall unit mark, academic integrity should still be considered as part of its design but assurance of the overall academic integrity of assessment for the unit may be through consideration of the complete assessment approach.

(4) If class tests and mid-semester examinations contribute to the assessment mark, the unit of study coordinator must take active measures to provide seating arrangements which prevent copying. Where it is not possible to ensure students cannot see another student’s paper one of the following techniques should be used:

(a) sorted seating where students are sitting with adjacent students taking different examinations;
(b) scrambling multiple choice questions between candidates; or
(c) another appropriate method.

(5) For the purpose of these procedures, legitimate or reasonable cooperation means that the process:

(a) is transparent and open;
(b) is fair, with no unfair advantage to any particular student in students who are working together on an assignment;
(c) advances student learning; and
(d) results in students submitting what they know.

6 Preliminary assessment

(1) Where an Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic becomes aware of an allegation of plagiarism or academic dishonesty, he or she must, in consultation with the examiner:

(a) formulate a clear expression of the alleged conduct; and
(b) form a preliminary view of whether, if proven, it would constitute plagiarism or academic dishonesty.

(2) If the Educational Integrity Coordinator’s preliminary view is that the alleged conduct could not amount to plagiarism or academic dishonesty and was not caused by a failure fully to understand referencing requirements rather than dishonesty as set out in 3 (3), he or she must record ‘no impropriety’ as the decision and take no further steps.

(3) If the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic’s preliminary view is that the conduct is likely to have been caused by a failure to fully understand referencing requirements rather than dishonesty, the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must check the student’s record.

(4) If, after checking the student’s record, the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic still considers that the conduct is likely to have been caused by a failure to fully understand referencing requirements and not dishonesty, the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must:

(a) direct the student to attend and complete, within a specified time, an additional development course on academic integrity approved by the Office of Educational Integrity; and

(b) provided that to do so would not confer an unfair advantage on any student, permit the student to resubmit the work for assessment:

(1) within a specified time; and

(2) if appropriate, for a specified maximum mark; or

(c) permit the student to undertake alternative assessment:

(1) within a specified time; and

(2) if appropriate, for a specified maximum mark.

(5) The Office of Educational Integrity must record the student’s completion of, and success or otherwise at, the additional development course.

Note: See the University Recordkeeping Policy and Recordkeeping Manual

(6) If a student satisfactorily completes an additional development course required under 3 (4), the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must record ‘development course completed’ as the outcome and take not further steps beyond those in 3 (4).

(7) If a student who has been required to attend and successfully complete a remedial education course fails to do so within the specified time, the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must require the student to attend an interview and follow the process set out in Clause 18 of the policy.

(8) If the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic’s preliminary view is that the conduct is not likely to have been caused by a failure to understand referencing requirements, the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must then determine whether the matter should be dealt with by the faculty, as provided in Clause 18 of the policy, or referred to the Registrar for action under the By-Law.

(a) If the allegations are such that, if proven, a penalty of failure in the unit of study would not be appropriate, the matter should be referred to the Registrar.

(b) If there is a credible allegation that:
(i) another person has been engaged to complete or contribute to the assessment instead of the student; or
(ii) the student has accepted such an engagement from another student the matter should be referred to the Registrar.

(9) If the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic forms the view that the conduct should be referred to the Registrar as set out in clause 3 (8), the student must be informed of this in writing.

(10) The Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must inform the examiner and the unit of study coordinator of the outcome of the preliminary assessment process, and record that outcome on the student’s file.

7 Conclusion of no impropriety

(1) If the decision maker concludes that the student has engaged in no impropriety:
   (a) the decision maker must inform:
      (i) the student;
      (ii) the examiner;
      (iii) the unit of study coordinator;
   and
   (b) if the work has not already been assessed, it must be returned to the examiner for assessment on its academic merit.

8 Conclusion of plagiarism or academic dishonesty

(1) If, after further consideration, the decision maker determines that the allegation of plagiarism or academic dishonesty is substantiated, he or she must inform the following of the conclusion reached:
   (a) the student;
   (b) the examiner;
   (c) the unit of study coordinator; and
   (d) if not the decision maker, the Educational Integrity Coordinator.

(2) If the decision maker concludes:
   (a) that the work contains plagiarism but not dishonest plagiarism; and
   (b) after consulting the student record, is satisfied that the plagiarism is due to a failure to fully understand referencing requirements
   the decision maker must:
   (c) direct the student to attend and successfully complete, within a specified period, and additional development course on academic integrity approved by the Office of Educational Integrity;
   (d) inform the unit of study coordinator and, if not the decision maker, the Educational Integrity Coordinator, of the outcome; and
   (e) provided that to do so would not confer an unfair advantage on any student, permit the student to resubmit the work for assessment:
(i) within a specified time; and
(ii) if appropriate, for a specified maximum mark;

or

(f) permit the student to undertake alternative assessment:
   (i) within a specified time; and
   (ii) if appropriate, for a specified maximum mark.

(3) The Office of Educational Integrity must record the student's completion of, and success or otherwise at, the additional development course.

(4) If a student who has been required to undertake and successfully complete an additional development course fails to do so, the decision maker must then:
   (a) apply one of more of the actions specified in sub-clauses 5 (5); and
   (b) inform the following of this decision:
      (i) the student;
      (ii) the Educational Integrity Coordinator, if not the decision maker;
      (iii) the examiner; and
      (iv) the unit of study coordinator.

(5) If the decision maker concludes that the work contains dishonest plagiarism or that the student has engaged in academic dishonesty, the decision maker must apply one or more of the following outcomes:
   (a) provided that to do so would not confer an unfair advantage on any student, require the student to resubmit the work for assessment or undertake alternative assessment:
      (i) within a specified time; and
      (ii) for a specified maximum mark
   (b) require the student to undertake other remedial action;
   (c) apply a fail grade, a mark penalty or a mark to the work which reflects its unsatisfactory standard;
   (d) apply a fail grade or a mark penalty to the unit of study; or
   (e) if the decision maker considers the conduct to be sufficiently serious, refer the matter to the Registrar to be dealt with under the By-Law.

(6) In any case where there is a conclusion of academic dishonesty in a substantial assessment item (as determined by the decision maker in his or her absolute discretion), the penalty should be a mark of zero for the assessment unless there are exceptional mitigating circumstances. The nominated academic may also impose a grade of FA for the unit of study.

(7) If the conduct would, if proven, constitute academic misconduct, the decision maker must refer the matter to the Registrar for investigation under the By-Law.

(8) The decision maker must inform the original examiner, the student and the unit of study coordinator of the results obtained from any resubmission or other remedial action imposed.

9 Risk of educational integrity in assessments
(1) As part of reviewing and revising assessments, staff should give consideration to the degree of risk of educational integrity inherent in each assessment type, and implementing appropriate mitigating measures.

(2) Staff should also consider how likely the risk of educational integrity is to occur versus the contribution of that particular assessment to the overall mark.

(3) All faculties should develop guidelines that give consideration to the degree of risk to educational integrity of the assessment types used within their faculty.

(4) The process used would include the following steps:
   (a) unit of study coordinators will complete a template using the Assessment risk and mitigation table and Risk assessment matrix.

   **Note:** See Schedule One of these procedures

   (b) in cases where an assessment has a risk that is high or very high, the Learning and teaching committee may wish to discuss the use of that particular assessment with the unit of study coordinators and the implementation of mitigating strategies.

   (c) Learning and teaching committees should ensure that there is follow-up at the end of semester to:
      (i) confirm the initial risk assessment;
      (ii) confirm the success of mitigating strategies; and
      (iii) discuss what may be implemented in the future if the initial strategy was not successful.

   (d) Faculties should report annually any issues that have been identified with particular assessments/ assessment types, including any proposed changes and further strategies to mitigate these issues to the Academic Board.

10 **Proof-reading and editing of written work**

(1) The unit of study coordinator may determine whether students are permitted to use editors or proof-readers in the preparation of written assignments.

(2) If a unit of study coordinator determines that editors or proof-readers are not to be used, this must be indicated in the unit of study outline.

(3) If permitted by the unit of study coordinator students proposing to use an editor must:
   (a) discuss the use of an editor with the relevant tutor, lecturer or unit of study coordinator;
   (b) provide the editor with a copy of these procedures; and
   (c) ensure that their editor abides by the standards set out in the *Australian Standards for Editing Practice (ASEP) 2013*

   **Note:** As at the date of these procedures the *Australian Standards for Editing Practice (ASEP) 2013* can be found at the website of the Institute of Professional Editors Limited

(4) An editor may only be used for:
   (a) copy-editing and proof-reading; and
   (b) providing advice about:
(i) matters of structure (the need to structure and reword, deletions, additions);
(ii) conventions of grammar and syntax;
(iii) using clear language;
(iv) logical connections between phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs and sections;
(v) voice and tone; and
(vi) avoiding ambiguity, repetition and verbosity.

(5) When an editor has been used:

(a) the name of the editor and a brief description of the service rendered must be printed as part of the list of acknowledgements or other prefatory matter near the front of the work when it is submitted for examination; and
(b) if the editor’s current or former area of academic specialisation is similar to that of the student, this must also be stated.

11 Appeals

Students may appeal against academic decisions under the policy and procedures in the manner provided in the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended).

PART 4 – HIGHER DEGREE BY RESEARCH STUDENTS

12 Academic dishonesty, code breaches and research misconduct

(1) Higher degree by research students must adhere to the highest possible standards of academic honesty and research integrity and avoid any academic dishonesty, code breaches or research misconduct.

(2) All higher degree by research students and their supervisors must abide by the conditions of the Research Code of Conduct, the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy and other relevant policies and procedures, including the Research Data Management Policy and related procedures.

(3) Academic dishonesty is seeking to obtain or obtaining academic advantage for oneself or for others (including in the assessment or publication of work) by dishonest or unfair means. In the context of higher degree by research students, it is used to describe academically dishonest conduct by a higher degree by research student undertaking coursework.

Note: See Clause 9 (1) of the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy

(4) A code breach is conduct which deviates from the requirements of the Research Code of Conduct, or any other applicable code of conduct for the research being carried out.

Note: See Clause 19 (1) of the Research Code of Conduct

(5) Research misconduct is conduct which:

(a) is a code breach as defined in (3) above;
(b) involves intent and deliberation, recklessness or gross and persistent negligence;
(c) has serious consequences, such as false information on the public record, or adverse effects on research participants, animals or the environment.

(6) Any instance of code breach, research misconduct or academic dishonesty by a higher degree by research student will be investigated according to the relevant policy as set out in these procedures.

13 Forms of academic dishonesty, code breach and research misconduct

(1) Any form of academic dishonesty by a higher degree by research student is potentially a code breach.
(2) Any code breach meeting the criteria in 12 (4) above is potentially research misconduct.
(3) Research misconduct includes but is not limited to:
   (a) fabrication, falsification or deception in research proposals, drafts, publications, or thesis;
   (b) plagiarism in a proposal, submitted draft, publication or thesis;
   (c) failure to declare conflict of interest;
   (d) wilful or avoidable failure to follow procedures approved by an ethics committee or conducting research without ethics approval where required;
   (e) misleading ascription of authorship;
   (f) taking, sequestering or materially damaging research-related property without authority;
   (g) risking human safety or wellbeing, animals or the environment;
   (h) gross or persistent negligence in complying with policy or following approved procedure;
   (i) other conduct referred to in Clause 18 (2) of the Research Code of Conduct.
(4) Conduct described in 13 (3) above that is found not to be research misconduct my still be a code breach or academic dishonesty or both.

14 Progression

(1) Students must observe the highest standards of academic and research integrity throughout their candidature.
(2) Students must satisfactorily complete the Responsible Research Practice module and Academic Integrity Research Student module [name to be confirmed] as part of the Preliminary appraisal milestone within six months of commencing candidature as set out in Schedule 1 of the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy.
(3) Supervisors must report any suspected breach of academic or research misconduct by students who they supervise as set out in the relevant policy and these procedures.
(4) Review panels must ensure that students have completed the Responsible Research Practice and Academic Integrity Research Student module [name to be confirmed] modules as part of the Preliminary appraisal milestone within six months of commencing candidature as set out in Schedule 1 of Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy and must report any academic or research misconduct by a student as set out in the relevant policy and these procedures.

(5) Higher degree by research students or staff members who become aware of suspected research or academic misconduct by others must report any academic or research misconduct as set out in the relevant policy and these procedures.

15 Process for handling suspected academic dishonesty, code breaches or research misconduct at probationary milestone or during candidature

(1) A student or staff member who suspects academic dishonesty, a code breach or research misconduct by a higher degree by research student or another researcher must report the suspected misconduct using the online reporting tool.

(2) The Associate Dean Research or postgraduate coordinator will consider all reported cases of suspected academic dishonesty, code breach or research misconduct by a higher degree by research student or another researcher and come to a preliminary view as to whether the conduct potentially constitutes:
   (a) research misconduct, a code breach but without misconduct, or
   (b) academic dishonesty but with a code breach or research misconduct.

(3) The Associate Dean Research or postgraduate coordinator must refer the suspected case to the Director of Research Integrity if:
   (a) the suspected case is potentially a case of research misconduct as defined in 12 (5) above;
   (b) the case is related to research work on a project funded by a research grant;
   (c) the case is related to research findings that have been published or which are about to be published.

(4) If the Associate Dean Research or postgraduate coordinator’s preliminary view is that the conduct is potentially a code breach but not research misconduct the Associate Dean Research or postgraduate coordinator must consult with the Director of Research Integrity and refer the case to the Director of Research Integrity if requested.

(5) If the Associate Dean Research or postgraduate coordinator’s preliminary view is that the conduct is potentially a code breach or academic dishonesty but not research misconduct and the Director of Research Integrity has not requested that the case be referred as set out in 14 (1) (c) above, the Associate Dean Research or postgraduate coordinator must:
   (a) inform the student in writing of the allegation as formulated;
   (b) appoint a time and place for the student to attend an interview; and
   (c) provide the student with:
      (i) any further information and materials relevant to the case; and
      (ii) a copy of these procedures.
(6) Following the interview the Associate Dean Research or postgraduate coordinator will come to a determination on the allegation.

(7) Available determinations:
   
   (a) The Associate Dean Research or postgraduate coordinator must make one or more of the following determinations:
       
       (i) refer the case to the Director of Research Integrity for investigation;
       
       (ii) require the student to undertake additional education and make corrections to data, findings, drafts, papers or other research work;
       
       (iii) require the student to attend an additional progress review in accordance with the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy;
       
       (iv) make a finding of no impropriety.

16 Process for handling suspected academic dishonesty, code breach or research misconduct in a thesis that has been submitted for examination

(1) Three months prior to submission of a thesis for examination all higher degree by research students must check their compliance with any ethics approval given and their data management plan and report to the supervisor.

(2) The administrative unit will conduct a submission check, apply similarity detection software to and conduct a data integrity check to all higher degree by research theses submitted for examination and assess the report.

(3) If the administrative unit is satisfied that the similarity detection and data integrity report reveal no evidence of possible academic dishonesty, code breach or research misconduct, the thesis will be forwarded to examiners for examination.

(4) If, after conducting the submission check referred to in 16 (2) above, the administrative unit has a suspicion of possible academic dishonesty, code breach or research misconduct, the administrative unit must refer the matter to the Associate Dean Research using the online report tool.

(5) On receipt of a suspected case of academic dishonesty, code breach or research misconduct, the Associate Dean Research will come to a preliminary view.

(6) If the Associate Dean Research’s preliminary view is that the thesis contains evidence of potential academic misconduct as defined in 12 (5), a potential code breach as defined in 12 (4), the Associate Dean Research must refer the matter to the Director of Research Integrity in accordance with clause 21 (1) of the Research Code of Conduct.

(7) If the Associate Dean Research’s preliminary view is that the deficiencies identified by the administrative unit do not constitute academic dishonesty, a code breach or research misconduct, the Associate Dean Research will:

   (a) forward the thesis to examiners for examination and forward a report on the deficiencies to the PhD Award Sub-Committee and the Faculty Postgraduate Awards Committee requiring that they be addressed along with any recommendations from the examiners and considered when the Faculty Postgraduate Awards Committee and the PhD Awards Sub-Committee are determining the outcome of the examination. A copy of the report is to be kept on the student file.

   or
(b) forward the case to the Faculty Postgraduate Committee to reconsider the
decision as to whether the thesis is suitable to examine in the light of
information discovered in the submission check.

(8) If the Faculty Postgraduate Committee is asked to reconsider a previously taken
decision on the basis of information discovered in the submission check outlined in
16 (2) above it must either:
(a) decline to examine the thesis; or
(b) forward the thesis to examiners for examination and forward a report on the
deficiencies to the PhD Award Sub-Committee and the Faculty Postgraduate
Awards Committee requiring that they be addressed along with any
recommendations from the examiners and considered when the Faculty
Postgraduate Awards Committee and the PhD Award Sub-Committee are
determining the outcome of the examination. A copy or the report is to be
kept on the student file.

(9) If the Faculty Postgraduate Committee decides to decline to examine a thesis on
the basis of information identified in the submission check described at 12 above, it
must:
(a) report the circumstances and reasons for the decision to the PhD Award
Sub-Committee;
(b) inform the student in writing of:
   (i) the reasons for declining to examine the thesis;
   (ii) any changes necessary to make the thesis acceptable for
        examination; and
   (iii) any other actions required to be completed prior to examination.
(c) recommend to the Dean that the student be either:
   (i) permitted to re-enrol in order to complete the necessary actions and
       changes and resubmit the thesis; or
   (ii) be asked to show good cause why they should be permitted to re-
        enrol.

(10) If the Faculty Committee decides to decline to examine a thesis as set out in (9)
above, the Dean will decide whether the student will be permitted to re-enrol or
required to show good cause.

(11) If the Faculty Examinations Committee receives a report from an Associate Dean
indicating problems have been identified in the submission check, but that it was
decided to send the thesis for examination, it must, on receipt of the examiners
reports, forward the reports to the PhD Award Sub-Committee as set out in Clause
10 (11) of the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures
after considering the matter as set out in Section 16 (1) of these procedures.

(12) If the PhD Awards Sub-Committee receives a report from either an Associate Dean
Research or a Faculty Postgraduate Committee indicating problems have been
identified in the submission check, but that it was decided to send the thesis for
examination, it must require that all issues identified in the submission check are
addressed before a higher degree by research is awarded.

(13) If an internal or an external examiner of a thesis reports allegations of potential
academic dishonesty, code breach or research misconduct, matters will be referred
for investigation by the Office of Research Integrity. (Clause 10 of the Thesis and
Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures).
17 Proof-reading and editing of theses

(1) Students are permitted to use editors or proof-readers in the preparation of their thesis for submission.

(2) Students proposing to use an editor must:
   (a) discuss the use of an editor with their supervisor;
   (b) provide the editor with a copy of these procedures; and
   (c) ensure that their editor abides by the standards set out in the Australian Standards for Editing Practice (ASEP) 2013.

Note: As at the date of these procedures the Australian Standards for Editing Practice (ASEP) 2013 can be found at the website of the Institute of Professional Editors Limited.

(3) An editor may only be used for:
   (a) copy-editing and proof-reading; and
   (b) providing advice about:
      (i) matters of structure (the need to structure and reword, deletions, additions);
      (ii) conventions of grammar and syntax;
      (iii) using clear language;
      (iv) logical connections between phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs and sections;
      (v) voice and tone; and
      (vi) avoiding ambiguity, repetition and verbosity.

(4) When an editor has been used:
   (a) the name of the editor and a brief description of the service rendered must be printed as part of the list of acknowledgements or other prefatory matter near the front of the work when it is submitted for examination; and
   (b) if the editor’s current or former area of academic specialisation is similar to that of the student, this must also be stated.

18 Appeals

Students may appeal against academic decisions under the policy and procedures in the manner provided in the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended).

19 Rescissions and replacements

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

(1) Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Procedures, which commenced in 2012.
### SCHEDULE ONE: SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT TYPES, RISKS AND MITIGATING STRATEGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Type</th>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Suggested Mitigating Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invigilated Quiz</td>
<td>Identity of student</td>
<td>Identity Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-exam room setting, or poor spacing in room</td>
<td>Multiple versions of same paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Randomisation of the question order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Try to book bigger room or even 2 rooms to spread class out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple quizzes run on different days with similar but not identical questions (may be electronic or paper based)</td>
<td>Questions with answers likely to be memorized and shared through social media – ensure no mobile phones, difficult to totally mitigate for, content should be retested in formal examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Password protected entry to quiz if electronically accessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Automatic closure of exam after time is completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Invigilated Exam</td>
<td>Identity of student</td>
<td>Identity Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confidential papers removed from exam room</td>
<td>Maintain strict exam conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions from confidential papers memorized and then reproduced</td>
<td>Don’t use confidential papers if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Always change at least some questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t use confidential papers if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Always change at least some questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Give sample, practice or past papers/questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Type</td>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Suggested Mitigating Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invigilated Oral Exam (vivas, OSCEs, patient exams)</td>
<td>Identity of student</td>
<td>Identity Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reuse of questions</td>
<td>Quarantine students before/after exam until all students with same question have finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-test work in a formal (preferably barrier) exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have a test bank of suitable questions/scenarios to reduce the likelihood of students been given “the same” question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-invigilated Quiz</td>
<td>No assurance of identity of student at all</td>
<td>Impossible to assure identity, therefore ensure that it is a low weighted assessment and re-test work in a formal (preferably barrier) exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider the use of technology such as Examity (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identity of student completing work</td>
<td>Include an oral component with detailed questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment (as above) with scaffolding or periodic submission of sections</td>
<td>Identity of student completing work</td>
<td>Include an oral component with detailed questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Presentation</td>
<td>Identity of student of who prepared presentation and speech?</td>
<td>Include detailed oral questions about topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Type</td>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Suggested Mitigating Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-lab/pre-tutorial work</td>
<td>Identity of student who completed work</td>
<td>Ensure that weighting of pre-class work is low, retest in formal (preferably barrier) exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab class</td>
<td>Source of results were used for write up</td>
<td>Require students to submit results or product before leaving the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plagiarism of Lab report</td>
<td>Use Turnitin for submitted written work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If lab is a repeat no assurance of identity of person who obtained results</td>
<td>Include 5 min viva on lab experiment with detailed questions, and/or retest in final barrier exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical exams</td>
<td>Identity of student</td>
<td>Identity Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple exams run on different days with similar but not identical questions</td>
<td>Questions with answers likely to be shared through social media – ensure no mobile phones, difficult to totally mitigate for, ensure content is retested in formal barrier examination. Have a test bank of suitable questions/scenarios to reduce the likelihood of students been given “the same” question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>If repeat class no assurance of identity of person who prepared work.</td>
<td>Keep weighting low, ensure content is retested in formal barrier examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Type</td>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Suggested Mitigating Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>Did student attend placement at all?</td>
<td>Visit or Skype call to placement site, at least once during course of placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plagiarism of report or reflective diary used to assess placement</td>
<td>Have a mid-way “check” of student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forgery of signature of external educators on assessment reports or</td>
<td>Require student to produce ID card to placement site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>competency documents</td>
<td>Use Turnitin for submitted work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identity of who completed report, reflective diary etc associated</td>
<td>All assessment pieces with educator signature to be duplicated and forward to University for cross check. Consider electronic submission of placement assessment reports. Keep a bank of authorized signatures for review. Use watermarked documents that allow alterations to be clearly identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with placement</td>
<td>Include short interview about placement activities, include preceptor if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Performances</td>
<td>Identity of student</td>
<td>Identity check</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# UoS Assessment Integrity Risk Assessment and Mitigation Strategy

**Unit of Study Code**

**Unit of Study Name**

**Faculty**

**School**

**Co-ordinator Name**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Type</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigating Strategy</th>
<th>% Weighting of assessment</th>
<th>Overall Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(overall Risk: low, medium, high, very high)
Reasons for not using a particular mitigating strategy


### Educational Integrity of Assessments Risk Assessment Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Significance</th>
<th>Not Significant</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Highly Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning &amp; Teaching Activity with low weighted contribution to final mark. Content can be retested in formal exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low weighted assessment e.g. short quiz. Content can be retested in formal exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment that contributes to a significant proportion of marks (~30%). Content can be retested in formal exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major assessment (~50%) but content can be retested in a formal exam or OSCE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major assessment e.g. final exam, Honours thesis, dissertation, test of essential professional skills. Cannot be further examined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Likelihood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost Certain</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Rare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected to occur regularly</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected to occur</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately likely</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not likely to occur</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May happen, but not often</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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