NOTICE OF MEETING

A meeting of the Academic Board will be held at 2:00 pm on Wednesday, 19 August 2015 in the Professorial Board Room. Members who are unable to attend are asked to notify Megan Kemmis at the above address. Enquiries concerning this meeting may also be directed to Ms Kemmis.

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

Megan Kemmis
Secretary to Academic Board
12 August 2015

AGENDA

1. Apologies
   Apologies have been received from: Associate Professor M Halliwell, Professor S Houston and Professor J Shields.

2. Arrangement of agenda
   2.1 Starring of items
   2.2 Adoption of unstarred items

   Recommendation
   That the Academic Board resolve as recommended with respect to all unstarred items.

3. Minutes of previous meeting
   3.1 Meeting of 1 July 2015

   Recommendation
   That the Academic Board adopt the minutes of the previous meeting held on 1 July 2015 as a true record.

4. Business arising from Minutes (not dealt with elsewhere in the Agenda)

5. Presentation: Education and Research in the 2016-2020 Strategic Plan
   Professor D Ivison, Acting Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) and Professor P Pattison, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)
6. Report of the Chair

6.1 Report on Senate Matters

6.1.1 Report of the Senate meeting held on 3 August 2015

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Board on academic matters considered by Senate at its meeting of 3 August 2015.

6.2 Honours and Distinctions

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Board on the honours and distinctions and congratulate the recipients, as set out in the report presented.

6.3 General Report

6.3.1 Academic Board membership

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the nomination of Mr Thomas Greenwell and Ms Kylee Hartman-Warren by SUPRA under clause 5.1.3.10 of the University of Sydney (Academic Governance) Rule 2003 (as amended).

6.3.2 Academic Board Standing Committees: Nominations for Membership

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the nomination of Dr Andrea McCloughen as the representative of the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery on the Graduate Studies Committee for a term of membership expiring 31 December 2015.

6.3.3 Reframing the PhD for Australia’s future universities

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the report on the OLT-funded project “Reframing the PhD for Australia’s future universities” and agree to participate in the project as necessary.

6.3.4 Correspondence Register

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the register of correspondence, as set out in the report presented.

7. Report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal

7.1 Report on Senate Matters

7.1.1 Report of the Senate meeting held on 3 August 2015 supplementary agenda

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal on matters considered by Senate at its meeting of 3 August 2015.

7.2 General report

8. Question time (Time limit 15 minutes)

Questions to the Vice-Chancellor and Chair of the Academic Board.
9. Reports of the Faculties  
9.1 Faculty of Agriculture and Environment: Amendment to 2016 Semester Dates  
Recommendation 
That the Academic Board approve the request from the Faculty of Agriculture and Environment to amend its semester dates for 2016, as set out in the report presented.

9.2 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: Amendment to Faculty Constitution  
Recommendation 
That the Academic Board recommend that Senate approve the amendments to the Senate Resolutions relating to the Constitution of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

10. Report of the Admissions Committee  
(Professor Jane Hanrahan) 
10.1 Oral report of the Chair 
Recommendation 
That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Admissions Committee.

10.2 Report of the meeting held by circulation on 29 July 2015  
10.2.1 Amendment to the Coursework Policy 2014 
Recommendation 
That the Academic Board approve the proposed amendment to the Coursework Policy 2014 with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

11 Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee  
(Associate Professor Stephen Cattle) 
11.1 Oral report of the Chair 
Recommendation 
That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Admissions Committee.

11.2 Report of the meeting held on 5 August 2015 
11.2.1 Minor course amendment proposals 
11.2.1.1 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: Bachelor of Political, Economic and Social Sciences 
Recommendation 
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the requirements for award for the Bachelor of Political, Economic and Social Sciences; and
(2) approve the amendment to the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.
11.2.1.2 Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies

(1) Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees

E1-E2, E5-E13

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies relating to the Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees; and

(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal

with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

(2) Bachelor of Information Technology/Bachelor of Medical Science

E2, E14-E16

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies relating to the Bachelor of Information Technology and Bachelor Medical Science; and

(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal

with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

11.2.1.3 Faculty of Health Sciences: Resolutions of the Faculty of Health Sciences for coursework awards

E2, E17-E21

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences relating to coursework awards; and

(2) approve the amendments to the Faculty Resolutions arising from this proposal

with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

11.2.1.4 Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery: Bachelor of Arts/Master of Nursing, Bachelor of Science/Master of Nursing, Bachelor of Health Science/Master of Nursing

E2-E3, E22-E23

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery relating to the Bachelor of Arts/Master of Nursing, Bachelor of Science/Master of Nursing and Bachelor of Health Science/Master of Nursing; and

(2) approve the amendments to the course resolutions arising from the proposal

with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

11.2.2 Honours data

E3, E24-E26

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board note the report on Honours data.
11.2.3 Proceedings of the Committee

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Undergraduate Studies Committee meeting held on 5 August 2015, as set out in the report presented.

12 Report of the Graduate Studies Committee

12.1 Oral report of the Chair

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee.

12.2 Report of the meeting held on 5 August 2015

12.2.1 Proposals for new and amended postgraduate courses

12.2.1.1 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: Master of China Studies, Graduate Diploma in China Studies, Graduate Certificate in China Studies

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to delete the Master of China Studies, Graduate Diploma in China Studies and Graduate Certificate in China Studies;
(2) recommend that Senate endorse the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal and approve amendments to the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificate in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences; and
(3) approve the deletion of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2019 (for the Graduate Certificate in China Studies), 1 January 2020 (for the Graduate Diploma in China Studies) and 1 January 2022 (for the Master of China Studies) in accordance with clause 12.2 of the Coursework Rule, as set out in the report presented.

12.2.2 Minor course amendment proposals

12.2.2.1 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: Graduate Certificate in Political Economy

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Graduate Certificate in Political Economy; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

12.2.2.2 Faculty of Medicine

(1) Master of Health Policy, Graduate Diploma in Health Policy, Graduate Certificate in Health Policy

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine to amend the Master of Health Policy, Graduate
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(2) Diploma in Health Policy and Graduate Certificate in Health Policy; and
approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

(2) Master of Qualitative Health Research, Graduate Diploma in Qualitative Health Research  

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine to amend the Master of Qualitative Health Research and Graduate Diploma in Qualitative Health Research; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

(3) Changes to Tables of Units of Study

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine to amend tables of units of study for the study areas of Clinical Epidemiology, Genetic Counselling, Public Health and Qualitative Health Research; and
(2) approve the amendment of the tables of units of study arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

12.2.2.3 Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery

(1) Faculty Resolutions

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery to amend its English language proficiency requirements; and
(2) approve the amendment of the Faculty resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.
(2) **Master of Advanced Nursing Practice, Master of Cancer and Haematology Nursing, Master of Emergency Nursing, Master of Intensive Care Nursing, Master of Mental Health Nursing, Master of Nursing (Nurse Practitioner), Master of Primary Health Care Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Advanced Nursing Practice, Graduate Diploma in Cancer and Haematology Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Emergency Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Intensive Care Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Mental Health Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Primary Health Care Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Clinical Trials Practice, Graduate Certificate in Clinical Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Cancer and Haematology Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Emergency Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Intensive Care Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Mental Health Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Primary Health Care Nursing**

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board:

1. approve the proposal from the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery to amend the Master of Advanced Nursing Practice, Master of Cancer and Haematology Nursing, Master of Emergency Nursing, Master of Intensive Care Nursing, Master of Mental Health Nursing, Master of Nursing (Nurse Practitioner), Master of Primary Health Care Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Advanced Nursing Practice, Graduate Diploma in Cancer and Haematology Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Emergency Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Intensive Care Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Mental Health Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Primary Health Care Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Clinical Trials Practice, Graduate Certificate in Clinical Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Cancer and Haematology Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Emergency Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Intensive Care Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Mental Health Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Primary Health Care Nursing; and

2. approve the amendment of the table of units of study and specialisations arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

(3) **Master of Nursing (Graduate Entry)**

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board:

1. approve the proposal from the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery to amend the Master of Nursing (Graduate Entry); and

2. approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

(4) **Master of Philosophy**

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board:

1. approve the proposal from the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery to amend the Master of Philosophy; and
12.2.3 Use of the UQI factor in awards ranking scheme

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve an amendment to the use of the UQI factor with respect to applications from members or fellows of medical colleges.

12.2.4 Proceedings of the Committee

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on 5 August 2015, as set out in the report presented.

13 Report of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee

13.1 Oral report of the Chair

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee.

13.2 Report of the meeting held on 29 July 2015

13.2.1 Coursework Policy and Procedure Amendments

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the amendments to the Coursework Policy 2014, the Assessment Procedures 2011 and the introduction of the Coursework Credit Procedures 2015 with effect from 1 January 2016 as set out in the report presented.

13.2.2 Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce Report

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) note the report of the Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce “An Approach to Minimising Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism at the University of Sydney - Part 1: Prevention and Detection”;
(2) endorse the recommendations of the report and undertake the review of assessment strategy and policy outlined in that recommendation; and
(3) note that the Academic Standards and Policy Committee has established a working party to undertake the policy reviews outlined in recommendation (5).

13.2.3 Hague Declaration on Knowledge Discovery in the Digital Age

Recommendation
That the Academic Board endorse the University becoming a signatory to the Hague Declaration on Knowledge Discovery in the Digital Age.
13.2.4 Proceedings of the Committee

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the proceeding of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee meeting held on 29 July 2015, as set out in the report presented.

14. General Business
Minutes of the meeting of the Academic Board
held at 2.00pm on Wednesday 1 July 2015 in the Professorial Board Room

There were present: the Chair (Associate Professor P McCallum) presiding; the Vice-Chancellor and Principal (Dr M Spence); the Chairs of the Standing Committees (Associate Professor S Cattle and Associate Professor D Traini); Associate Professor S Barrie, Dr R Bathgate, Mr K Blakeney, Dr J Bloomfield, Dr R Bourne, Professor B Caine, Professor T Carlin, Dr B Church, Professor M Crock, Associate Professor W Davis, Dr J Gao, Professor S Garton, Associate Professor J Glister, Professor M Graeber, Associate Professor T Grewal, Professor S Houston, Mr S Isaac, Professor D Ivison, Dr N Jarkey, Mr C Jones, Dr D Larkin, Professor P Leong, Ms D Mair, Dr J May, Professor D Mayer, Professor E Mpofo, Associate Professor L Nicholson, Dr C Owens, Professor C Peck, Professor I Ramzan, Professor J Redmond, Professor K Refshauge, Professor C Rhodes, Dr K Rooney, Ms A Rose, Dr R Saunders, Professor J Shields, Professor R Stancliffe, Associate Professor C Sutton-Brady, Professor D Waters, Associate Professor G White, Dr P White, Professor G Whitwell, Associate Professor T Wilkinson and Professor P Young.

Present as observers: Ms K Hartman-Warren (SUPRA), Professor C Jones (Faculty of Medicine), Mr D Pacey (Secretary to Senate), Ms L Rose (Office of the Provost).

In attendance: Ms M Kemmis (Secretary to Academic Board).

The Chair welcomed Professor Ivison in his new role as Acting Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research), Professor Caine as the Acting Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, and Mr Christian Jones as the newly elected President of SUPRA. He thanked Ms Kylee Hartman-Warren for her work as the interim President of SUPRA.

1. Apologies

Apologies have been received from: Professor M Adams, Associate Professor J Anderson, Dr T Balle, Dr T Bell, Professor B Buckley, Ms T Clement, Dr S Colmar, Associate Professor D Easdown, Ms C Fahd, Associate Professor T Gerzina, Dr J Gullick, Professor N Gurran, Professor T Hambly, Professor J Hanrahan, Professor M Hindson, Ms A Irish, Professor Y-H Jeon, Dr P Knight, Associate Professor S van der Laan, Professor D Lowe, Dr J Ma, Dr M MacKenzie, Associate Professor T Masters, Associate Professor S McGrath-Champ, Professor P Pattison, Professor A Reid, Professor J Riley, Professor L Rivory, Professor B Robinson, Dr J Saleeba, Associate Professor P Seltikas, Ms J Smith, Dr C Taylor, Professor C Wade and Dr R Wilson.

2. Arrangement of agenda

2.1 Starring of items

The following items were starred: 9.2.2, 10.2.2.9(4)

2.2 Adoption of unstarred items

Resolution AB_4_108/15

That the Academic Board resolved as recommended with respect to all unstarred items.
3. Minutes of previous meeting

Resolution AB_4_109/15
That the Academic Board adopted the minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 May 2015 as a true record.

4. Business arising from Minutes (not dealt with elsewhere in the Agenda)

5. Presentation: Admissions

The Chair introduced Professor Carlin to talk about the 2015 admissions round and the University’s admission strategies. Professor Carlin spoke briefly about the focus of the University’s admissions team on attracting the most meritorious and academically adept students from diverse geographic, cultural and social backgrounds before guiding the meeting through an overview of the University’s admissions results for 2015.

The Chair noted a reference in the presentation to flexible entry and advised that the Admissions Committee has discussed the University’s use of flexible entry in comparison to the bonus points used by many other institutions. Bonus points have not been used at this University as not all faculties are interested in offering them, and flexible entry can be used by faculties in a targeted way during the admissions season; however the Chair pointed out that bonus points provide a level of certainty to prospective students.

Mr Blakeney commented on the data for ATSI student preferences and enrolments, noting that the University does well at the very top of the ATAR range, but then tails off. He queried whether this might be a result of students with the top ATARs attending more privileged, rather than regional, schools. Professor Carlin advised that it was not possible to know this for sure but he agreed it was the most likely scenario. Mr Blakeney suggested that ATSI students are more attracted to universities with a strong commitment to student and staff cultural competencies, citing the mandatory 2nd year Koori Studies unit at Charles Sturt University as an example. He encouraged the University to do more in this area. Professor Carlin responded that the University is developing more strategies including bringing ATSI secondary students to the University to experience the campus. The Vice-Chancellor added that it was important to work on increasing the number of first preferences from ATSI students achieving ATARs between 75 and 94. Ms Hartman-Warren queried whether such students believed courses at the University of Sydney are more academically difficult than at other institutions and suggested promoting the university’s support services. Mr Blakeney agreed that students are sometimes intimidated by Sydney’s reputation as an institution and reiterated her suggestion that student support services should be promoted.

The Chair asked Professor Carlin to speak about the proposed Dux scheme. Professor Carlin advised that this scheme had grown out of discussions regarding diversity and opportunity, and the knowledge that there are schools in NSW who have never sent a student to this University. He offered to provide a follow up report on this scheme. Professor Shields pointed out that many of the students the University wants to attract via this scheme come from areas with significantly lower costs of living than in Sydney, adding that the University will need to provide them with additional support. Professor Houston advised that Ms Jordi Austin is working on this issue, noting that some other universities already offer generous first year scholarships to rural and remote students. Associate Professor Cattle added that this is a significant issue for the Faculty of Agriculture and Environment, with many rural students advising that the cost of living in Sydney is a major disincentive. Professor Carlin advised that the University is discussing similar issues with the Principal of Hurlstone Agricultural High School to strengthen the pathway from that school to the university’s agricultural degrees.

The Chair thanked Professor Carlin for his presentation.

Resolution AB_4_110/15
That the Academic Board note the presentation on admissions.
6. Report of the Chair

6.1 Report on Senate Matters

6.1.1 Report of the Senate meeting held on 1 June 2015

The Chair advised that Senate approved the recommended amendments to the University of Sydney (Academic Governance) Rule 2003 (as amended) at this meeting. The Academic Board noted this report.

Resolution AB_4_111/15
That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Board on academic matters considered by Senate at its meeting of 1 June 2015.

6.2 Honours and Distinctions

The Board noted and congratulated by acclamation the recipients of honours and distinctions, as set out in the agenda and the supplementary agenda.

Resolution AB_4_112/15
That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Board on the honours and distinctions and congratulate the recipients, as set out in the report presented.

Action: Chair of the Academic Board to write to recipients congratulating them on their honours and distinctions.

6.3 General Report

6.3.1 NSW/Territories Committee of Chairs

The Chair advised members that this committee had met at the Bathurst campus of Charles Sturt University on 26th June. The main issue discussed at the meeting was the additional requirements for teacher education proposed by both the State and Federal governments, including the proposed numeracy and literacy testing of education students. The Vice-Chancellor advised that he has encouraged the Go8 to lobby the Federal minister for this testing to be done prior to university admission and without cost to the students. The Chair added that the committee of chairs has also established a project on academic honesty in the digital age.

Resolution AB_4_113/15
That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair on the meeting of the NSW/Territories Committee of Chairs on 26th June 2015.

6.3.2 Policy Developments and Major Items for 2015

The Chair advised that this item is a follow-up to his comments at the previous meeting, adding that proposals from the Vice-Chancellor's taskforce on academic dishonesty could be presented to the Board soon. In addition to the working parties listed, he advised that Professor Pattison has also established a working party on analytics.

Resolution AB_4_114/15
That the Academic Board note the report on policy developments and other major items being undertaken in 2015.

6.3.3 Correspondence Register

Members noted the report.

Resolution AB_4_115/15
That the Academic Board note the register of correspondence, as set out in the report presented.

7. Report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal

7.1 Report on Senate Matters

7.1.1 Report of the Senate meeting held on 1 June 2015

The Academic Board noted this report.
7.2 General report
The Vice-Chancellor spoke with members on the following matters:

- Development of the 2016-2020 strategic plan: this remains the major item for the University, and the Vice-Chancellor thanked all of those who have engaged with the first discussion paper released on undergraduate education. A further five discussion papers are due in the next eight weeks on teaching and learning, investment in research, research and development, organisational design and culture;

- Integrated China Strategy: the strategy has been widely discussed by a range of groups and the business case has recently been approved. The University will establish a physical presence in Suzhou near Shanghai, which is the location of a major education park hosting institutions such as Oxford University, Cold Spring Harbor, the National University of Singapore and Monash University. This site will provide a base for student recruitment, alumni, graduations, off-shore teaching, research collaborations and other activities;

- The Medical Research Future Fund (MRFF): the University is lobbying for the government to clarify the relationship between the fund and the NHMRC, given both organisations will be funding medical research. On more general government matters, he added that the government is still expressing commitment for fee deregulation while the opposition has yet to fully clarify its higher education policies. He urged members to write to their local members in support of better funding arrangements for universities; in response to a question from the Chair regarding the political focus of the MRFF he advised that the government views the NHMRC as overly focussed on publication and citations and not on delivering improved health outcomes for the Australian populace;

- Student accommodation: in response to questions from Mr Blakeney and Ms Hartman-Warren, the Vice-Chancellor undertook to provide them with information regarding the weekly rent for subsidised accommodation in the new Queen Mary Building, noting that the standard rent for unsubsidised accommodation is $288 per week; he also advised that some of the ground floor rooms may be shared, but the majority are single; Professor Carlin advised that a decision has not been made as yet on providing access to subsidised accommodation to international students; the Vice-Chancellor explained that the Queen Mary and Abercrombie developments will help address not just the lack of accommodation for the University’s students, but also the lack of affordable accommodation; in response to a suggestion that profits from the two buildings could be used to reduce rental costs in future he advised that the University would be investing in more accommodation (with a goal of doubling the current number of rooms to a total of 6000 beds), and would also invest in establishing bursaries to cover accommodation costs for students.

Resolution AB_4_117/15
That the Academic Board note the report presented by the Provost.

8. Question time
No questions asked

9. Report of the Admissions Committee

9.1 Oral report of the Chair
In the absence of Professor Hanrahan, the Chair advised he had nothing further to add to this report.
9.2 Report of the meeting held on 10 June 2015

9.2.1 Amendment to the Coursework Policy 2014

Resolution AB_4_118/15
That the Academic Board approve the proposed amendment to the Coursework Policy 2014 with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

Action: Executive Officer to update the Coursework Policy 2014 on the Policy Register.

9.2.2 Overseas Foundation Programs
Associate Professor Glister asked for clarification of how students from these programs will be assessed, pointing out that most UK universities routinely take students from their own foundation programs but not necessarily those from programs run by other universities. Professor Carlin advised that students from these programs will have to meet University-level minimum standards with respect to their GPA and English language capabilities, and there would also be faculty-specific admission requirements. The Chair added that the University of Sydney is the only Go8 university currently not accepting students from foundation programs run by the Russell Group of universities. He added that the current board of studies for the University’s foundation program offered by Taylors College may be expanded to cover students from all the foundation programs offered by the Study Group. Members approved the proposal.

Resolution AB_4_119/15
That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the recognition for admission to the University of Foundation programs of at least one year’s duration offered by the Russell Group of universities in the United Kingdom and of Foundation programs of at least one year’s duration offered by Study Group International, excluding distance education and online programs; and

(2) approve the inclusion of the Advanced International Certificate of Education, University of Cambridge, within the new category of foundation programs from the United Kingdom with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

Action: Director of Admissions to note the Academic Board’s recognition of Foundation programs offered by the Russell Group of universities in the United Kingdom and by Student Group International and the Advanced International Certificate of Education offered by the University of Cambridge.

9.2.3 UAC Schedules

Resolution AB_4_120/15
That the Academic Board adopt the UAC Schedules for the International Baccalaureate (IB), German Abitur and Swedish Upper Secondary School Leaving Certificate and reject the Schedule for the Jordanian General Secondary Education Certificate Examination, as set out in the reports presented.

Action: Director of Admissions to note the Academic Board’s adoption of the UAC Schedules for the International Baccalaureate (IB), German Abitur and Swedish Upper Secondary School Leaving Certificate and rejection of the Schedule for the Jordanian General Secondary Education Certificate Examination.
9.2.4 Proceedings of the Committee

Resolution AB_4_121/15
That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Admissions Committee meeting held on 10 June 2015, as set out in the report presented.

10. Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee

10.1 Oral report of the Chair
Professor Cattle advised that the Committee had dealt with a much greater number of minor amendment proposals than usual due to faculties wanting to meet Sydney Student deadlines for 2016.

Resolution AB_4_122/15
That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Undergraduate Studies Committee.

10.2 Report of the meeting held on 17 June 2015

10.2.1 Proposals for new and amended undergraduate courses

10.2.1.1 Faculty of Education and Social Work: Bachelor of Education (Secondary: Human Movement and Health Education)

Resolution AB_4_123/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Education and Social Work to amend the current Bachelor of Education (Secondary: Human Movement and Health Education) and to rename it the Bachelor of Education (Health and Physical Education)
(2) recommend that Senate endorse the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal and approve amendments to the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificate in the Faculty of Education and Social Work; and
(3) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2017, as set out in the report presented.

Action: Chair to recommend that Senate note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal from the Faculty of Education and Social Work to amend the current Bachelor of Education (Secondary: Human Movement and Health Education) and to rename it the Bachelor of Education (Health and Physical Education) and approve amendments to the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificate in the Faculty of Education and Social Work.

The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Education and Social Work, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the current Bachelor of Education (Secondary: Human Movement and Health Education) and to rename it the Bachelor of Education (Health and Physical Education) and amend the resolutions in CMS.

10.2.2 Minor course amendment proposals

10.2.2.1 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

(1) Bachelor of International and Global Studies

Resolution AB_4_124/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Bachelor of International and Global Studies; and

(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Bachelor of International and Global Studies and amend the resolutions in CMS.

(2) Amendment of Majors

Resolution AB_4_125/15
That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the list of majors in its Faculty Resolutions; and

(2) approve the amendment of the Faculty resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the list of majors in its Faculty Resolutions and amend the resolutions in CMS.

(3) Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Social Work

Resolution AB_4_126/15
That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Social Work; and

(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Social Work and amend the resolutions in CMS.

10.2.2.2 Faculty of Education and Social Work: Bachelor of Social Work

Resolution AB_4_127/15
That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Education and Social Work to amend the Bachelor of Social Work; and

(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Education and Social Work, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Bachelor of Social Work and amend the resolutions in CMS.
10.2.2.3 Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning

(1) Bachelor of Architecture and Environments (Honours)

Resolution AB_4_128/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Bachelor of Architecture and Environments (Honours); and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions and the table of units of study arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Bachelor of Architecture and Environments (Honours) and amend the resolutions in CMS.

(2) Bachelor of Design Computing

Resolution AB_4_129/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Bachelor of Design Computing; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Bachelor of Design Computing and amend the resolutions in CMS.

10.2.2.4 Sydney Conservatorium of Music

(1) Bachelor of Music, Bachelor of Music (Composition), Bachelor of Music (Music Education), Bachelor of Music (Performance), Bachelor of Music Studies/Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Music Studies/Doctor of Medicine

Resolution AB_4_130/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Sydney Conservatorium of Music to amend the Bachelor of Music, Bachelor of Music (Composition), Bachelor of Music (Music Education), Bachelor of Music (Performance), Bachelor of Music Studies/Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Music Studies/Doctor of Medicine; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Sydney Conservatorium of Music, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Bachelor of Music, Bachelor of Music (Composition), Bachelor of Music (Music Education), Bachelor of Music (Performance), Bachelor of Music Studies/Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Music Studies/Doctor of Medicine and amend the resolutions in CMS.
Resolution AB_4_131/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Sydney Conservatorium of Music to amend the Bachelor of Music Studies, Bachelor of Music Studies/Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Music Studies/Doctor of Medicine and Bachelor of Music (Music Education); and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Sydney Conservatorium of Music, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Bachelor of Music Studies, Bachelor of Music Studies/Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Music Studies/Doctor of Medicine and Bachelor of Music (Music Education) and amend the resolutions in CMS.

Resolution AB_4_132/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Sydney Conservatorium of Music to amend the Bachelor of Music (Composition), Bachelor of Music (Performance) and Bachelor of Music Studies; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Sydney Conservatorium of Music, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Bachelor of Music (Composition), Bachelor of Music (Performance) and Bachelor of Music Studies and amend the resolutions in CMS.

Resolution AB_4_133/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and IT to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Aeronautical), Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Mechanical) and Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Mechatronic); and
(2) approve the amendment of the tables of units of study arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Aeronautical), Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Mechanical) and Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Mechatronic) and amend the resolutions in CMS.
of the proposal to amend the tables of units of study for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Aeronautical), Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Mechanical) and Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Mechatronic).

10.2.2.6 Faculty of Health Sciences

(1) Bachelor of Applied Science (Occupational Therapy)

Resolution AB_4_134/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Applied Science (Occupational Therapy); and
(2) approve the amendment to the table of units of study arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Health Sciences, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the table of units of study for the Bachelor of Applied Science (Occupational Therapy).

(2) Bachelor of Applied Science (Diagnostic Radiography)
Pass and Honours

Resolution AB_4_135/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Applied Science (Diagnostic Radiography); and
(2) approve the amendment to the course resolutions and table of units of study arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Health Sciences, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Bachelor of Applied Science (Diagnostic Radiography) Pass and Honours and amend the resolutions in CMS.

(3) Bachelor of Health Sciences

Resolution AB_4_136/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Health Sciences; and
(2) approve the amendment to the table of units of study arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Health Sciences, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the table of units of study for the Bachelor of Health Sciences.
10.2.2.7 Faculty of Medicine (plus Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Sydney Conservatorium of Music, University of Sydney Business School and Faculty of Science): Bachelor of Commerce/Doctor of Medicine, Bachelor of Economics/Doctor of Medicine, Bachelor of Music Studies/Doctor of Medicine, Bachelor of Science (Advanced)/Doctor of Medicine, Bachelor of Medical Science/Doctor of Medicine

Resolution AB_4_137/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine and other faculties to amend the minimum time stated in the progression rules for the Bachelor of Commerce/Doctor of Medicine, Bachelor of Economics/Doctor of Medicine, Bachelor of Music Studies/Doctor of Medicine, Bachelor of Science (Advanced)/Doctor of Medicine and Bachelor of Medical Science/Doctor of Medicine; and
(2) approve the amendment to the course resolutions arising from this proposal
with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Deans and Faculty Managers, Faculty of Medicine, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Sydney Conservatorium of Music, University of Sydney Business School and Faculty of Science, to note the Academic Board's approval of the proposal to amend the minimum time stated in the progression rules for the Bachelor of Commerce/Doctor of Medicine, Bachelor of Economics/Doctor of Medicine, Bachelor of Music Studies/Doctor of Medicine, Bachelor of Science (Advanced)/Doctor of Medicine and Bachelor of Medical Science/Doctor of Medicine and amend the resolutions in CMS.

10.2.2.8 Faculty of Pharmacy: Bachelor of Pharmacy

Resolution AB_4_138/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Pharmacy to amend the Bachelor of Pharmacy; and
(2) approve the amendments to the tables of units of study arising from the proposal
with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Pharmacy, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the tables of units of study for the Bachelor of Pharmacy.

10.2.2.9 Faculty of Science
(1) Bachelor of Science (Advanced)/Doctor of Dental Medicine

Resolution AB_4_139/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science (Advanced)/Doctor of Dental Medicine; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal
with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Science, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the
Bachelor of Science (Advanced)/Doctor of Dental Medicine and amend the resolutions in CMS.

(2) Bachelor of Liberal Arts and Science

Resolution AB_4_140/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Liberal Arts and Science; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Science, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Bachelor of Liberal Arts and Science and amend the resolutions in CMS.

(3) Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Arts

Resolution AB_4_141/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Arts; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Science, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Arts and amend the resolutions in CMS.

(4) Bachelor of Science/Master of Nutrition and Dietetics, Bachelor of Science (Advanced)/Master of Nutrition and Dietetics, Bachelor of Science (Advanced Mathematics)/Master of Nutrition and Dietetics

Mr Blakeney referred to the progression requirements for these courses which require students to maintain a credit average. He asked if there was a process students who do not maintain this average could use, other than special consideration, to look at extenuating circumstances. The Chair advised that shifting students from these courses to the Bachelor of Science is dealt with as a transfer, but that students do have the right to appeal these decisions. He assured Mr Blakeney that any such appeal is dealt with case by case. Members approved the proposal to amend the courses.

Resolution AB_4_142/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science/Master of Nutrition and Dietetics, Bachelor of Science (Advanced)/Master of Nutrition and Dietetics and Bachelor of Science (Advanced Mathematics)/Master of Nutrition and Dietetics; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.
Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Science, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Bachelor of Science/Master of Nutrition and Dietetics, Bachelor of Science (Advanced)/Master of Nutrition and Dietetics and Bachelor of Science (Advanced Mathematics)/Master of Nutrition and Dietetics and amend the resolutions in CMS.

10.2.2.10 Faculty of Veterinary Science

(1) Bachelor of Science (Veterinary)

Resolution AB_4_143/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Veterinary Science to amend the Bachelor of Science (Veterinary); and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Veterinary Science, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Bachelor of Science (Veterinary) and amend the resolutions in CMS.

(2) Bachelor of Animal and Veterinary Bioscience, Bachelor of Veterinary Biology/Doctor of Veterinary Medicine

Resolution AB_4_144/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Veterinary Science to amend the Bachelor of Animal and Veterinary Bioscience and the Bachelor of Veterinary Biology/Doctor of Veterinary Medicine; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions and table of units of study arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Veterinary Science, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Bachelor of Animal and Veterinary Bioscience and the Bachelor of Veterinary Biology/Doctor of Veterinary Medicine and amend the resolutions in CMS.

(3) Bachelor of Veterinary Biology/Doctor of Veterinary Medicine

Resolution AB_4_145/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Veterinary Science to amend the Bachelor of Veterinary Biology/Doctor of Doctor of Veterinary Medicine; and
(2) approve the amendment of the Faculty resolutions and course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Veterinary Science, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Bachelor of Veterinary Biology/Doctor of Doctor of Veterinary Medicine and amend the resolutions in CMS.
10.2.3 Proceedings of the Committee

Resolution AB_4_146/15
That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Admissions Committee meeting held on 17 June 2015, as set out in the report presented.

11. Report of the Graduate Studies Committee

11.1 Oral report of the Chair
In the absence of Associate Professor Masters the Chair advised that the Committee had, like the Undergraduate Studies Committee, dealt with a large number of minor amendment proposals. He particularly pointed out the revised ranking guidelines for postgraduate scholarships, and put on record his thanks to Associate Professor Coleman and Professor Carroll for their work on this issue.

Resolution AB_4_147/15
That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee.

11.2 Report of the meeting held on 17 June 2015
11.2.1 Proposals for new and amended postgraduate courses
11.2.1.1 Faculty of Medicine
(1) Master of Medicine, Master of Science in Medicine, Master of Medicine (Advanced), Master of Science in Medicine (Advanced), Graduate Diploma in Medicine, Graduate Diploma in Science in Medicine, Graduate Certificate in Medicine, Graduate Certificate in Science in Medicine

Resolution AB_4_148/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine to amend the Master of Medicine and Master of Science in Medicine to introduce new streams in Clinical Neurophysiology, Maternal Fetal and Reproductive Medicine and the existing Sleep Medicine stream from the Master of Medicine (Sleep Medicine) and the Master of Medicine in Science (Sleep Medicine);
(2) recommend that Senate endorse the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal and approve amendments to the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificate in the Faculty of Medicine; and
(3) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: Chair to recommend that Senate note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine to amend the Master of Medicine and Master of Science in Medicine to introduce new streams in Clinical Neurophysiology, Maternal Fetal and Reproductive Medicine and the existing Sleep Medicine stream from the Master of Medicine (Sleep Medicine) and the Master of Medicine in Science (Sleep Medicine) and approve amendments to the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificate in the Faculty of Medicine.

The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Medicine, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Master of Medicine and Master of Science in Medicine to introduce new streams in Clinical Neurophysiology, Maternal Fetal and Reproductive Medicine and the existing Sleep Medicine stream from the Master of Medicine (Sleep Medicine) and the Master of Medicine in Science (Sleep Medicine) and approve amendments to the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificate in the Faculty of Medicine.
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Medicine stream from the Master of Medicine (Sleep Medicine) and the Master of Medicine in Science (Sleep Medicine) and amend the resolutions in CMS.

(2) Master of Surgery, Graduate Certificate in Surgery

Resolution AB_4_149/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine to amend the Master of Surgery (Stream) to introduce a Graduate Certificate in Surgery (Stream);
(2) recommend that Senate endorse the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal and approve amendments to the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificate in the Faculty of Medicine; and
(3) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: Chair to recommend that Senate note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine to amend the Master of Surgery (Stream) to introduce a Graduate Certificate in Surgery (Stream) and amend the resolutions in CMS.

The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Medicine, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Master of Surgery (Stream) to introduce a Graduate Certificate in Surgery (Stream) and amend the resolutions in CMS.

11.2.2 Minor course amendment proposals

11.2.2.1 Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning: Master of Architectural Science, Graduate Diploma in Architectural Science, Graduate Certificate in Architectural Science

Resolution AB_4_150/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Master of Architectural Science, Graduate Diploma in Architectural Science and Graduate Certificate in Architectural Science; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Master of Architectural Science, Graduate Diploma in Architectural Science and Graduate Certificate in Architectural Science and amend the resolutions in CMS.


11.2.2.2 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

(1) Master of Health Communication, Graduate Diploma in Health Communication, Graduate Certificate in Health Communication

Resolution AB_4_151/15

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Health Communication, Graduate Diploma in Health Communication and Graduate Certificate in Health Communication; and

(2) approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Master of Health Communication, Graduate Diploma in Health Communication and Graduate Certificate in Health.

(2) Master of Museum and Heritage Studies, Graduate Diploma in Museum and Heritage Studies, Graduate Certificate in Museum and Heritage Studies

Resolution AB_4_152/15

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Museum and Heritage Studies, Graduate Diploma in Heritage Studies and Graduate Certificate in Heritage Studies; and

(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Master of Museum and Heritage Studies, Graduate Diploma in Heritage Studies and Graduate Certificate in Heritage Studies and amend the resolutions in CMS.

(3) Master of Peace and Conflict Studies, Graduate Diploma in Peace and Conflict Studies, Graduate Certificate in Peace and Conflict Studies

Resolution AB_4_153/15

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Peace and Conflict Studies, Graduate Diploma in Peace and Conflict Studies and Graduate Certificate in Peace and Conflict Studies; and

(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions and the table of units of study arising from this proposal with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Master of Peace and Conflict
11.2.2.3 University of Sydney Business School: Master of Commerce, Graduate Diploma in Commerce, Graduate Certificate in Commerce

Resolution AB_4_154/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend the Master of Commerce, Graduate Diploma in Commerce and Graduate Certificate in Commerce; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, University of Sydney Business School, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Master of Commerce, Graduate Diploma in Commerce and Graduate Certificate in Commerce and amend the resolutions in CMS.

11.2.2.4 Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies
(1) Master of Engineering, Graduate Diploma in Engineering, Graduate Certificate in Engineering

Resolution AB_4_155/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Engineering, Graduate Diploma in Engineering and Graduate Certificate in Engineering; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Master of Engineering, Graduate Diploma in Engineering and Graduate Certificate in Engineering and amend the resolutions in CMS.

(2) Master of Professional Engineering (Software)

Resolution AB_4_156/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Software); and
(2) approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the table of units of study for the Master of Professional Engineering (Software).
(3) Master of Project Management, Graduate Diploma in Project Management, Graduate Certificate in Project Management

Resolution AB_4_157/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Project Management, Graduate Diploma in Project Management and Graduate Certificate in Project Management; and
(2) approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the table of units of study for the Master of Project Management, Graduate Diploma in Project Management and Graduate Certificate in Project Management.

11.2.2.5 Faculty of Health Sciences
(1) Master of Health Science (Developmental Disability)

Resolution AB_4_158/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Master of Health Science (Developmental Disability); and
(2) approve the amendment to the table of capstone units of study arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Health Sciences, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the table of capstone units of study for the Master of Health Science (Developmental Disability).

(2) Master of Medical Imaging Science, Graduate Diploma in Medical Imaging Science

Resolution AB_4_159/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Master of Medical Imaging Science; and
(2) approve the amendment of the table of units of study and specialisations arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Health Sciences, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the table of units of study for the Master of Medical Imaging Science.

(3) Master of Physiotherapy

Resolution AB_4_160/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Master of Physiotherapy; and

(2) approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Health Sciences, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the table of units of study for the Master of Physiotherapy.

11.2.2.6 Faculty of Medicine: Master of Medicine, Master of Science in Medicine, Master of Medicine (Advanced), Master of Science in Medicine (Advanced), Graduate Diploma in Medicine, Graduate Diploma in Science in Medicine, Graduate Certificate in Medicine, Graduate Certificate in Science in Medicine

Resolution AB_4_161/15
That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine to amend the Master of Medicine and Master of Science in Medicine; and

(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Medicine, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Master of Medicine and Master of Science in Medicine and amend the resolutions in CMS.

11.2.2.7 Faculty of Pharmacy

(1) Master of Pharmacy

Resolution AB_4_162/15
That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Pharmacy to amend the Master of Pharmacy; and

(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Pharmacy, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Master of Pharmacy and amend the resolutions in CMS.

(2) Graduate Certificate in Pharmacy Practice

Resolution AB_4_163/15
That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Pharmacy to amend the Graduate Certificate in Pharmacy Practice; and

(2) approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.
Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Pharmacy, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the table of units of study for the Graduate Certificate in Pharmacy Practice.

11.2.8 Faculty of Science: Master of Science (Research)

Resolution AB_4_164/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Master of Science (Research); and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal
with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Science, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Master of Science (Research) and amend the resolutions in CMS.

11.2.9 Sydney Conservatorium of Music: Master of Music (Musicology)

Resolution AB_4_165/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Sydney Conservatorium of Music to amend the Master of Music (Musicology); and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal
with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Sydney Conservatorium of Music, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Master of Music (Musicology) and amend the resolutions in CMS.

11.2.3 Revised Guidelines for the Award of Postgraduate Research Scholarships

Resolution AB_4_166/15
That the Academic Board approve the revised guidelines for the award of postgraduate research scholarships with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

Action: Manager, Scholarships and Financial Support Service, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the revised guidelines for the award of postgraduate research scholarships.

11.2.4 Proceedings of the Committee

Resolution AB_4_167/15
That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on 17 June 2015, as set out in the report presented.

12. Report of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee

12.1 Oral report of the Chair
Associate Professor Traini advised she had nothing to add to the report but was happy to take questions. The Chair added that this committee had sought additional advice from faculties regarding the 2014 reports on cases of academic dishonesty, adding that one of the anticipated outcomes of the Vice-Chancellor’s taskforce on academic dishonesty would be a streamlined annual report.
Resolution AB_4_168/15
That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee.

12.2 Report of the meeting held on 10 June 2015
12.2.1 Proceedings of the Committee

Resolution AB_4_169/15
That the Academic Board note the proceeding of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee meeting held on 10 June 2015, as set out in the report presented.

13. General Business

The meeting finished at 3:30 pm

Signed as a correct record

--------------------------------------------------
Chair

--------------------------------------------------
Date
6.1 Report on Senate Matters

6.1.1 Report on the Senate meeting held on 3 August 2015

At its meeting on 3 August 2015, Senate resolved as follows:

(1) **Courses**

   Endorsed the Academic Board’s approval of proposals from the:
   • Faculty of Education and Social Work with effect from 1 January 2017;
   • Faculty of Medicine with effect from 1 January 2016;
   and

   Approved the amendments of the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates with effect from 1 January 2016 for the Faculty of Medicine and 1 January 2017 for the Faculty of Education and Social Work.

(2) **Minor Course Amendments**

   Endorsed the Academic Board’s approval of a range of minor amendments to existing courses, with effect from 1 January 2016.

(3) **Other items**

   Senate received and noted the other matters reported by the Board, including the policy developments and other major items being undertaken in 2015.

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Board on academic matters considered by Senate at its meeting of 3 August 2015.

6.2 Honours and Distinctions

I am pleased to report the following honours and distinctions and recommend the Academic Board extend its congratulations to the recipients:

**Professor Lesley BARCLAY**, Faculty of Medicine

   Included on the list of Ten of the Best Research Projects 2014 from the National Health and Medical Research Council.

**Associate Professor Simon BARRIE**, Institute for Teaching and Learning

   Awarded a national grant by the Office of Learning and Teaching.

**Mr Tanvir HUDA and Professor Michael DIBLEY**, Faculty of Medicine

   Awarded a Grand Challenges Exploration from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

**Dr Manreena KAUR**, Brain and Mind Research Centre

   Received an Early Career Research award from the Society of Mental Health Research.

**Professor Bruce ROBINSON**, Faculty of Medicine

   Appointed to the Council of the National Health and Medical Research Council.

**Dr Gabrielle RUSSELL-MUNDINE**, National Centre for Cultural Competence

   Awarded a national grant by the Office of Learning and Teaching.

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Board on the honours and distinctions and congratulate the recipients, as set out in the report presented.

6.3 General Report

6.3.1 Academic Board membership

   The *University of Sydney (Academic Governance)* Rule 2003 (as amended) was revised earlier this year to amend various sections, including the introduction of extra student positions. The Board’s membership now includes two nominees of the SRC and two nominees of SUPRA. SUPRA has advised that it nominates Mr Thomas Greenwell and Ms Kylee Hartman-Warren to fill the two postgraduate positions with immediate effect.
Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the nomination of Mr Thomas Greenwell and Ms Kylee Hartman-Warren by SUPRA under clause 5.1.3.10 of the University of Sydney (Academic Governance) Rule 2003 (as amended).

6.3.2 Academic Board Standing Committees: Nominations for Membership
Dr Janice Gullick has advised that she needs to step down from the Graduate Studies Committee and has nominated Dr Andrea McCloughen to take her place for the rest of the year.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the nomination of Dr Andrea McCloughen as the representative of the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery on the Graduate Studies Committee for a term of membership expiring 31 December 2015.

6.3.3 Reframing the PhD for Australia's future universities
The Office of Learning and Teaching announced last month that it had awarded funding to the University of Sydney for the following project:

Title: Reframing the PhD for Australia's future universities
Lead institution: The University of Sydney
Partner institutions: Deakin University, La Trobe University, The University of Western Australia, The University of Auckland (NZ)
Project Leader: Associate Professor Simon Barrie
Abstract: The project will deliver practical strategies and resources that reframe and integrate (i) the PhD research project, (ii) its supervision, (iii) the disciplinary community the PhD occurs in, and (iv) universities’ doctoral research skills and teaching development strategies, to better prepare graduates for employment in both academia and industry. The project addresses the role of the PhD in preparing the future academic workforce, especially in relation to higher education teaching. While it pays particular attention to the preparation of doctoral students for careers in academia, it does so in a way that will also better prepare them for careers in industry and elsewhere. As a result of collaborations with international researchers, the project brings a much-needed academic tenor to the national conversations about the PhD. Through the nation's Academic Boards, it will engage academic communities in shaping a different way of thinking about the research 'heart' of the PhD borrowing from, and extending, the Carnegie Foundation's idea of 'stewardship'.
Funding: $349 000

The Office for Learning and Teaching nominated the contemporary PhD as a grant priority in 2015, and has awarded funding to a project led by Associate Professor Simon Barrie, Professor Trigwell and Associate Professor McCallum partnering with other universities. The project will look at concerns regarding the PhD’s ability to produce graduates able to tackle emerging issues, and consider how PhD learning outcomes can be looked at holistically. The project will use preparation for academic practice and stewardship of disciplines as a lens for these issues. Consultation across the University and via the national group of chairs of Academic Boards and Senates is also planned as well as a number of discussion papers.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the report on the OLT-funded project “Reframing the PhD for Australia's future universities” and agree to participate in the project as necessary.

6.3.4 Correspondence Register
Members are asked to note the following items of correspondence:

27/5/15 Correspondence with Dr Ole Bohn regarding the book "The Centenary of the Con"
Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the register of correspondence, as set out in the report presented.
9.1 Faculty of Agriculture and Environment: Amendment to 2016 Semester Dates
On behalf of the Faculty of Agriculture and Environment, the Acting Dean recommends the variation of the semester and vacation dates for 2016 as set out in the attached report in respect of this Faculty. These variations are mainly to allow for the faculty’s extensive field teaching program.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the request from the Faculty of Agriculture and Environment to amend its semester dates for 2016, as set out in the report presented.

9.2 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: Amendment to Constitution
The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences is proposing to amend the name of two of its departments: the Department of Art History and Film Studies to become the Department of Art History and the Department of Performance Studies to the Department of Theatre and Performance Studies. Both changes require consequent amendments to the membership of the faculty as set out in its Constitution.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board recommend that Senate approve the proposed amendments to the constitution of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.
MEMORANDUM

To: Chair of Academic Board,
   A/Prof Peter McCallum

From: Professor Alex McBratney, Dean

cc: Executive Officer to Academic Board,
    Ms Megan Kemmis

Date: 8 July 2015

Subject: The Faculty of Agriculture and Environment 2016 Academic Calendar

The Faculty of Agriculture and Environment has an extensive field teaching program as described in the attached file. Due to the number of field trips and distances travelled some of these occur one to two weeks before the start of Semester 1 and Semester 2. As a result, we would like to vary our semester dates to start 2 weeks before the traditional semester 1 start date and start 1 week before the traditional Semester 2 start date.

Regards

Alex McBratney
Dean
Professor of Soil Science

Faculty of Agriculture and Environment
Biomedical Building C31
The University of Sydney
NSW 2006 Australia

T +61 2 8627 1010
E agriculture.dean@sydney.edu.au
sydney.edu.au

Location of Biomedical Building:
1 Central Avenue
Australian Technology Park,
Eveleigh NSW 2015

19 August 2015
FACULTY OF AGRICULTURE & ENVIRONMENT

FACULTY FIELD TRIPS AND EXCURSIONS

*Note, prices and times run are indicative and may be subject to change at short notice due to external factors such as weather and external suppliers’ price increases. Additional excursions may also be introduced for other units of study throughout your candidature and students should check their unit of study outlines provided in the first weeks of semester for further details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinator</th>
<th>UoS</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Damien Field</td>
<td>AFNR3001</td>
<td>Laos – International Development</td>
<td>January/February</td>
<td>~21 days</td>
<td>Airfare to Laos, meals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Tan</td>
<td>AGRO4003/AFNR5201</td>
<td>Narrabri/Nowley – Northern NSW – Cotton and PA</td>
<td>O-Week</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>$75 per night – covering transport, accommodation, some meals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Adams</td>
<td>AGEN1002</td>
<td>Snowy Mountains/Tumut/Lockhart: Managing Land Systems</td>
<td>Weekend Semester 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>AGEN1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feike Dijkstra</td>
<td>ENVI5708</td>
<td>Cootamundra – Environmental Sampling</td>
<td>Weekend at end of Week 2 Sem 1</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>$100 – transport, accommodation, most meals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balwant Singh</td>
<td>SOIL2003</td>
<td>Cobbitty – Field description of soil.</td>
<td>Thursday and Friday of O-Week</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>None except transport costs. No overnight stay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Cattle</td>
<td>SOIL2004</td>
<td>Hunter Valley</td>
<td>Last week of holidays before start of Sem 2</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>$250 – accommodation and most meals. Transport is the responsibility of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex McBratney</td>
<td>SOIL3009</td>
<td>Northern NSW</td>
<td>Week before O-Week</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$300 – accommodation and transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willem Vervoort</td>
<td>LWSC2002(^1)</td>
<td>Cootamundra - Hydrology</td>
<td>Semester 2 Break</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$100 – transport, accommodation, most meals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lachlan Ingram</td>
<td></td>
<td>Can be used for PD</td>
<td>Pilbara, Western Australia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1000 – transport, accommodation, most meals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Merchant</td>
<td>AGEN2005</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Weekend between Week 5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cost of food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inakwu Odeh</td>
<td>ENVX3001</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Semester 2 Break</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$100 – transport, accommodation, most meals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Ampt</td>
<td>AFNR4001</td>
<td>Central NSW</td>
<td>Easter Break</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>$450 – transport, accommodation, most meals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southern NSW or Northern NSW</td>
<td>Semester 2 Break</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 LWSC2002 and ENVX3001 excursions are run back to back over 5 days in the Semester 2 Break

**Excursions which are part of core units in degrees**

**BEnvSys:** AGEN1002, SOIL2003, LWSC2002, ENVX3001, SOIL3009

**BScAgr:** AGEN1002, SOIL2003, SOIL2004, one of the AFNR4001 excursions
On 25 May the Faculty’s Dean’s Executive Committee endorsed a name change for the Department of Art History and Film Studies to the Department of Art History. This change will be on the next faculty Board agenda scheduled for the 10 August. This change is intended to articulate an unambiguous identity, while also reflecting the depth of expertise of staff in the department.

On 30 March the Faculty’s Dean’s Executive Committee endorsed a name change for the Department of Performance Studies to the Department of Theatre and Performance Studies. This change was endorsed at the Faculty Board on 4 May. This change is a response to a review of the School of Letters, Arts and Media and is intended to highlight the department’s theatre allegiances.

These changes require your approval. I have attached the reports submitted to DEC outlining the rationales.

**Art History and Film Studies proposed name change: Department of Art History**

As part of the continuing discussion of identity and marketing that has followed the revived and now cross-Faculty Film Studies Major, and the incorporation of Museum Studies colleagues, the current Department of Art History and Film Studies has recognized the need for clarity and for simplicity in the Department title. Having explored a number of options, it has agreed to the proposition of the SLAM Review that the Department change its name to the Department of Art History. The name implies no weakening of the department’s commitment to the Film Studies program. The new name however, articulates a strong and unambiguous identity for marketing purposes and reflects the department’s strength and depth in historical study of global art, especially as the competition locally divests itself of its commitment to historical art.

We expect the name change to catalyse new marketing and web literature, and a new and clear articulation of the Art History major to outside audiences, and in particular to potential students.

Mark Ledbury, CoD, Art History and Film Studies
Vanessa Smith, HoS, SLAM

**Performance Studies proposed name change: Department of Theatre and Performance Studies**

The Department of Performance Studies has responded positively to FASS and SLAM initiatives over the past 4 years. Through the Refocusing the Majors project (2012), the department’s own Operational Plan (2013-2016), and the FASS Sustainable Curriculum Project (2014), old units were retired and new units established. The department implemented a major change with the introduction of junior units across 2014/15, and this has already had a positive effect on student load.

In 2014 the Review of the School of Letters, Art and Media also focused on aspects of the department’s profile. It was suggested that the department illustrate its theatre as well as performance synergies more emphatically. On reflection the department agreed. It has extensive theatre allegiances, illustrated by the fact that 15 of 20 undergraduate units are thematically theatre based. However, this affiliation has not been well signposted. The department recognizes the need to play to these established strengths.

We therefore propose a name change, from the Department of Performance Studies to the Department of Theatre & Performance Studies. These changes will, as the SLAM Review Committee suggested, make it easier for potential students, colleagues and external entities to ‘place’ the discipline and the department.

Amanda Card, CoD Performance Studies
Vanessa Smith, HoS SLAM
Membership of the Faculty – schools and departments, centres and programs
1. The schools, departments, centres and programs that the Vice-Chancellor has determined shall be placed under the supervision of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences are:

1.1 School of Letters, Art and Media comprising the following:

1.1.1 Art History and Film Studies
1.1.2 English
1.1.3 Linguistics
1.1.4 Media and Communications
1.1.5 Museum Studies
1.1.6 Theatre and Performance Studies
1.1.7 Studies in Religion
1.1.8 Australian Literature Program
1.1.9 Celtic Studies Program
1.1.10 Digital Cultures Program
1.1.11 Film Studies Program
1.1.12 Centre for Medieval Studies
1.1.13 Pacific and Regional Archive for Digital Sources in Endangered Cultures
1.1.14 The Power Institute

1.2 School of Languages and Cultures comprising the following:

1.2.1 Arabic Language and Cultures
1.2.2 Chinese Studies
1.2.3 Japanese Studies
1.2.4 French Studies
1.2.5 Germanic Studies
1.2.6 Hebrew, Biblical and Jewish Studies
1.2.7 Indian Sub-Continental Studies
1.2.8 Indonesian Studies
1.2.9 Italian Studies
1.2.10 Korean Studies
1.2.11 Modern Greek Studies
1.2.12 South East Asian Studies
1.2.13 Spanish and Latin American Studies
1.2.14 Asian Studies Program
1.2.15 Buddhist Studies Program
1.2.16 European Studies Program
1.2.17 International and Comparative Literature Studies (ICLS) Program

1.3 School of Philosophical and Historical Inquiry comprising the following:

1.3.1 Archaeology
1.3.2 Classics and Ancient History
1.3.3 Gender and Cultural Studies
1.3.4 History
1.3.5 Philosophy
1.3.6 American Studies Program
1.3.7 Australian Archaeological Institute at Athens
1.3.8 Centre for Time
1.3.9 Heritage Studies Program
1.3.10 Sydney Centre for the Foundations of Science

1.4 School of Social and Political Sciences comprising the following:

1.4.1 Anthropology
1.4.2 Government and International Relations
1.4.3 Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies
1.4.4 Political Economy
1.4.5 Sociology and Social Policy
1.4.6 Graduate School of Government
1.4.7 Centre for International Security Studies
1.5 School of Economics
AGENDA ITEM 10
Report of the Admissions Committee

10.2 Report of the Admissions Committee meeting held by circulation on 29 July 2015
The Admissions Committee met by circulation on Wednesday, 29 July 2015 and the agenda was circulated to: Professor J Hanrahan (Chair), Mr K Blakeney, Professor T Carlin, Associate Professor S Cattle, Ms Y Cheng (for Ms J Chambers), Associate Professor R Cooper, Mr K Ghezel, Mr S Isaac, Associate Professor A Masters, Associate Professor P McCallum, Mr B Nelson, Associate Professor T Wilkinson and Ms K Wylie.

The agenda papers for this meeting are available from the Committee's website: http://sydney.edu.au/ab/committees/admissions/admissions_agendas.shtml

10.2.1 Amendment to the Coursework Policy 2014
It was proposed that the Coursework Policy 2014 be amended to allow international applicants similar rights of deferral of admission to undergraduate courses as are currently available to domestic applicants. The amendment is as follows:

38 Deferred admission by commencing domestic undergraduate applicants
   (1) An domestic applicant offered a place in an undergraduate award course may defer admission to that course, but only as provided in this Part.
   (2) The University may permit an domestic applicant to defer admission provided that the offer of admission has not lapsed or been withdrawn by the University due to the applicant's actions prior or subsequent to the offer being made.
   (3) Subject to subclause (4) below, the maximum period of deferral is one year.
   (4) The Dean of the relevant faculty may extend the period of deferral for an individual applicant to a maximum of two years.
   (5) Applicants who are offered a place in an undergraduate award course at the Sydney Conservatorium of Music must undertake a further satisfactory audition prior to admission.
   (6) The Dean of the relevant faculty may decline to allow deferral for a particular course.

The proposal was discussed by circulation and it was agreed that the proposal be approved as presented. It was also suggested that the extension of deferral to international postgraduate students be discussed at a future date.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the proposed amendment to the Coursework Policy 2014, with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.
11.2 Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee meeting held on 5 August 2015

The Committee met on 5 August 2015, when there were present: Associate Professor S Cattle (Chair), presiding, Associate Professor R Cooper, Dr W Davis, Dr M Hardie, Dr J Humberstone, Associate Professor P McCallum, Dr T Newsome, Associate Professor L Smith, Associate Professor T Wilkinson. In attendance: Mr S French, Professor S Kilbreath, Associate Professor H McKenzie, Ms M Kemmis, Dr J Rule.

The agenda for this meeting is available from the Committee’s website: http://sydney.edu.au/ab/committees/UG_studies/UG_studies_agendas.shtml

11.2.1 Minor course amendment proposals

11.2.1.1 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: Bachelor of Political, Economic and Social Sciences

A proposal had been received from the Sydney Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Undergraduate Course resolutions of the Bachelor of Political, Economic and Social Sciences. Under ‘requirements for award,’ the wording proposed by FASS for item (d) was as follows:

a minimum of 12 senior credit points from any two of Economics, Government and International Relations, Political Economy, and either Anthropology or Sociology (not both). (These units of study must be taken from two subject areas that are different from the core major);

The Undergraduate Studies Committee approved the proposed amendment but recommended that a sub-numbering formatting would be clearer. Following the meeting, the document was re-formatted in accordance with the Committee’s suggestion. (re-formatted attachment *)

Recommendation

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the requirements for award for the Bachelor of Political, Economic and Social Sciences; and

(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

11.2.1.2 Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies

1 Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees

As part of the approved proposal for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours, the individual combined degree resolutions were replaced by one resolution that contains sections pertaining to each of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees. A proposal has been received by the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. to amend the relevant sections of the single course resolution that encompasses the eight Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees, so that the new resolution will accurately prescribe the rules governing these degrees in 2016.

The Undergraduate Studies Committee approved the proposal subject to some clarifications requested by the Faculty of Science relating to references to its units of study.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies relating to the Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees; and
(2) 

Bachelor of Information Technology/Bachelor of Medical Science E14-E16

The Faculty of Science had requested amendments to the course resolution for the Bachelor of Information Technology and Bachelor Medical Science, Clause 6: Progression Rules. The purpose is to specify in more detail the unit of study completion rules for the Medical Science component of the combined degree. These specifications are also reflected in changes to Clause 7: Requirements of the Award. The same change is proposed for the single course resolution for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees, thereby ensuring uniformity in the rules governing the Medical Science component of both combined degrees.

The Undergraduate Studies Committee approved the proposal subject to some clarifications requested by the Faculty of Science relating to references to its units of study.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies relating to the Bachelor of Information Technology and Bachelor Medical Science; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal
with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

11.2.1.3 Faculty of Health Sciences: Resolutions of the Faculty of Health Sciences for coursework awards E17-E21

A proposal had been received from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Resolutions of the Faculty of Health Sciences for coursework awards, to clarify and formalise the method by which the Faculty will determine the honours mark and classification in appended and integrated honours. In addition, the proposal seeks to clarify the process by which the University Medal is awarded to Honours candidates, due to a perception of circularity in the current resolution.

The Undergraduate Studies Committee approved the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences relating to coursework awards; and
(2) approve the amendments to the Faculty Resolutions arising from this proposal
with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

11.2.1.4 Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery: Bachelor of Arts/Master of Nursing, Bachelor of Science/Master of Nursing, Bachelor of Health Science/Master of Nursing E22-E23

A proposal had been received from the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery to update the Course Resolutions for the above degrees, removing the statement referring to elective units of study in the Master of Nursing and the combined degrees. The Course Resolutions for the Master of Nursing and the combined degrees currently contain a statement referring to 90 credit points of core units of study and 6 credit points of elective units of study. This will be an out-dated statement in 2016, as under the curriculum for these degrees there are now 96 credit points of core units of study and no elective units. Sydney Nursing School would like approval to remove the reference to elective units of study, and amend the wording of the Bachelor of Arts / Master of Nursing Course Resolutions.
Academic Board Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee – Appendix E

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery relating to the Bachelor of Arts/Master of Nursing, Bachelor of Science/Master of Nursing and Bachelor of Health Science/Master of Nursing; and
(2) approve the amendment to the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

11.2.2 Honours data
The Undergraduate Studies Committee considered the enclosed consolidated data from faculty reports on awards with honours. It was agreed that this report would be referred to the Academic Board for its information.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the report on Honours data.

11.2.3 Proceedings of the Committee
The Undergraduate Studies Committee:
- endorsed the proposed amendment to the Coursework Policy 2014 related to deferral of admission (see agenda item 10.2.1 under the report of the Admissions Committee for full details); and
- noted the report of the Academic Board meeting of 1 July 2015, as set out in the report presented.

Recommendation:
That the Academic Board note the above report on the Committee Proceedings.
11.2.1.1 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: Bachelor of Political, Economic and Social Sciences

Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

Contact person: Dr Susan Schroeder/Emma Doyle 20 July 2015

1. Name of award course
   Bachelor of Political, Economic and Social Sciences

2. Purpose of proposal
   To amend the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Undergraduate Course resolutions of the Bachelor of Political, Economic and Social Sciences.

3. Details of amendment

4. Requirements for award
   (1) The units of study that may be taken for the Bachelor of Political, Economic and Social Sciences are set out in Table A and Table B of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Tables of units of study.
   (2) To qualify for the award of the pass degree, a candidate must successfully complete 144 credit points, comprising:
      (a) a maximum of 60 junior credit points;
      (b) a minimum of 84 senior credit points;
      (c) a core major from the majors listed in these resolutions;
      (d) a minimum of 12 senior credit points from any two of:
         (i) Economics;
         (ii) Government and International Relations;
         (iii) Political Economy; and
         (iv) either Anthropology or Sociology (not both).
   These units of study must be taken from two subject areas that are different from the core major.

4. Transitional arrangements

5. Other relevant information

6. Signature of Dean
Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies

Contact person: David Lowe ext. 15653; Glenys Eddy ext. 18556; Christine Lacey, ext. 40678.

1. Name of award course
   Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Arts
   Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Arts
   Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Commerce
   Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Commerce
   Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Design in Architecture
   Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Design in Architecture
   Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Laws
   Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Laws
   Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Medical Science
   Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Medical Science
   Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Science
   Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Science
   Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Music Studies
   Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Music Studies
   Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Project Management
   Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Project Management

2. Purpose of proposal
   As part of the approved proposal for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours, the individual
   combined degree resolutions were replaced by one resolution that contains sections
   pertaining to each of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees.
   It is proposed to amend the relevant sections of the single course resolution that
   encompasses the eight Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees, so that the new
   resolution will accurately prescribe the rules governing these degrees in 2016.

3. Details of amendment
   Amendments to the relevant sections of the resolution have been marked up to outline the
   changes requested by the participating faculties. These proposed changes have been
   approved by the faculties concerned.
   Please note that with three exceptions, all of the proposed amendments are to Clause 6:
   Requirements for Award.
   Please see Appendix A for a description in table form of the proposed changes.
   Please see Appendix B for the marked-up proposal.

4. Transitional arrangements
   The transitional arrangements stated in the original single combined degree resolution are for
   a 2016 implementation, and remain unchanged.

5. Other relevant information: N/A

6. Signature of Dean or Delegate

19 August 2015
## Appendix A: Table of Proposed Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined degree</th>
<th>Faculty Contact</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE Hons combined: Engineering component</td>
<td>Glenys Eddy</td>
<td>6 (1) (c): specification of “relevant Engineering stream specialist table” rather than “Engineering tables”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE Hons/BA</td>
<td>Emma Doyle</td>
<td>No change for 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE Hons/BDesArc</td>
<td>Penny Andreou</td>
<td>3 (3): deletion of the clause concerning majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE Hons/BCom</td>
<td>Neville Mills</td>
<td>No change for 2016: amendments planned for 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE Hons/LLB</td>
<td>Chris Pile</td>
<td>No change for 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE Hons/BMedSc</td>
<td>Sascha Jenkins</td>
<td>6 (8) (c): change to completion requirements 11 (3): change to progression rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE Hons/BSc</td>
<td>Sascha Jenkins</td>
<td>No change for 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE Hons/BMus</td>
<td>Ivy Chu</td>
<td>3 (4): change to Music Studies streams 5 (2): change to admission requirements 6 (10) (ii): Composition: change to music skills requirements 6 (10) (iii): change to Musicology Principal Study requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE Hons/BPM</td>
<td>Christine Lacey</td>
<td>6 (9), addition of “and electives” to description of units to complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B:

Minor Resolution Amendment for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours Combined Degree Course Resolution.

Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees
Bachelor of Engineering combined degrees
Combined Degree Course Resolutions

Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Arts
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Arts
Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Commerce
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Commerce
Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Science
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Science
Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Design in Architecture
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Design in Architecture
Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Laws
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Laws
Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Medical Science
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Medical Science
Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Music Studies
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Music Studies
Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Project Management
Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Project Management

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 2000 (the 'Coursework Rule'), 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.

Course resolutions
0 Terminology
(1) In the following resolutions, all reference to the Bachelor of Engineering degree apply to both the Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Engineering Honours degrees, except where otherwise indicated.

1 Course codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPENGART-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGART-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPENGCOM-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGCOM-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPENGSCI-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGSCI-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPENGDAR-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Design in Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGDAR-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Design in Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPENGLAW-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGLAW-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPENGMSC-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Medical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGMSC-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Medical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGMST-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Music Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Music Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Attendance Pattern

(1) The attendance pattern for the following programs is full-time only. The attendance pattern for all other Bachelor of Engineering combined courses is full time or part time.
   (a) Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Design in Architecture
   (b) Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Design in Architecture
   (c) Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Laws
   (d) Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Laws

(2) Part time students must still satisfy appropriate enrolment progression and are subject to the same degree time limits as full time students. International students are required to follow the enrolment pattern as specified by their visa. The Faculty strongly recommends full time enrolment as the preferred option for all undergraduate students unless exceptional circumstances exist.

3 Streams

(1) Completion of a stream is a requirement of the Bachelor of Engineering.
(2) Within the Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Design in Architecture and the Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Design in Architecture, the Bachelor of Engineering is available only in the Civil Engineering stream. For all other Bachelor of Engineering combined degrees, the streams available for the Bachelor of Engineering are listed under the course resolution for the Bachelor of Engineering.
(3) Streams available for the Bachelor of Design in Architecture are listed under the course resolution for the Bachelor of Design in Architecture. Completion of a stream is not a requirement of the Bachelor of Design in Architecture. Candidates may transfer between streams in the Bachelor of Design in Architecture.
(4) The Bachelor of Science degree is available in the following streams:
   (a) Advanced
   (b) Advanced Mathematics.
   Completion of a stream is not a requirement of the Bachelor of Science. Candidates wishing to transfer between streams should contact the Faculty of Science student office.
(5) The Bachelor of Music Studies is available in the following streams:
   (a) Performance
   (b) Composition
   (c) Contemporary Music Practice
   (d) Musicology
   (e) Performance
   Completion of a stream is a requirement of the Bachelor of Music Studies

4 Cross-Faculty management

(1) Candidates in the combined Engineering and Law courses will be under the general supervision of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies until the end of the semester in which they complete the requirements for the Bachelor of Engineering. They will then be under the supervision of the Faculty of Law. Candidates in all other combined degree programs will be under the general supervision of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies for the duration of the combined program.
(2) The Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies and the Dean of the Faculty hosting the associated combined degree shall jointly exercise authority in any matter concerned with the combined course not otherwise dealt with in these resolutions.

5 Admission to Candidature

(1) Admission to these degrees is on the basis of a secondary school leaving qualification such as the NSW Higher School Certificate (including national and international equivalents), tertiary study or an approved preparation program. English language requirements must be met where these are not demonstrated by sufficient qualifications taught in English. Special admission pathways are open for mature aged applicants who do not possess a school leaving qualification, educationally disadvantaged applicants and for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Applicants are ranked by merit and offers for available places are issued according to the ranking. Details of admission policies are found in the Coursework Rule.
(2) Admission to the Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Music Studies will, in addition to the above, require the applicant to complete a music skills test or jazz aptitude test and:

(a) Principal Study in Composition, to submit at least three compositions in different performance media which should represent their present level of achievement as composers and to attend an interview;

(b) Principal Study in Contemporary Music Practice, to submit a portfolio with original work; song(s) or composition(s) in any genre that demonstrates a high level of creative potential and technical ability and to attend an interview;

(c) Principal Study in Musicology, to present an example of recent written work and to attend an interview;

(d) Principal Study in Performance, to undertake a practical audition in their nominated instrument or in voice.

The results of this process will form part of the ranking of applicants.

6 Requirements for Award

(1) To qualify for the award of the combined degree:

(a) For all Bachelor of Engineering combined degrees except the Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Laws, a candidate must complete 240 credit points and satisfy any additional requirements specified in the following clauses.

(b) For the Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Laws combined degree, a candidate must complete 288 credit points and any additional requirements specified in the following clauses.

(c) Where the requirements specified in the following clauses account for less than the total required credit, candidates must complete additional units of study (not including general electives) from the tables relevant to the Bachelor of Engineering relevant Bachelor of Engineering specialist stream table subject to any conditions specified in that table as may be necessary to satisfy the requirements of the degree.

(2) For the Bachelor of Engineering component of a combined degree:

(a) The units of study that may be taken for the Bachelor of Engineering component of the combined degree are set out in the tables of units of study for the Bachelor of Engineering single degree;

(b) Except where varied by other clauses of these resolutions, all candidates must complete a minimum of 144 credit points comprising:

(i) 36cp from the Engineering Core Table, including all required units;

(ii) 108cp from the Engineering Stream Core Table pertaining to the specialist stream being undertaken, including all required units;

(c) The Faculty Board may approve, based on appropriate academic justification, a list of approved unit alternatives. These alternatives specify, for particular Engineering stream / combined degree combinations, units within the normal requirements for the Bachelor of Engineering component of the combined degree that can be replaced by specified alternative units that would form part of the normal program for single degree students in that stream.

(3) For the Bachelor of Arts component of a combined degree:

(a) The units of study that may be taken are set out in Table A from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Tables of units of study.

(b) Candidates must complete a total of 84 credit points from Table A, including:

(i) a major from Table A

(ii) a minimum of 54 credit points of 2000/3000 level units of study.

(4) For the Bachelor of Commerce component of a combined degree:

(a) The units of study that may be taken are set out in the Tables of Undergraduate Units of Study from The University of Sydney Business School.

(b) Candidates must complete 96 credit points of units of study selected from the Table of Undergraduate Units of Study from The University of Sydney Business School including:

(i) 36 credit points of core units of study (30 junior credit points and six senior credit points); and

(ii) a major; and

(iii) at least 48 credit points of 2000 and/or 3000 level units of study.

(5) For the Bachelor of Science component of a combined degree:

(a) The units of study that may be taken are listed in Table 1 from the Faculty of Science.

(b) Candidates must complete 96 credit points of Science units of study, including at least one major in a Science subject area.

(c) Candidates completing the Bachelor of Science in the Advanced or the Advanced Mathematics stream must include as part of the above requirements:
(i) a minimum of 54 credit points of intermediate or senior Science units of study, of which at least 36 credit points shall be completed at either the Advanced level or as Talented Student Program (TSP) units of study; and

(ii) a minimum of 24 credit points of senior Science units of study at either the Advanced level or as TSP units in a single Science subject area.

(6) For the Bachelor of Design in Architecture component of a combined degree:
   (a) Candidates must complete 96cp of units of study from the BEBDesArch Bachelor of Design in Architecture Table.

(7) For the Bachelor of Laws component of a combined degree:
   (a) The units of study that may be taken are set out in the Faculty of Law Undergraduate Table.
   (b) Candidates must complete 144 credit points of Law units of study taken from the Faculty of Law Undergraduate Table, comprising:
      (i) 102 credit points of compulsory units of study; and
      (ii) 42 credit points of elective units of study, of which a maximum of 36 credit points are taken from Part 1 and a minimum of 6 credit points are taken from Part 2.

(8) For the Bachelor of Medical Science component of a combined degree:
   (a) The units of study that may be taken are listed in Table IV for the Bachelor of Medical Science from the Faculty of Science.
   (b) The mathematics requirement for the Bachelor of Engineering component of the combined degree will also satisfy the mathematics requirements for the Bachelor of Medical Science component.
   (c) Candidates must complete 10296 credit points of units including:
      (i) A minimum of 3024 credit points from junior Science units of study, including:
         - 12 credit points from Mathematics; and
         - 12 credit points from Chemistry; and
         - MBLG1001/1901/1991 Introductory Molecular Biology and Genetics; and
         - 6 credit points of Junior Biology.
      (ii) 48 credit points from intermediate Science units of study, comprising
         - 36 credit points of BMED240X units from Table IV (B) for the Bachelor of Medical Science; and
         - MBLG20X71/2971 Molecular Biology and Genomics Molecular Biology and Genetics A; and
         - MBLG20X72/2972 Genetics and Genomics Molecular Biology and Genetics B
      (iii) A minimum of 24 credit points of senior Science units of study selected from the Bachelor of Medical Science Table IV (C) the subject areas of Anatomy/Histology, Biology (Genetics), Biochemistry, Cell Pathology, Histology, Immunology, Infectious Diseases, Microbiology, Neuroscience, Nutrition & Metabolism, Pharmacology, Physiology and Virology.

(9) For the Bachelor of Project Management component of a combined degree:
   (a) Candidates must complete the core and elective units of study as set out in the Bachelor of Project Management Unit of Study Table.

(10) For the Bachelor of Music Studies component of a combined degree:
   (a) Candidates must complete 96 credit points from the Conservatorium of Music, and reach the minimum levels of achievement as set out in the table below:

   (i) Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
<th>Minimum level of achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Study</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Principal Study 1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Skills</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Harmony and Analysis 1-4 and Aural Perception 1-4; or Jazz Music Skills 1-4; or Music Fundamentals 1-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis, history and culture studies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>At least 12 credit points from Foundation units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   (ii) Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
<th>Minimum level of achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### (iii) Musicology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
<th>Minimum level of achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Study</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Principal Study 1-66 credit points of Historical Studies; 6 credit points of Ethnographical Studies; 6 credit points in Analytical Studies; 18 credit points in senior Musicology Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicology</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Musicology Workshop 1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Skills</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Harmony and Analysis 1-4 and Aural Perception 1-4; or Jazz Music Skills 1-4; or Music Fundamentals 1-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis, History and Culture Studies</td>
<td>48-24</td>
<td>At least 12-24 credit points from Foundation units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>61-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (iv) Contemporary Music Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
<th>Minimum level of achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Study</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Contemporary Music Practice 1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Music Studies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12cp in Popular Music units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Skills</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Music 1, 2 and 3, or 18cp in Harmony &amp; Analysis, Aural Perception, or Jazz Music Skills units; 6 cp in Music Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis, History and Culture Studies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sounds, Screens, Speakers, New Music, New Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7 Majors and Principal Studies**

1. For the Bachelor of Engineering component of a combined degree:
   (a) The conditions for awarding of a major, and the majors available, are the same as for the Bachelor of Engineering degree.
   (b) Where a candidate wishes to complete a major, and that major requires completion of additional credit points beyond the standard requirements, then such enrolment will be allowed for the first major to be completed, up to 24cp in total, provided the candidate utilises all allowed elective components in satisfying the requirements of the major.

2. For the Bachelor of Arts component of a combined degree:
   (a) completion of a Table A major is a requirement. The list of Table A majors is specified in the resolutions of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

3. For the Bachelor of Science component of a combined degree:
   (a) completion of at least one major is a requirement. The list of majors available in the Bachelor of Science is specified in the course resolutions for the Bachelor of Science.
(4) For the Bachelor of Medical Science component of a combined degree:
   (a) If the senior Science units of study completed by a candidate form a Science Table 1
       major, the candidate shall have that major recorded on the Bachelor of Medical Science
       testamur at the completion of the degree.

(5) For the Bachelor of Commerce component of a combined degree:
   (a) completion of a major is a requirement. The majors available and requirements are
       outlined in the resolutions for the Bachelor of Commerce.

(6) Principal Studies available for the Bachelor of Music Studies are listed under the course
    resolution for the Bachelor of Music Studies.

8 Requirements for Honours
(1) Honours is available to candidates and is as defined for the constituent single degrees.
(2) Requirements for awarding of honours is as defined in the course resolutions for the constituent
    single degrees.

9 Award of the Degrees
(1) Candidates will be awarded a separate testamur for each degree completed.
(2) The award grades, and the criteria for the grades, are as defined in the resolutions for the
    constituent degrees.
(3) Candidates who do not meet the requirements for the award of the Bachelor of Engineering
    Honours but who have otherwise satisfied the requirements of the Bachelor of Engineering shall
    graduate with the Bachelor of Engineering pass degree.
(4) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Arts (Honours) who do not meet the requirements,
    and who have not already graduated, will be awarded the Bachelor of Arts pass degree.
(5) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Commerce (Honours) who do not meet the
    requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded the Bachelor of Commerce
    pass degree.
(6) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Design in Architecture (Honours) who do not meet
    the requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded the Bachelor of Design
    in Architecture pass degree.
(7) The Bachelor of Laws can be awarded in the grades of either Pass or Honours. Honours in the
    Bachelor of Laws is awarded in First Class or Second Class in accordance with the resolutions
    of the Bachelor of Laws.
(8) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Medical Science (Honours) who do not meet the
    requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded the Bachelor of Medical
    Science pass degree.
(9) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Science (Honours) who do not meet the
    requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded Bachelor of Science pass
    degree.
(10) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Music Studies (Honours) who do not meet the
    requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded the Bachelor of Music
    Studies pass degree.

10 Course transfer
(1) For the Bachelor of Engineering combined with Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Bachelor
    of Design in Architecture, Bachelor of Project Management, Bachelor of Medical Science, and
    Bachelor of Music Studies, a candidate may abandon the combined program and elect to
    complete either the Bachelor of Engineering or the associated combined degree in accordance
    with the resolutions governing that degree.
(2) For the Bachelor of Engineering combined with Bachelor of Laws, a candidate may withdraw
    from the combined degree program and elect to transfer to the Bachelor of Engineering, by
    written application to the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies, and complete
    the requirements in accordance with the resolutions governing that degree at the time of
    transfer. Candidature in the Bachelor of Laws will cease in these circumstances.
(3) For the Bachelor of Engineering combined with Bachelor of Commerce a candidate may
    abandon the combined program and elect to complete either the Bachelor of Engineering or the
    Bachelor of Commerce in accordance with the resolutions governing that degree. Transfer from
    a combined degree to the Bachelor of Commerce is also conditional on the student having met
    the entry requirements of the Bachelor of Commerce in force at the time of their enrolment in
    the combined degree.
(4) Completion of the abandoned degree in the future will require a new application for admission to
    that course and completion in accordance with the resolutions governing that degree.

11 Progression rules
(1) General progression rules for the combined degrees are covered by the resolutions of the
    Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies.
(2) Candidates in a combined Science program with a stream in either Science (Advanced) or Science (Advanced Mathematics):
(a) are required to maintain a minimum average mark of 65 in all intermediate and senior units of study in Science subject areas in each year of enrolment. Failure to maintain the required average will result in candidates being transferred to the Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Science without stream in their next year of enrolment with full credit for the units of study completed.
(b) who fail to achieve an average mark of 65 across all Science units of study attempted in their final year but have otherwise completed all the requirements of the degree will be awarded the Bachelor of Science.

(3) Candidates in a combined law program:
(a) must successfully complete LAWS1006 Foundations of Law before enrolling in any other Bachelor of Laws units of study;
(b) are required to complete the Bachelor of Laws units of study in the order listed in the Faculty of Law Undergraduate Table;
(c) except with permission of the Dean of the Faculty of Law, candidates must complete the requirements for the Bachelor of Engineering before proceeding to Year Five of the Bachelor of Laws.

12 Transitional provisions
(1) These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature on or after 1 January, 2016.
(2) Students who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2016 may:
(a) complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions governing their candidature immediately prior to these changes; or
(b) where approved by the Faculty, elect to proceed under these resolutions provided appropriate programs of study can be identified.
Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies

Contacts: Glenys Eddy ext. 18556; Christine Lacey, ext. 40678; Sascha Jenkins (Science), ext. 40856.

1. **Name of award course**
   Bachelor of Information Technology and Bachelor of Medical Science

2. **Purpose of proposal**
   The Faculty of Science has requested amendments to the course resolution for the Bachelor of Information Technology and Bachelor Medical Science, Clause 6: Progression Rules. The purpose is to specify in more detail the unit of study completion rules for the Medical Science component of the combined degree. These specifications are also reflected in changes to Cause 7: Requirements of the Award. The same change is proposed for the single course resolution for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined degrees, thereby ensuring uniformity in the rules governing the Medical Science component of both combined degrees.

3. **Details of amendment**
   Amendments to the relevant sections of the resolution have been marked up to outline the changes requested by the Faculty of Science, and approved by the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies.

   Please see Appendix A for a copy of the course resolutions containing the proposed changes in marked-up form.

4. **Transitional arrangements**
   As the resolution amendment does not in effect alter the program of study but merely clarifies it, the transitional provisions remain unchanged.

5. **Other relevant information: N/A**

6. **Signature of Dean or Delegate**
Appendix A:

**Bachelor of Information Technology and Bachelor of Medical Science**

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 2000 (the ‘Coursework Rule’), 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.

**Course resolutions**

1 **Course codes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPITCMSC-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology and Bachelor of Medical Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 **Attendance pattern**

The attendance pattern for this course is available in full time or part time. Part time students must still follow appropriate enrolment progression and are subject to the same degree time limits as full time students. International students are required to follow the enrolment pattern as specified by their visa. The Faculty strongly recommends full time enrolment as the preferred option for all undergraduate students unless exceptional circumstances exist.

3 **Streams**

Completion of a stream is a requirement for the Bachelor of Information Technology. The streams available and requirements are outlined in the resolutions for the Bachelor of Information Technology.

4 **Cross faculty management**

(1) Candidates in this combined degree program will be under the general supervision of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies for the duration of the combined program.

(2) The Deans of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies and the Faculty of Science shall jointly exercise authority in any matter concerned with the combined course not otherwise dealt with in these resolutions.

5 **Admission to candidature**

Admission to this course is on the basis of a secondary school leaving qualification such as the NSW Higher School Certificate (including national and international equivalents), tertiary study or an approved preparation program. English language requirements must be met where these are not demonstrated by sufficient qualifications taught in English. Special admission pathways are open for mature aged applicants who do not possess a school leaving qualification, educationally disadvantaged applicants and for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Applicants are ranked by merit and offers for available places are issued according to the ranking. Details of admission policies are found in the Coursework Rule.

6 **Progression rules**

General progression rules for the combined degree are covered by the resolutions of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies.

(1) Except with the permission of the Dean, students may not enrol in an intermediate core unit of study until they have completed 42 credit points from:

- 12 credit points from Mathematics; and
- 12 credit points from Chemistry; and
- MBLG1001/1901 Introductory Molecular Biology and Genetics; and
- 6 credit points of Junior Biology; and
- 12 credit points of Information Technology

(2) Students may not enrol in a Science senior unit of study until they have completed 18 credit points of intermediate core units of study including BMED2401.

7 **Requirements for award**

(1) The units of study that may be taken for the Bachelor of Information Technology are set out in the Bachelor of Information Technology units of study table.

(2) The units of study that may be taken for the Bachelor of Medical Science are listed in Table IV for the Bachelor of Medical Science from the Faculty of Science.

(3) To qualify for the award of the pass degree, a candidate must successfully complete 240 credit points.

(4) For the Bachelor of Information Technology a candidate must complete 144 credit points in accordance with the Bachelor of Information Technology Table, consisting of all Core units of study together with additional Selected Core units for the Bachelor of Information Technology stream the candidate is pursuing, noting that:

(a) Students must complete at least 78 credit points of 3000-level or above IT units of study.

(b) The mathematics requirement for this degree will also satisfy the mathematics requirements for the Bachelor of Medical Science; and

(c) The core INFO1XXX requirement for this degree will also satisfy the computer science requirements for the Bachelor of Medical Science degree.
(5) For the Bachelor of Medical Science candidates must complete 120 credit points of units including:
(a) a minimum of 48 credit points from Junior Science units of study, including:
   (i) 12 credit points from Mathematics; and
   (ii) 12 credit points from Chemistry; and
   (iii) 12 credit points from Computer Science; and
   (iv) 6 credit points from Junior Biology; and
(b) 48 credit points from Intermediate Science units of study comprising
   (i) 36 credit points of BMED240X units from Table IV (B) for the Bachelor of Medical Science; and
   (ii) MBLG2071/2971 Molecular Biology and Genomics; and MBLG2X71 Molecular Biology and Genetics A; and
   (iii) MBLG2072/2972 Genetics and Genomics MBLG2X72 Molecular Biology and Genetics B.
(c) A minimum of 24 credit points of senior Science units of study selected from the Bachelor of Medical Science Table IV (C), the subject areas of Anatomy, Biology (Genetics), Biochemistry, Cell Pathology, Histology, Immunology, Infectious Diseases, Microbiology, Neuroscience, Nutrition and Metabolism, Pharmacology, Physiology and Virology.

8 Requirements for the Honours degree
(1) Honours is available to meritorious candidates, in either or both the Bachelor of Information Technology or Bachelor of Medical Science. Honours requires the completion an alternative set of units in the final year of the Bachelor of Information Technology degree and of one additional full time year of study for the Bachelor of Medical Science degree. The Resolutions of the Faculty of Science allow for part time honours in certain circumstances.
(2) Admission and award requirements for honours in the Bachelor of Information Technology are listed in the resolution for the Bachelor of Information Technology degree. Admission and award requirements for honours in the Bachelor of Medical Science are listed in the resolutions of the Faculty of Science.

9 Award of the degrees
(1) Candidates will be awarded a separate testamur for each degree completed.
(2) The Bachelor of Information Technology and the Bachelor of Medical Science are awarded in the grades of either Pass or Honours. The honours degrees are awarded in classes ranging from First Class to Third Class according to the rules specified in the Resolutions of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies and Faculty of Science.
(3) Candidates who do not meet the requirements for the award of the Bachelor of Information Technology (Honours) but who have otherwise satisfied the requirements of the Bachelor of Information Technology shall graduate with the pass degree.
(4) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Medical Science (Honours) who do not meet the requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded the pass degree.
(5) If the senior Science units of study completed by a candidate to satisfy section 7(5)(c) form a Science Table 1 major, the candidate shall have that major recorded on the Bachelor of Medical Science testamur at the completion of the degree.

10 Course transfer
A candidate may abandon the combined program and elect to complete either the Bachelor of Information Technology or the Bachelor of Medical Science in accordance with the resolutions governing that degree. Completion of the abandoned degree in the future will require a new application for admission to that course and completion in accordance with the resolutions governing that degree.

11 Transitional provisions
(1) These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature after 1 January, 2012 and students who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2012 who elect to proceed under these resolutions.
(2) Candidates who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2012 may complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions in force at the time of their commencement.
(3) Candidates who have completed some, but not all, of the intermediate core units listed in Table IV prior to January 2012 should consult the transitional provisions in the resolutions for the Bachelor of Medical Science degree, for information on completion of the required 36 credit points of BMED240X units.
Minor Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Health Sciences

Contact person: Dr Sarah Dennis / Ms Clare Higgins

1. Purpose of proposal
The Faculty of Health Sciences proposes to amend the Resolutions of the Faculty of Health Sciences for coursework awards, to clarify and formalise the method by which the Faculty will determine the honours mark and classification in appended and integrated honours.

Over the past two years, the Faculty of Health Sciences has implemented a common program of 3x6cp Honours units of study across all FHS integrated honours degrees. The aim of this program is to provide high achieving undergraduate students with interdisciplinary teaching and an opportunity to develop an understanding of research areas across the Faculty and how these might relate to their discipline. It will also help to prepare students for interdisciplinary working after graduation.

As part of the implementation of shared curricula, it was recognised that there was a need to more clearly define the process by which the Faculty calculates the overall Honours mark and classification, to ensure consistency, equity and transparency.

In addition, the proposal seeks to clarify the process by which the University Medal is awarded to Honours candidates, due to a perception of circularity in the current resolution.

2. Details of amendment
Details of the proposed amendment to the resolution are included below.

Resolutions of the Faculty of Health Sciences for coursework awards

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.

Part 1: Course enrolment

1 Enrolment restrictions
(1) The Coursework Rule Policy 2014 limits the maximum number of credit points students may take in any given semester. The Faculty does not encourage full time students to exceed the recommended enrolment patterns for its courses.
(2) Except with the permission of the Dean, a student may not enrol in more than 30 credit points in any one semester. All other enrolment restrictions are as defined by the Coursework Rule Policy.

2 Time limits
The Coursework Rule Policy limits the time students may take to complete their course; part time students should ensure their enrolment pattern allows completion within the maximum time. The Rule Policy also defines how time limits are affected by periods of suspension or absence.

3 Suspension, discontinuation and lapse of candidature
Suspension, discontinuation and lapse of candidature are governed in accordance with the Coursework Rule Policy.

4 Credit for previous study
(1) The Coursework Rule Policy specifies the general conditions for the granting of credit for previous study to courses in this Faculty, except that credit will not be granted for recognised prior learning older than 5 years at the time of first enrolment.
(2) The Faculty does not grant credit for units of study for which a result of Terminating Pass or Pass (Concessional) has been awarded.
Part 2: Unit of study enrolment

5 Cross-institutional study
(1) Provided permission has been obtained in advance, the Dean may permit a student to complete a unit of study at another institution and have that unit credited to the student's course requirements, provided that:
   (a) the unit of study content is not taught in any corresponding unit of study at the University; or
   (b) the student is unable, for good reason, to attend a corresponding unit of study at the University.
(2) Cross institutional study is regarded as another form of credit and will be counted as such when considering eligibility.
(3) Credit granted on the basis of work completed at another university or institution under a cross-institutional program may not exceed 24 credit points, or half of the overall course requirements, whichever is lesser.
(4) Credit granted on the basis of postgraduate study completed under a cross-institutional program at another institution other than a university may not exceed:
   (a) 18 credit points for a master's degree;
   (b) 12 credit points for a graduate diploma; and
   (c) 6 points for a graduate certificate.

6 International exchange
The faculty encourages students to participate in international exchange programs, unless specified otherwise in the resolutions for a particular course. For more information refer to the International Office.

Part 3: Studying and Assessment

7 Attendance
(1) Students are required to be in attendance at the correct time and place of any formal or informal examinations. Non attendance on any grounds insufficient to claim special consideration will result in the forfeiture of marks associated with the assessment. Participation in a minimum number of assessment items may be a requirement of any unit of study.
(2) Students are expected to attend a minimum of 90% of timetabled activities for a unit of study, unless granted exemption by the Dean, head of school or professor most concerned. The Dean, head of school or professor most concerned may determine that a student fails a unit of study because of inadequate attendance. Alternatively, at their discretion, they may set additional assessment items where attendance is lower than 90%.

8 Late submission policy
(1) It is expected that unless an application for special consideration has been approved, students will submit all assessment for a unit of study on the due date specified. If the assessment is completed or submitted within the period of extension, no academic penalty will be applied to that piece of assessment.
(2) If a student does not seek an extension, or one is not granted by the academic staff member concerned, or is granted but work is submitted by the student after the extended due date, the late submission of assessment will result in an academic penalty as follows:
   (a) For work submitted after the deadline but up to three calendar days late, a penalty of 20 per cent of the total mark awardable for the assignment will apply.
   (b) For work submitted after 3 days and less than one week after the deadline, a penalty of 30 per cent of the total mark awardable for the assignment will apply.
   (c) For work submitted more than one week late but less than two weeks after the deadline, a penalty of 40 per cent of the total mark awardable for the assignment will apply.
   (d) Work submitted more than two weeks after deadline will not be assessed (Fail).

9 Special consideration for illness, injury or misadventure
Special consideration is a process that affords equal opportunity to students who have experienced circumstances that adversely impact their ability to adequately complete an assessment task in a unit of study. The Coursework Rule Policy 2014 provides full details of the University policy. The procedures for applying for special consideration are described in each unit of study outline.

10 Concessional pass
In this Faculty the grade PCON (Concessional Pass) is not awarded.

11 Re-assessment
(1) The Faculty does not offer opportunities for re-assessment other than on the grounds of approved Special Consideration.
(2) Students who have successfully requested special consideration may be allowed to sit the exam or submit the required work at a negotiated date that should not be longer than the period of incapacitation and in any case not longer than 3 months after the original examination or submission date. After this time the student will be considered to have discontinued with permission. Marks will be awarded at full value for further examination where special consideration is approved.

Part 4: Progression, Results and Graduation

12 Progression in honours courses
Candidates for honours must maintain a credit average throughout the program.

13 Satisfactory progress
(1) The Faculty will monitor students for satisfactory progress towards the completion of their award course. In addition to the common triggers used to identify students not meeting academic progression requirements (as set out in the provisions relating to progression in the Coursework Rule Policy), students must pass any unit of study identified in the course resolutions as being critical to progression through the course. In addition, students must meet all requirements of off-campus clinical placement components of any unit of study undertaken. Performance in clinical placements will be monitored in accordance with the faculty's Clinical Progression Policy for Students.

(2) Students must complete at least one core unit per semester where core units are available for study in the normal progression pattern. Students who fail a core unit of study must repeat the failed unit at the first opportunity.

(3) Students whose conduct or work towards their award is unsatisfactory, may, on the recommendation of the head of the academic unit concerned, be refused permission by the Faculty to undertake or continue the clinical educational fieldwork/professional experience component of their award. The Faculty reserves the right not to place a student in any clinical placement or other professional experience setting in any instance where the performance, personal or professional conduct of the student does not meet the required standard of the professional organisation, regardless of the fact that the student may be enrolled in the unit of study.

14 Award of the bachelor's degree with honours
(1) Honours is available to meritorious students as either appended honours or integrated honours. Admission to candidature and requirements for the honours courses are in accordance with the relevant course resolutions.

(2) The honours mark will be determined in appended and integrated honours as follows:

(i) For integrated honours the honours mark is determined by the following calculation:

\[ \text{Final Honours Mark} = \frac{2}{3} \times (\text{FHS HWAM}) + \frac{1}{3} \times (\text{Yr 3/4 WAM}) \]

where the FHS HWAM is the average mark for Honours units weighted as follows:

- 1 x BHSC3021 Honours A: Research Design
- 2 x BHSC4012 Honours B: Applied Research Skills
- 7 x BHSC4013 Honours C: Research Project

and the Yr 3/4 WAM is the average mark of all attempted Year 3 and Year 4 units of study, as specified in the Faculty of Health Sciences Handbook, excluding Practicum and Clinical Placement units.

(ii) For appended honours, the honours mark will be determined by a weighted average mark of BHSC4005 Honours Thesis A (weighted 40%), and BHSC4006 Honours Thesis B (weighted 60%).

(3) Honours is awarded in the following classes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mark Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class I/First Class</td>
<td>mark &gt;= 80 ≤ honours mark ≤ 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Class / Honours Class II (Division I)</td>
<td>75 ≤ honours mark &lt;= mark &lt; 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Class / Honours Class II (Division II)</td>
<td>70 ≤ honours mark &lt;= mark &lt; 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class III/Third Class</td>
<td>65 ≤ honours mark &lt;= mark &lt; 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours not awarded</td>
<td>mark &lt; 65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15 **University medal**

University medals are awarded in accordance with the Coursework Rule Policy 2014 and Academic Board Policy on Awards with Honours. A student with First Class Honours may be awarded a university medal. The medal is awarded at the discretion of the Faculty to the highest achieving student/s who in the opinion of the Faculty have demonstrated outstanding achievement in a bachelor degree.

16 **Weighted average mark (WAM)**

(1) WAM's are used by the University as one indicator of performance. For example, WAM's may be used in assessing admission to and progression of honours, eligibility for prizes and scholarships, or assessing progression through a course. Unless another formula is specified for a particular purpose, the University WAM is used. The University WAM is calculated using the following formula:

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

where \( Wc \) is the unit of study credit points \( x \) the unit weighting and \( Mc \) is the mark achieved for the unit. The mark used for units with a grade AF is zero. Pass/ fail units and credited units from other institutions are not counted.

(2) For the Faculty of Health Sciences, each unit has a weight of 1, regardless of level.

**Part 5: Other**

17 **Requirements for students undertaking clinical placements**

(1) **Certificate of competency in CPR**

Students must have a current certificate of competency in Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation before enrolling in a course with a practicum placement requirement and must ensure that their certificate retains currency for the duration of their course. Please refer to our Faculty Placements web site for further information: [sydney.edu.au/health-sciences/placements/essential_preparation/preplacement_requirements/](http://sydney.edu.au/health-sciences/placements/essential_preparation/preplacement_requirements/)

(2) **Student clearance for clinical placements**

The NSW Ministry of Health requires that all students obtain clearance in order to undertake clinical placements. This involves a criminal record check. Please refer to our Faculty Placements web site for further information: [sydney.edu.au/health-sciences/placements/essential_preparation/preplacement_requirements/index.shtml](http://sydney.edu.au/health-sciences/placements/essential_preparation/preplacement_requirements/index.shtml)

(3) **Immunisation**

Students must have evidence of vaccinations and immunisation against certain infectious diseases prior to undertaking clinical placements. The requirements are consistent with Australian public health policy and NHMRC guidelines. Please refer to our Faculty Placements web site for further information: [sydney.edu.au/health-sciences/placements/essential_preparation/preplacement_requirements/index.shtml](http://sydney.edu.au/health-sciences/placements/essential_preparation/preplacement_requirements/index.shtml)

(4) **Prohibited employment declaration**

Students should complete a prohibited employment declaration for Working with Children as required by the NSW Commission for Children and Young People. Please refer to our Faculty Placements web site for further information: [sydney.edu.au/health-sciences/placements/essential_preparation/preplacement_requirements/index.shtml](http://sydney.edu.au/health-sciences/placements/essential_preparation/preplacement_requirements/index.shtml)

(5) **NSW Health Records and Information Privacy Act (2002)**


18 **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) Students who commenced prior to 1 January, 2015 may complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions in force at the time of their commencement, provided that requirements are completed by 1 January, 2021. 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**

Students currently enrolled in their 3rd Yr of integrated honours programs (the Bachelor of Applied Science (Physiotherapy) Honours, Bachelor of Applied Science (Occupational Therapy) Honours and Bachelor of Applied Science (Speech Pathology) Honours have been
provided with information about the process by which the final honours mark will be determined. The present proposal will formalise current practice within the Faculty, and no transitional arrangement will be required.

5. Other relevant information

6. Signature of Dean
Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Sydney Nursing School

Contact person: Jacqueline Bloomfield

1. Name of award course
   Bachelor of Arts/Master of Nursing
   Bachelor of Science/Master of Nursing
   Bachelor of Health Science/Master of Nursing

2. Purpose of proposal
   To advise the Undergraduate Studies Committee of an update to the Course Resolutions, removing the statement referring to elective units of study in the Master of Nursing and the Combined Degrees.

3. Details of amendment
   The Course Resolutions for the Master of Nursing and the Combined degrees currently contain a statement referring to 90 credit points of core units of study and 6 credit points of elective units of study. This will be an out-dated statement in 2016, as under the curriculum for these degrees there are now 96 credit points of core units of study and no elective units.

Sydney Nursing School would like approval to remove the reference to elective units of study, and change the 

   Bachelor of Arts / Master of Nursing 

Course Resolutions to read:

6(3) To qualify for the award of the combined Bachelor of Arts / Master of Nursing, a candidate must
   complete a total of 192 credit points, including:
   (a) 96 credit points from the Bachelor of Arts, comprising:
       (i) a major from Table A; and
       (ii) a maximum of 48 junior credit points; and
       (iii) a maximum of 12 credit points from Table B; and
   (b) 96 credit points of core units of study from the Master of Nursing, comprising:
       (i) 90 credit points of core units of study; and
       (ii) a six credit point elective unit of study.

The Faculty would like approval to remove the reference to elective units of study, and change the 

   Bachelor of Health Sciences / Master of Nursing 

Course Resolutions to read:

6(2) To qualify for the award of the combined Bachelor of Health Sciences / Master of Nursing, a candidate must complete a total of 192 credit points, including:
   (a) 96 credit points from the Bachelor of Health Sciences, comprising:
       36 credit points of core units of study; and
       60 credit points of elective units of study, including a minimum of 24 credit points of senior units of study; and
   (b) 96 credit points of core units of study from the Master of Nursing, comprising:
       (i) 90 credit points of core units of study; and
       (ii) a six credit point elective unit of study.

The Faculty would like approval to remove the reference to elective units of study, and change the 

   Bachelor of Sciences / Master of Nursing 

Course Resolutions to read:

6(3) To qualify for the award of the combined Bachelor of Science / Master of Nursing, a candidate must complete a total of 192 credit points, including:
   (a) 96 credit points from the Bachelor of Science, comprising:
       (i) a major from Table 1; and
       (ii) a maximum of 48 credit points of junior units of study, which must include 12 credit points from the Science subject areas of Mathematics and Statistics and 24 credit points from at least two other Science subject areas; and
(b) 96 credit points of core units of study from the Master of Nursing, comprising:
(i) 90 credit points of core units of study; and
(ii) a six credit point elective unit of study.

4. Transitional arrangements
For candidates who commenced prior to 2015, any unit of study which is no longer available will be replaced by the equivalent new unit of study under the current curriculum. Candidates who commenced prior to 2015 will be required to complete NURS6032 in place of clinical elective units, which will no longer be offered in 2016.

5. Other relevant information

6. Signature of Dean
11.2.2 Honours data

**University-wide Hons completions**

![Graph showing University-wide Hons completions from 2008 to 2013.](image)

**Six faculties with most Hons students**

![Graph showing six faculties with most Hons students from 2008 to 2013.](image)

*Note:* these six faculties accounted for 79% of USyd's Hons students in 2013; the “Big 4” = 69%
UM % of Hons cohort
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AGENDA ITEM 12
Report of the Graduate Studies Committee

12.2 Report of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on 5 August 2015

The Committee met on 5 August 2015 when there were present: The Chair (Associate Professor T Masters) presiding; Associate Professor R Coleman, Mr S French, Associate Professor G Frost, Dr A Harmer, Associate Professor D Hirsh, Associate Professor P Jones, Dr J Kavanagh, Associate Professor M Kertesz, Professor I Krass, Associate Professor P McCallum, Dr A McCloughen (for Dr J Gullick) and, Dr M Melatos. Associate Professor S Barrie, Ms S Brown, Ms M Kemmis, Ms S Lange, Dr S Reid and Mr T Smithers were in attendance.

The agenda for this meeting is available from the Committee website: http://sydney.edu.au/ab/committees/grad_studies/grad_studies_agendas.shtml

12.2.1 Proposals for new and amended postgraduate courses

12.2.1.1 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: Master of China Studies, Graduate Diploma in China Studies, Graduate Certificate in China Studies

F5-F10

The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences is proposing to delete the Master of China Studies due to lower than anticipated enrolments. The proposed deletion date will allow for the completion of all currently enrolled students.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to delete the Master of China Studies, Graduate Diploma in China Studies and Graduate Certificate in China Studies;

(2) recommend that Senate endorse the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal and approve amendments to the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificate in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences; and

(3) approve the deletion of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2019 (for the Graduate Certificate in China Studies), 1 January 2020 (for the Graduate Diploma in China Studies) and 1 January 2022 (for the Master of China Studies) in accordance with clause 12.2 of the Coursework Rule, as set out in the report presented.

12.2.2 Minor course amendment proposals

12.2.2.1 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: Graduate Certificate in Political Economy

F11

The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences is proposing to amend the admission requirements for the Master of Health Policy, Graduate Diploma in Health Policy and Graduate Certificate in Health Policy to clarify the work experience criterion.

12.2.2.2 Faculty of Medicine

(1) Master of Health Policy, Graduate Diploma in Health Policy, Graduate Certificate in Health Policy

F12-F14

The Faculty of Medicine is proposing to amend the admission requirements for the Master of Health Policy, Graduate Diploma in Health Policy and Graduate Certificate in Health Policy to clarify the work experience criterion.
Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine to amend the Master of Health Policy, Graduate Diploma in Health Policy and Graduate Certificate in Health Policy; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal
with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

(2) Master of Qualitative Health Research, Graduate Diploma in Qualitative Health Research
The Faculty of Medicine is proposing to amend the course resolutions for the Master of Qualitative Health Research and Graduate Diploma in Qualitative Health Research to revise the award requirements.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine to amend the Master of Qualitative Health Research and Graduate Diploma in Qualitative Health Research; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal
with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

(3) Changes to Tables of Units of Study
The Faculty of Medicine is proposing to introduce units of study in the areas of Clinical Epidemiology (CEPI), Genetic Counselling (GENC), Public Health (PUBH) and Qualitative Health Research (QUAL).

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine to amend tables of units of study for the study areas of Clinical Epidemiology, Genetic Counselling, Public Health and Qualitative Health Research; and
(2) approve the amendment of the tables of units of study arising from this proposal
with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

12.2.2.3 Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery
(1) Faculty Resolutions
The Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery is proposing to amend its faculty resolutions with respect to proof of English language proficiency for admission to its post-registration postgraduate courses.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery to amend its English language proficiency requirements; and
(2) approve the amendment of the Faculty resolutions arising from this proposal
with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.
The Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery is proposing to amend the course resolutions for its Advanced Learning Masters and associated graduate diplomas and graduate certificates to remove periods of suspension from the Time Limits of each degree program, and bring the maximum time limits for course completion in line with the University’s Coursework Rule.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery to amend the Master of Advanced Nursing Practice, Master of Cancer and Haematology Nursing, Master of Emergency Nursing, Master of Intensive Care Nursing, Master of Mental Health Nursing, Master of Nursing (Nurse Practitioner), Master of Primary Health Care Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Advanced Nursing Practice, Graduate Diploma in Cancer and Haematology Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Emergency Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Intensive Care Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Mental Health Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Primary Health Care Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Clinical Trials Practice, Graduate Certificate in Clinical Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Cancer and Haematology Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Emergency Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Intensive Care Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Mental Health Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Primary Health Care Nursing; and

(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal

with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

(3) Master of Nursing (Graduate Entry)

The Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery is proposing to amend the Master of Nursing (Graduate Entry) to remove the statement referring to elective units of study in the degree and amend the progression rules to clarify their meaning.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery to amend the Master of Nursing (Graduate Entry); and

(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal

with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

(4) Master of Philosophy

The Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery is proposing to amend the Master of Philosophy to ensure terminology is consistent and the Resolutions are in accordance with the current University policies and procedures for Higher Degrees by Research. Members suggested some changes to further align the resolutions to the new policies.
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Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery to amend the Master of Philosophy; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal
with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

12.2.3 Use of the UQI factor in awards ranking scheme

The Faculty of Medicine has identified an anomaly in the revised guidelines for ranking award applicants and the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee is proposing a minor change to the guidelines to address this.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve an amendment to the use of the UQI factor with respect to applications from members or fellows of medical colleges.

12.2.5 Proceedings of the Committee

The Committee considered a submission from the Student Administrative Services (SAS) Project to introduce the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015, noting that associated procedures were being developed. Following the meeting the SAS Project team advised that further work was being done to the draft policy in response to consultations with the SEG Research Training Committee. The policy and procedures will be resubmitted to the September meetings of the Committee and the Academic Board.

The Committee also:
• noted the report of the PhD Award Subcommittee on procedures for managing conflicts of interest by faculty;
• considered the “Investing in Research Excellence” discussion paper;
• noted a proposal from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Indigenous Strategy and Services) for a Sino – Australian Service Learning Exchange Program;
• noted a report on the OLT-funded project “Reframing the PhD for Australia’s future universities”;
• noted information on SUPRA’s survey on bullying;
• noted a report on the Government’s Research Policy and University Funding Review and the Review of the Research Training System;
• noted the reports of the PhD Award Sub-committee meetings held on 30 June and 28 July 2015;
• noted the reports of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-committee meetings held on 19 June and 10 July 2015; and
• noted the report of the Academic Board meeting of 1 July 2015.
12.2.1.1 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: Master of China Studies, Graduate Diploma in China Studies, Graduate Certificate in China Studies

Resolutions of the Senate

1 Degrees, diplomas and certificates of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
(1) With the exception of the Doctor of Letters and the Doctor of Philosophy, the Senate, by authority of the University of Sydney Act 1989 (as amended), provides and confers the following degrees, diplomas and certificates, according to the rules specified by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. The Doctor of Letters and the Doctor of Philosophy are provided and conferred according to the rules specified by the Senate and the Academic Board.

(2) This list is amended with effect from 1 January, 2022. Degrees, diplomas and certificates no longer open for admission will be conferred by the Senate according to the rules previously specified by the Faculty.

2 Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title &amp; stream</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DA000</td>
<td>Doctor of Letters</td>
<td>DLitt</td>
<td>Published Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB003</td>
<td>Doctor of Arts</td>
<td>DArts</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB000</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB004</td>
<td>Doctor of Social Sciences</td>
<td>DSocSci</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC080</td>
<td>Master of Arts (Research)</td>
<td>MA(Res)</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC009</td>
<td>Master of Philosophy</td>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC042</td>
<td>Master of Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>MAPpLing</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC075</td>
<td>Master of Art Curating</td>
<td>MArtC</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC063</td>
<td>Master of Art Curatorship **</td>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC034</td>
<td>Master of Arts **</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC043</td>
<td>Master of Asian Studies **</td>
<td>MAsianStud</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC073</td>
<td>Master of China Public Administration</td>
<td>MCPA</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC072</td>
<td>Master of China Studies</td>
<td>MChinaStud</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC044</td>
<td>Master of Creative Writing</td>
<td>MCW</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC045</td>
<td>Master of Crosscultural Communication</td>
<td>MCC</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC057</td>
<td>Master of Cultural Studies</td>
<td>MCS</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC040</td>
<td>Master of Development Studies</td>
<td>MDVST</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC050</td>
<td>Master of Digital Communication and Culture</td>
<td>MDCC</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC084</td>
<td>Master of Economic Analysis</td>
<td>MEcAnalysis</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC070</td>
<td>Master of Economics</td>
<td>MEc</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC076</td>
<td>Master of English Studies</td>
<td>MES</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC046</td>
<td>Master of European Studies **</td>
<td>MEuroStud</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC051</td>
<td>Master of Film Studies **</td>
<td>MFS</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC064</td>
<td>Master of Health Communication</td>
<td>MHC</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC055</td>
<td>Master of Human Rights</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC069</td>
<td>Master of Human Rights and Democratisation (Asia Pacific Regional Program)</td>
<td>MHRD(Asia Pacific)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC085</td>
<td>Master of International Relations</td>
<td>MIR</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC071</td>
<td>Master of International Security</td>
<td>MIntSec</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC060</td>
<td>Master of International Studies</td>
<td>MIntS</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC037</td>
<td>Master of Media Practice</td>
<td>MMedia Prac</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Combined degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title &amp; stream</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DH021</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts* and Bachelor of Laws^</td>
<td>BA/LLB</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH037</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts (Media and Communications)* and Bachelor of Laws^</td>
<td>BA(Media &amp; Comm)/LLB</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH019</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts* and Bachelor of Social Work^</td>
<td>BA/BSW</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH033</td>
<td>Bachelor of Commerce* and Bachelor of Arts*</td>
<td>BCom/BA</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH065</td>
<td>Bachelor of Economics* and Bachelor of Laws^</td>
<td>BEc,LLB</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XH029</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education (Secondary: Humanities and Social Sciences)^ and Bachelor of Arts^</td>
<td>BEd(Sec:HumSocSc)/BA</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH016</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering^ and Bachelor of Arts*</td>
<td>BE/BA</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH047</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology^ and Bachelor of Arts *</td>
<td>BIT/BA</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH061</td>
<td>Bachelor of International and Global Studies* and Bachelor of Laws^</td>
<td>BIGS/LLB</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QH021</td>
<td>Bachelor of Music Studies* and Bachelor of Arts*</td>
<td>BMusStudies/BA</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH063</td>
<td>Bachelor of Political, Economic and Social Sciences* and Bachelor of Laws **</td>
<td>BPESS/LLB</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH0XX</td>
<td>Bachelor of Project Management*/Bachelor of Arts*</td>
<td>BPM/BA</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH039</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science* and Bachelor of Arts*</td>
<td>BSc/BA</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*may be awarded with honours following a further year of study.

### Double degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title &amp; stream</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DH049</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts (Advanced) (Honours)^</td>
<td>BA(Adv)(Hons)/</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5 Graduate diplomas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DF022</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>GradDipAppLing</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF047</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Art Curating</td>
<td>GradDipArtC</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF039</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Art Curatorship **</td>
<td>GradDipAC</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF012</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Arts **</td>
<td>GradDipArts</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF023</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Asian Studies **</td>
<td>GradDipAsian Stud</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF045</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in China Studies</td>
<td>GradDipChinaStud</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF024</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Creative Writing</td>
<td>GradDipCW</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF034</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Cultural Studies</td>
<td>GradDipCS</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF020</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Development Studies</td>
<td>GradDipDVST</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF028</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Digital Communication and Culture</td>
<td>GradDipDCC</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF055</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Economic Analysis</td>
<td>GradDipEcAnalysis</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF043</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Economics</td>
<td>GradDipEc</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF048</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in English Studies</td>
<td>GradDipES</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF025</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in European Studies **</td>
<td>GradDipEuroStud</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF029</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Film Studies **</td>
<td>GradDipFS</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF040</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Health Communication</td>
<td>GradDipHC</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Health Security</td>
<td>GradDipHealthSec</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF033</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Human Rights</td>
<td>GradDipHR</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF056</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in International Relations</td>
<td>GradDipIR</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF044</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in International Security</td>
<td>GradDipIntSec</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF037</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in International Studies</td>
<td>GradDipIntS</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF017</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Media Practice</td>
<td>GradDipMediaPrac</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF049</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Museum and Heritage Studies</td>
<td>GradDipMHS</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF013</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Museum Studies **</td>
<td>GradDipMuseumStud</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF026</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Peace and Conflict Studies</td>
<td>GradDipPACS</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF042</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Political Economy</td>
<td>GradDipPolEc</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF000</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Public Administration</td>
<td>GradDipPAdmin</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF035</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Public Policy</td>
<td>GradDipPP</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF031</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Publishing</td>
<td>GradDipPub</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF021</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Strategic Public Relations</td>
<td>GradDipStatPR</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF041</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Translation Studies **</td>
<td>GradDipTrans</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF032</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in US Studies</td>
<td>GradDipUSS</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No new admissions**

### 6 Graduate certificates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**May be awarded with honours following a further year of study.**

**May be awarded with honours in an integrated program.**

**No new admissions from 2014.**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DG016</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>GradCertAppLing</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG041</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Art Curating</td>
<td>GradCertArtC</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG035</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Art Curatorship **</td>
<td>GradCertAC</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG004</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Arts **</td>
<td>GradCertArts</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG017</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Asian Studies **</td>
<td>GradCertAsianStud</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG039</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in China Studies</td>
<td>GradCertChinaStud</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG018</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Creative Writing</td>
<td>GradCertCW</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG030</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Cultural Studies</td>
<td>GradCertCS</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG014</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Development Studies</td>
<td>GradCertDVST</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG023</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Digital Communication and Culture</td>
<td>GradCertDCC</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG045</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Economics</td>
<td>GradCertEc</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG042</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in English Studies</td>
<td>GradCertES</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG019</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in European Studies **</td>
<td>GradCertEuroStud</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG024</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Film Studies **</td>
<td>GradCertFS</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG036</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Health Communication</td>
<td>GradCertHC</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Health Security</td>
<td>GradCertHlthSec</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG029</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Human Rights</td>
<td>GradCertHR</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG044</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in International Relations</td>
<td>GradCertIR</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG038</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in International Security</td>
<td>GradCertIntSec</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG031</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in International Studies</td>
<td>GradCertIntS</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG010</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Media Practice</td>
<td>GradCertMediaPrac</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG043</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Museum and Heritage Studies</td>
<td>GradCertMHS</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG005</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Museum Studies **</td>
<td>GradCertMuseumStud</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG020</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Peace and Conflict Studies</td>
<td>GradCertPACS</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG037</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Political Economy</td>
<td>GradCertPolEc</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG000</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Public Administration</td>
<td>GradCertPAdmin</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG032</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Public Policy</td>
<td>GradCertPP</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG026</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Publishing</td>
<td>GradCertPub</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG015</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Strategic Public Relations</td>
<td>GradCertStratPR</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG028</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in US Studies</td>
<td>GradCertUSS</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** No new admissions

^ No new admissions in the specialisations of Archaeology, Classics & Ancient History, Philosophy and Sociology, no new admissions in the speciality of History from Semester 2, 2013. No new admissions at all from Semester 1, 2014

### 7 Diplomas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DI000</td>
<td>Diploma of Arts</td>
<td>DipArts</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI002</td>
<td>Diploma of Language Studies</td>
<td>DipLangStud</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI001</td>
<td>Diploma of Social Sciences</td>
<td>DipSocSc</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate Certificate in China Studies Graduate Diploma in China Studies Master of China Studies

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 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.

Course resolutions

1 Course codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCCHNSTD-01</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in China Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNCHNSTD-01</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in China Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACHNSTD-01</td>
<td>Master of China Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Attendance pattern

The attendance pattern for these courses is full-time or part-time according to candidate choice.

3 Master’s type

The master’s degree in these resolutions is an advanced learning master’s course, as defined by the Coursework Rule.

4 Embedded courses in this sequence

(1) The embedded courses in this sequence are:
   (a) the Graduate Certificate in China Studies
   (b) the Graduate Diploma in China Studies
   (c) the Master of China Studies

(2) Providing candidates satisfy the admission requirements for each stage, a candidate may progress to the award of any of the courses in this sequence. Only the highest award completed will be conferred.

5 Admission to candidature

Available places will be offered to qualified applicants based on merit and in the order in which complete applications are received, according to the following admissions criteria:

(a) Admission to candidature for the Graduate Certificate in China Studies requires:
   A bachelor’s degree or higher award from the University of Sydney or equivalent qualifications.

Relevant, recent professional qualifications and experience may be assessed as suitable for admission by the Academic Director of the China Studies Centre under the provision for exceptional circumstances outlined in the Coursework Rule.

(b) Admission to candidature for the Graduate Diploma in China Studies requires:
   A bachelor’s degree with a credit average or higher award from the University of Sydney or equivalent qualification.

Completion of the requirements of the embedded graduate certificate in this discipline with a credit average, or qualifications deemed by the China Studies Centre to be equivalent.

Relevant, recent professional qualifications and experience may be assessed as suitable for admission by the Academic Director of the China Studies Centre under the provision for exceptional circumstances outlined in the Coursework Rule.

(c) Admission to the Master of China Studies requires:
   A bachelor’s degree with a credit average, or an honours bachelor’s degree from the University of Sydney, or qualifications deemed by the China Studies Centre to be equivalent;
   or

Relevant, recent professional qualifications and experience may be assessed as suitable for admission by the Academic Director of the China Studies Centre under the provision for exceptional circumstances outlined in the Coursework Rule.

Completion of the requirements of the embedded graduate diploma in this discipline with a credit average, or qualifications deemed by the China Studies Centre to be equivalent.

6 Specialisations

(1) The Graduate Certificate in China Studies is available in the following specialisations:
   (a) History
   (b) Law
   (c) Society

(2) The Graduate Diploma in China Studies and the Master of China Studies are available in the following specialisations:
   (a) Business
   (b) Health
Completion of a specialisation is a requirement of the Graduate course. Candidates wishing to transfer between specialisations should contact the course coordinator.

7. Requirements for award

(a) The units of study that are required for the courses are set out in the Postgraduate Table of Units of Study.

(b) To qualify for the award of Graduate Certificate in China Studies a candidate must complete 24 credit points, including:
   i. 6 credit points foundational unit of study
   ii. 6 credit points core advanced units of study
   iii. 6 credit points methods units of study, and
   iv. 6 credit points language units of study

(c) To qualify for the award of Graduate Diploma in China Studies a candidate must complete 48 credit points, including:
   i. 6 credit points foundational unit of study
   ii. 18 credit points core advanced units of study
   iii. 12 credit points methods units of study
   iv. 12 credit points language units of study

(d) To qualify for the award of Master of China Studies a candidate must complete 96 credit points, including:
   i. 6 credit point foundational unit of study
   ii. 18 credit points core advanced units of study
   iii. 12 credit points methods units of study
   iv. 24 credit points of language units of study
   v. 12 credit points of China Studies elective units of study, and
   vi. 24 credit points of capstone units of study

8. Credit for previous study

Credit transfer is subject to the provisions of the Coursework Rule. All candidates for the Master of China Studies, notwithstanding any credit transfer, must complete a foundational unit, 3 core advanced units, 4 language units, and 3 capstone units.

9. Progression rules

Candidates of the Master of China Studies must have completed (and passed units accruing to) 48 credit points before they are allowed to enrol in the Capstone units. Typically those 48 credit points will include 1 foundational unit, 3 core advanced units, 2 methods units and 2 language units.

Failure to pass any single unit of study requires the candidate to retake the unit without credit or exemption for work previously completed.

10. Cross-institutional study

Cross-institutional study is not available in this course.

11. International exchange

International exchange is not allowed in this course.

12. Course transfer

A candidate for the Master of China Studies or the Graduate Diploma in China Studies may elect to discontinue study and graduate with a shorter award from this embedded sequence, with the approval of the Academic Director of the China Studies Centre, and provided the requirements of the shorter award have been met.
12.2.2.1 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: Graduate Certificate in Political Economy

Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

Contact person: Emma Doyle / Dr Mark Melatos 9 July 2015

1. Name of award course
   Graduate Certificate in Political Economy

2. Purpose of proposal
   To amend the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Postgraduate Course resolutions of the Graduate Certificate in Political Economy to allow for admission by students of any undergraduate background.

3. Details of amendment
   5 Admission to candidature
   (2) Admission to candidature for the Graduate Certificate in Political Economy requires:
   (a) a bachelor’s degree from the University of Sydney, with a major in the Social Sciences, or an equivalent qualification; or
   (b) evidence of a minimum of three years’ recent, relevant, professional experience.

4. Transitional arrangements

5. Other relevant information

6. Signature of Dean
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12.2.2(1) Faculty of Medicine: Master of Health Policy, Graduate Diploma in Health Policy, Graduate Certificate in Health Policy

Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Sydney Medical School

Contact person: James Gillespie  x15048; james.gillespie@sydney.edu.au

1. Name of award course
   Graduate Certificate in Health Policy
   Graduate Diploma in Health Policy
   Master of Health Policy

2. Purpose of proposal
   To amend the course resolutions for the degrees listed above to provide clarification on admission requirements

3. Details of amendment
   See Resolutions below.

4. Transitional arrangements
   None required

5. Other relevant information

6. Signature of Dean

[Signature]

Bruce Robinson
Dean
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Graduate Certificate in Health Policy
Graduate Diploma in Health Policy
Master of Health Policy

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 2000 (the ‘Coursework Rule’), 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.

Course resolutions
1 Course codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCHEAPOL-01</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Health Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNHEAPOL-01</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Health Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAHEAPOL-01</td>
<td>Master of Health Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Attendance pattern
The attendance pattern for the Master of Health Policy and the Graduate Diploma in Health Policy is full time or part time according to candidate choice. The attendance pattern for the Graduate Certificate in Health Policy is part time only.

3 Master’s type
The master’s degree in these resolutions is a professional master’s course, as defined by the Coursework Rule.

4 Embedded courses in this sequence
(1) The embedded courses in this sequence are:
   (a) the Graduate Certificate in Health Policy
   (b) the Graduate Diploma in Health Policy
   (c) the Master of Health Policy.
(2) Providing candidates satisfy the admission requirements for each stage, a candidate may progress to the award of any of the courses in this sequence. Only the longest award completed will be conferred.

5 Admission to candidature
(1) Available places will be offered to qualified applicants based on merit, according to the following admissions criteria. In exceptional circumstances the Dean may admit applicants without these qualifications who, in the opinion of the Faculty, have qualifications, evidence of experience and achievement sufficient to successfully undertake the award.
(2) Admission to the Graduate Certificate in Health Policy requires:
   (a) a bachelor’s degree from the University of Sydney, or equivalent qualification, and a minimum of 1 year of work experience in a policy field; or
   (b) A minimum of 5 years professional work experience in a policy related field or pass  a preliminary examination(s) as prescribed by the Faculty.
(3) Admission to the Graduate Diploma of Health Policy requires:
   (a) completion of the requirements of the embedded graduate certificate, or equivalent qualification; or
   (b) a bachelor’s degree from the University of Sydney, or equivalent qualification, and a minimum of 1 year of work experience in a policy related field.
(4) Admission to the Master of Health Policy degree requires:
   (a) completion of the requirements of the embedded graduate certificate; or
   (b) completion of the requirements of the embedded graduate diploma, or equivalent qualification; or
   (c) a bachelor’s degree with a first or second class honours from the University of Sydney, or equivalent qualification, and a minimum of 1 year of work experience in a policy related field.

6 Requirements for award
(1) The units of study that may be taken for the courses are set out in the Table of Units of Study: Health Policy.
(2) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Certificate of Health Policy a candidate must successfully complete 24 credit points, including:
   (a) 18 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) 6 credit points of elective units of study, or other postgraduate units of study as approved by the course coordinator.

(3) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Diploma of Health Policy a candidate must successfully complete 36 credit points, including:
(a) 24 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) 12 credit points of elective units of study, or other postgraduate units of study as approved by the course coordinator.

(4) To qualify for the award of the Master of Health Policy a candidate must successfully complete 48 credit points, including:
(a) 36 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) 12 credit points of elective units of study, or other postgraduate units of study as approved by the course coordinator.

7 Transitional provisions
(1) These resolutions apply to persons who commenced their candidature after 1 January, 2015 and persons who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2015 who formally elect to proceed under these resolutions.

(2) Candidates who commenced prior to 1 January, 2015 complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions in force at the time of their commencement, provided that those requirements are completed by 1 January 2017. The Faculty may specify a later date for completion or specify alternative requirements for completion of candidatures that extend beyond this time.
Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Sydney Medical School

Contact person: Julie Mooney-Somers  t:9036 3412  julie.mooneysomers@sydney.edu.au

1. Name of award course
   Graduate Certificate in Qualitative Health Research
   Master of Qualitative Health Research

2. Purpose of proposal
   To amend the course resolutions for the degrees listed above to provide clarification on award requirements

3. Details of amendment
   See Resolutions below.

4. Transitional arrangements
   None required. Changes do not materially impact the award and reflect changes with the deletion of the Graduate Diploma.

5. Other relevant information

6. Signature of Dean

[Signature]

Bruce Robinson
Dean
Graduate Certificate in Qualitative Health Research
Master of Qualitative Health Research

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 2000 (the 'Coursework Rule'), 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.

Course resolutions

1 Course codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCQUAHER-01</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Qualitative Health Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAQUAHER-01</td>
<td>Master of Qualitative Health Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Attendance pattern

The attendance pattern for these courses is full time or part time according to candidate choice, except for the Graduate Certificate in Qualitative Health Research, which is part time only.

3 Master's type

The master's degree in these resolutions is a professional master's course, as defined by the Coursework Rule.

4 Embedded courses in this sequence

1. The embedded courses in this sequence are:
   a) the Graduate Certificate in Qualitative Health Research
   b) the Master of Qualitative Health Research.

2. Providing candidates satisfy the admission requirements for each stage, a candidate may progress to the award of any of the courses in this sequence. Only the longest award completed will be conferred.

5 Admission to candidature

1. Available places will be offered to qualified applicants according to the following admissions criteria. In exceptional circumstances the Dean may admit applicants without these qualifications who, in the opinion of the Faculty, have qualifications and evidence of experience and achievement sufficient to successfully undertake the award.

2. Admission to the Graduate Certificate in Qualitative Health Research requires:
   a bachelor degree from the University of Sydney or equivalent qualification.

3. Admission to the degree of Master of Qualitative Health Research requires:
   a bachelor degree in a related discipline including health sciences, allied health, medicine, nursing, pharmacy, psychology, humanities, arts, law, social sciences, political sciences, policy analysis, international development, social work, marketing, communication, journalism, education, from the University of Sydney or equivalent qualification.

6 Requirements for award

1. The units of study that may be taken for the courses are set out in the Table of Units of Study: Qualitative Health Research.

2. To qualify for the award of the Graduate Certificate in Qualitative Health Research a candidate must successfully complete 24 credit points of core units of study.

3. To qualify for the award of the Master of Qualitative Health Research a candidate must successfully complete 60 credit points, including:
   a) 24 credit points of core units of study;
   b) 18 credit points of elective units of study from Part 1 and/or Part 2 of the Table; and
   c) 18 credit points of research practice units of study.

7 Transitional provisions

1. These resolutions apply to persons who commenced their candidature after 1 January, 2015 and persons who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2015 who formally elect to proceed under these resolutions.

2. Candidates who commenced prior to 1 January, 2015 will complete the requirements for their candidature in accordance with the resolutions and course rules in force at the time of their commencement, provided that those requirements are completed by 1 January 2017. The Faculty may specify a later date for completion or specify alternative requirements for completion of candidatures that extend beyond this time.
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12.2.2.2(3) Faculty of Medicine: Changes to Tables of Units of Study

Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Sydney Medical School

Contact person: Vera Terry x17124; email: vera.terry@sydney.edu.au

1. Name of award course
   Various

2. Purpose of proposal
   To advise the Graduate Studies Committee of the adoption of new units of study as follows:
   
   CEPI5311 Diagnostic and Screening Tests (Part 1) (2 crp)
   CEPI5312 Diagnostic and Screening Tests (Parts 1 & 2) (6 crp)
   GENC5020 Introduction to Research (6crp)
   PUBH5029 Fundamentals of Public Health Nutrition (6rp)
   PUBH5550 Climate Change and Public Health (6crp)
   PUBH5424 Ecology, Public Health and the Environment (6crp)
   PUBH5059 Health Equity (6crp)
   QUAL5101 Qualitative Capstone I (6crp)
   QUAL5102 Qualitative Capstone II (6crp)
   QUAL5103 Qualitative Capstone III (6crp)

3. Details of amendment
   Unit of Study information has been submitted to Sydney Students to be available for the 2016 handbook.

4. Transitional arrangements
   N/A

5. Other relevant information

6. Signature of Dean

Bruce Robinson
Dean
1. Name of resolutions
   Faculty Resolutions

2. Purpose of proposal
   To seek approval from the Graduate Studies Committee to amend our English Language Proficiency Requirements in our Faculty Resolutions with regard to our post-registration postgraduate degrees.

   Sydney Nursing School would like to accept an applicant’s current registration with the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency (AHPRA) as a (Division 1) Registered Nurse and proof of current employment in this capacity at an appropriate health facility as equivalent to the University’s English language requirements for admission to our post-registration postgraduate degrees. The reasoning behind this request is that AHPRA requires the equivalent of an IELTS score of 7.0 for registration purposes. Currently registered nurses applying to our post-registration postgraduate degree programs have therefore already met the University’s minimum English language requirements.

3. Details of amendment

   Part 1: Course Enrolment

   1. English language proficiency requirements

      (4) For admission to post-registration postgraduate courses, proof of English Language proficiency may also be provided by a record of current registration with the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency (AHPRA) as a (Division 1) Registered Nurse and proof of current employment in this capacity at an appropriate health facility.

4. Transitional arrangements

5. Other relevant information

6. Signature of Dean
12.2.2.3(2) Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery: Master of Advanced Nursing Practice, Master of Cancer and Haematology Nursing, Master of Emergency Nursing, Master of Intensive Care Nursing, Master of Mental Health Nursing, Master of Primary Health Care Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Advanced Nursing Practice, Graduate Diploma in Cancer and Haematology Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Emergency Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Intensive Care Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Mental Health Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Primary Health Care Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Clinical Trials Practice, Graduate Certificate in Clinical Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Cancer and Haematology Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Emergency Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Intensive Care Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Mental Health Nursing, Graduate Certificate in Primary Health Care Nursing

Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Sydney Nursing School

Contact person: Janice Gullick

1. **Name of award course**
   - Graduate Certificate in Clinical Trials Practice
   - Graduate Certificate in Clinical Nursing
   - Master of Advanced Nursing Practice and Graduate Diploma in Advanced Nursing Practice
   - Master of Cancer and Haematology Nursing, Graduate Diploma and Graduate Certificate in Cancer and Haematology Nursing
   - Master of Emergency Nursing, Graduate Diploma and Graduate Certificate in Emergency Nursing
   - Master of Intensive Care Nursing, Graduate Diploma and Graduate Certificate in Intensive Care Nursing
   - Master of Mental Health Nursing, Graduate Diploma and Graduate Certificate in Mental Health Nursing
   - Master of Primary Health Care Nursing, Graduate Diploma and Graduate Certificate in Primary Health Care Nursing

2. **Purpose of proposal**
   To amend the course resolutions of our Advanced Learning Masters, Graduate Diploma and Graduate Certificate Programs to:
   1) remove periods of suspension from the Time Limits of each degree program; and
   2) bring the maximum time limits for course completion in line with the University's 2014 Coursework Rule (excluding the Master of Nursing (Nurse Practitioner)).

3. **Details of amendment**

   **Advanced Nursing Practice and Clinical Nursing**
   Time Limits
   7(1) A candidate must complete all the requirements for the Graduate Certificate within two and a half three calendar years of first enrolment, including excluding periods of suspension.
   (2) A candidate must complete all the requirements for the Graduate Diploma within four calendar years of first enrolment, including excluding periods of suspension.
   (3) A candidate must complete all the requirements for the Master's degree within five six calendar years of first enrolment, including excluding periods of suspension.

   **Cancer and Haematology Nursing**
   Times Limits
   7(1) A candidate must complete all the requirements for the Graduate Certificate within two and a half three calendar years of first enrolment, including excluding periods of suspension.
   (2) A candidate must complete all the requirements for the Graduate Diploma within four calendar years of first enrolment, including excluding periods of suspension.
   (3) A candidate must complete all the requirements for the Master's degree within five six calendar years of first enrolment, including excluding periods of suspension.

   **Clinical Trials Practice**
   Time Limits
6(1) A candidate must complete all the requirements for the Graduate Certificate within two and a half three calendar years of first enrolment, including excluding periods of suspension.

**Emergency Nursing**

**Time Limits**
7(1) A candidate must complete all the requirements for the Graduate Certificate within two and a half three calendar years of first enrolment, including excluding periods of suspension.
(2) A candidate must complete all the requirements for the Graduate Diploma within four calendar years of first enrolment, including excluding periods of suspension.
(3) A candidate must complete all the requirements for the Master's degree within five six calendar years of first enrolment, including excluding periods of suspension.

**Intensive Care Nursing**

**Time Limits**
7(1) A candidate must complete all the requirements for the Graduate Certificate within two and a half three calendar years of first enrolment, including excluding periods of suspension.
(2) A candidate must complete all the requirements for the Graduate Diploma within four calendar years of first enrolment, including excluding periods of suspension.
(3) A candidate must complete all the requirements for the Master's degree within five six calendar years of first enrolment, including excluding periods of suspension.

**Mental Health Nursing**

**Time Limits**
7(1) A candidate must complete all the requirements for the Graduate Certificate within two and a half three calendar years of first enrolment, including excluding periods of suspension.
(2) A candidate must complete all the requirements for the Graduate Diploma within four calendar years of first enrolment, including excluding periods of suspension.
(3) A candidate must complete all the requirements for the Master's degree within five six calendar years of first enrolment, including excluding periods of suspension.

**Primary Health Care Nursing**

**Time Limits**
7(1) A candidate must complete all the requirements for the Graduate Certificate in Primary Health Care Nursing within two and a half three calendar years of first enrolment, including excluding periods of suspension.
(2) A candidate must complete all the requirements for the Graduate Diploma in Primary Health Care Nursing within four calendar years of first enrolment, including excluding periods of suspension.
(3) A candidate must complete all the requirements for the Master of Primary Health Care Nursing within five six calendar years of first enrolment, including excluding periods of suspension.

**Master of Nursing (Nurse Practitioner)**

**Time Limits**
A candidate must complete all the requirements for the course within seven and a half calendar years of first enrolment, including excluding periods of suspension.

4. **Transitional arrangements**
Where a student’s length of candidature is approaching its maximum, and they have had a period of suspension under the previous faculty resolution, that period of suspension will no longer be counted when determining their maximum length of candidature.

5. **Other relevant information**
While the Nurse Practitioner Masters (a 72 credit point, 3 year program) will be included in these amendments with respect to excluding periods of suspension, the time limits for course completion will remain as they are. This is because this is our only Advanced Learning Masters course that requires accreditation by ANMAC (Australian Nursing & Midwifery Council). There is the danger of any change in changing course content in response to changes in ANMAC authorisation requirements leaving a student without the necessary educational preparation if their course has an extended duration.

6. **Signature of Dean**

19 August 2015
12.2.2.3(3) Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery: Master of Nursing (Graduate Entry)

Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Sydney Nursing School

Contact person: Jacqueline Bloomfield

1. Name of award course
   Master of Nursing (Graduate Entry)

2. Purpose of proposal
   To advise the Graduate Studies Committee of an update to the Course Resolutions, removing the statement referring to elective units of study in the Master of Nursing (Graduate Entry) and amending the progression rules to clarify their meaning.

3. Details of amendment
   The Course Resolutions for the Master of Nursing (Graduate Entry) degree currently contains a statement referring to 90 credit points of core units of study and 6 credit points of elective units of study. This will be an out-dated statement in 2016, as under the curriculum for these degrees there are now 96 credit points of core units of study and no elective units.

   Sydney Nursing School would like approval to remove the reference to elective units of study, and change the Master of Nursing (Graduate Entry) Course Resolutions to read:

   5(2) To qualify for the award of the Master of Nursing (Graduate Entry) a candidate must complete 96 credit points of core units of study.

   5(2) To qualify for the award of the Master of Nursing a candidate must complete 96 credit points, including:
   (a) 90 credit points of core units of study; and
   (b) a six credit point elective unit of study

   Sydney Nursing School would also like approval to amend the progression rules to clarify their meaning and prevent confusion, and change the Master of Nursing (Graduate Entry) Course Resolutions to read:

   6(1) All candidates enrolled in the Master of Nursing must successfully complete all Year One Master of Nursing units of study before progressing to Year Two Master of Nursing units of study as prescribed in the unit of study table for this degree.

   (2) Candidates may be permitted to enrol in Year Two units of study while also enrolled in a normal Year One units of study pattern in the Master of Nursing (Graduate Entry) providing the requested units are available in the required semester and the pre-requisites and co-requisites have been met.

4. Transitional arrangements
   For candidates who commenced prior to 2015, any unit of study which is no longer available will be replaced by the equivalent new unit of study under the current curriculum. Candidates who commenced prior to 2015 will be required to complete NURS6032 in place of clinical elective units, which will no longer be offered in 2016.

5. Other relevant information

6. Signature of Dean
Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Sydney Nursing School

Contact person: Associate Professor Sandra West

1. Name of award course
   Master of Philosophy

2. Purpose of proposal
   To amend the Resolutions for the Master of Philosophy degree to ensure terminology is consistent and the Resolutions are in accordance with the current University policies and procedures for Higher Degrees by Research.

3. Details of amendment
   Part 2: Admission requirements
   2 Eligibility for admission to candidature
   (1) To be eligible to be admitted to candidature by the Dean or Associate Dean, an applicant must have the qualifications and experience outlined in sub-clause 2(2), except where the applicant can demonstrate alternate qualifications and evidence of experience which would indicate they are able to successfully undertake the award.
   (2) An applicant must:
      (a) hold or have completed the requirements for:
         (i) a Bachelor's degree with first or second class honours or qualifications demonstrating equivalence with a Bachelor's degree; or
         (ii) a Master's degree;
      (b) be registered as a nurse or midwife in Australia or another country or hold a relevant professional qualification;
      (c) have a minimum of one year’s post-registration experience as a registered nurse or midwife, or other relevant professional work experience.
   3 Application for admission to candidature
   (1) An applicant for admission to candidature must submit to the Faculty:
      (a) satisfactory evidence of the applicant's eligibility for admission;
      (b) a proposed course of research and advanced study, approved by the Associate Dean Research or nominated delegate in which the work is to be undertaken; and
      (c) a statement certifying the applicant's understanding that, subject to the HDR Rule, if the candidature is successful, his or her thesis will be lodged with the University Librarian and made available for immediate public use.
   4 Credit transfer
   The HDR Rule specifies the conditions for the granting of credit for previous studies, including the effect on completion times.

Part 3: Candidature

5 Appointment of supervisor Supervision
   The Associate Dean Research or nominee Head of Department will appoint a research supervisor and auxiliary supervisor for each candidate in accordance with the HDR Rule and Academic Board policies for postgraduate research higher degree supervision.

6 Control, Location and Modes of Attendance of candidature
   The HDR Rule specifies the conditions for the control of candidature by the University and its location and modes of attendance.

7. Other studies during candidature
   (1) A candidate may attend, undertake or complete assessment for lectures, seminars, courses or practical work during the course of his or her candidature. In accordance with the HDR Rule Part 2.09 a Master’s degree must comprise a minimum of two-thirds research.

7 Location of candidature and attendance
   The HDR Rule specifies the conditions for the location of candidature and attendance by candidates at the University.

Part 4: Requirements

8 Degree requirements
   (1) To satisfy the requirements of the degree candidates must:
      (a) complete any specified probationary requirements;
      (b) complete any prescribed units of study;
(c) conduct research on the approved topic; and
(d) write a thesis embodying the results of the research.

9 The thesis
(1) A candidate shall produce a thesis that meets the requirements specified in the HDR Rule the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015.
(2) The thesis will have a maximum length of 60,000 50,000 words, except with the permission of the Director, Research Students Dean, Associate Dean, or the Chair of the faculty committee.

Part 5: Enrolment and progression

10 Probation
(1) Probationary admission to candidature will occur in accordance with the HDR Rule. A candidate is normally accepted for candidature on a probationary basis for a period not exceeding one year according to the provisions of the HDR Rule.
(2) In the probationary period each candidate must:
(a) complete any prescribed units of study;
(b) develop and present a refined research proposal to the satisfaction of the Research Supervisor and Associate Dean Research Postgraduate Coordinator Research; and
(c) demonstrate adequate English language competency for the completion of the degree.

11 Time limits, earliest and latest submission dates
The HDR Rule specifies the allowable completion times and submission dates available for full- and part-time candidates in this course.

12 Mode of attendance
The attendance pattern for this course is full-time or part-time according to candidate choice but is subject to approval by the Board of Postgraduate Studies.

13 Discontinuation of candidature
A candidate may discontinue enrolment in a unit of study or the degree subject to the conditions specified by the HDR Rule.

14 Suspension of candidature
A candidate may suspend enrolment from the degree subject to the conditions specified by the HDR Rule.

15 Leave of absence
A candidate may take leave of absence from the degree subject to the conditions specified by the HDR Rule.

16 Progress
A candidate is required to maintain satisfactory progress towards the timely completion of the degree. Progress will be reviewed annually according to the provisions of the HDR Rule.

Part 6: Examination

17 Form of the thesis
A candidate must ensure that the thesis prepared for examination is typewritten and bound according to the Academic Board resolutions of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

18 Examination of the thesis
(1) Examination of the thesis will be conducted in general accordance with standards prescribed by Academic Board for the Doctor of Philosophy, except that:
(a) three copies of the thesis shall be submitted by the candidate;
(b) two examiners will be appointed by the Faculty, at least one of whom shall be external to the University; and
(c) the Board of Postgraduate Studies will act in place of the PhD Award Sub-Committee.
(2) On successful completion of the examination process a minimum of two copies of the thesis will be required by the Faculty, one for lodgement in the University Library, as provided in the HDR Rule, and the other for lodgement in the Faculty Library.

19 Award of the degree
The degree is awarded at the Pass level only.

4. Transitional arrangements

Part 7: Other

20 Transitional provisions
(1) These course resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature after 1 January, 2013 and students who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2013 who elect to proceed under these resolutions.
(2) Candidates who commenced prior to 1 January, 2013, 2016 may complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions in force at the time of their commencement, provided that requirements are completed within the time limits specified in those resolutions.
The Dean or Associate Dean may specify a later date for completion or specify alternative requirements for completion of candidatures that extend beyond this time.

5. Other relevant information

6. Signature of Dean
12.2.3 Use of the UQI factor in awards ranking scheme

Following the Sub-Committee’s meeting on 10 July, the Chair of the Sub-Committee advised that the Faculty of Medicine had identified an unanticipated anomaly with the ranking guidelines that severely disadvantages a few applicants. He sought permission to implement a suggested fix and to bring the details of the amendment to the Graduate Studies Committee’s meeting in August.

**Issue:**
Under the old ranking guidelines membership or fellowship of one of the medical colleges (e.g. the Royal Australian College of Physicians) was equated with an H1E of 80. This has been preserved in the amended ranking guidelines with relevant applicants allocated a SAM of 80. However the SAM is potentially affected by the UQI factor, which potentially increases the SAM to recognise that a degree has been obtained by a highly ranked university. The medical colleges are not included in this list, so no increase is available to these applicants, and they effectively become uncompetitive, even though many of these applicants will have a medical degree from a Go8 university.

**Recommendation:**
The Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee recommends that a 1.1 UQI factor be applied to applicants who are members/fellows of the appropriate medical colleges. Where an Australian College has reciprocal recognition with an international equivalent, applicants who hold membership or fellowship with such colleges would also receive a 1.1 UQI factor.

The Chair of the Academic Board has endorsed the use of this revision to the ranking guidelines for the current APA and UPA round.
13.2 Report of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee meeting held on 29 July 2015

The Academic Standards and Policy Committee met on 29 July 2015, when there were present: Associate Professor J Barrett (Acting Chair), presiding, Mr K Blakeney, Dr I Gelissen, Associate Professor P Gibbens, Mr T Greenwell (SUPRA), Ms K Henderson, Dr P Knight, Mr A Lavery, Ms E May, Associate Professor P McCallum, Dr C Owens, Associate Professor C Sutton-Brady, Professor G Tolhurst and Associate Professor D Traini. Dr A Black, Ms S Brown, Professor T Carlin, Ms M Kemmis, Mr T Robinson, Ms L Rose, Dr L Schwarz, Mr T Smithers and Ms K Stanton.

The agenda papers for this meeting are available from the Committee’s website: http://sydney.edu.au/ab/committees/ac_stands/ac_stands_index.shtml

13.2.1 Coursework Policy and Procedure Amendments

The Student Administration Services (SAS) Project aligns with Strategy Four of the University Strategic Plan (Enrich the experience of university life for all our students) through the provision of “efficient and helpful student administration systems”. The SAS Project has undertaken a systematic review across the University’s student administration processes as part of a larger restructure of student administration. A series of improvements have been identified which would significantly enhance both the student and staff experience and enable the centralisation of certain student administration services. As a consequence, there are some key changes required to the Coursework Policy 2014 relating to Special Consideration and Recognition of Prior Learning; additional procedural level changes will be tabled at a future date. Amendments to the Assessment Procedures 2011 are also proposed, and the introduction of Coursework Credit Procedures 2015.

The Committee discussed student concerns regarding the removal of references to simple extensions, but a majority of members supported recommending the amendments to the Academic Board.

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board approve the amendments to the Coursework Policy 2014, the Assessment Procedures 2011 and the introduction of the Coursework Credit Procedures 2015 with effect from 1 January 2016 as set out in the report presented.

13.2.2 Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce Report

The new taskforce on academic misconduct and plagiarism has released its first report, which details some of the ways the University could improve the prevention and detection of academic dishonesty among students in the digital age.

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board:

1. note the report of the Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce “An Approach to Minimising Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism at the University of Sydney - Part 1: Prevention and Detection”;
2. endorse the recommendations of the report and undertake the review of assessment strategy and policy outlined in that recommendation; and
3. note that the Academic Standards and Policy Committee has established a working party to undertake the policy reviews outlined in recommendation (5).

13.2.3 Hague Declaration on Knowledge Discovery in the Digital Age

The Hague Declaration on Knowledge Discovery in the Digital Age (The Hague Declaration) aims to foster agreement among research, education and knowledge institutions about how best to enable access to facts, information and ideas for knowledge discovery in the Digital Age. The Hague Declaration sets forth the idea that the free flow of information and ideas is an essential human right; aims to remove legal and policy barriers to accessing data and facts; and aims to enable researchers to develop novel ways answer research questions.

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board endorse the University becoming a signatory to the Hague Declaration on Knowledge Discovery in the Digital Age.
13.2.4 Proceedings of the Committee
The Committee also:
- noted the report of the Academic Board meeting of 1 July 2015;
- discussed recordkeeping practices with respect to cases of academic misconduct;
- noted the discussion paper on Investing in Research Excellence;
- noted an update on the work of the Learning and Teaching Policy Framework Working Group; and
- noted a report from the SRC on faculty processes for student applications to convert fail grades to DC (discontinued not to count as fail) grades.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the report on the Committee’s proceedings.
SUBMISSION TO ACADEMIC BOARD
Meeting: 19 August 2015
ASSessment PROCEDures 2011
COURSEwork CREDIT PROCEDures 2015

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
The Student Administration Services (SAS) Project aligns with Strategy Four of the University Strategic Plan (Enrich the experience of university life for all our students) through the provision of “efficient and helpful student administration systems”. The SAS Project has undertaken a systematic review across the University's student administration processes as part of a larger restructure of student administration. A series of improvements have been identified which would significantly enhance both the student and staff experience and enable the centralisation of certain student administration services.

As foreshadowed at the last Academic Standards and Policy Committee meeting, there are some key procedural changes which underpin the proposed amendments to the Coursework Policy 2014 for Special Consideration and Credit. Enclosed for consideration are the proposed amendments to the Assessment Procedures 2011 and in addition, a set of new procedures entitled the Coursework Credit Procedures 2015.

The following is a summary of these amendments:

**Assessment Procedures 2011:**
- Retain special consideration as an academic decision however, enable the SAS PSU to apply exam based remedial decisions (for formal end of semester examinations) and other standard remedial decisions on behalf of faculties based on an agreed set of rules
- Non-standard remedial decisions to reflect the requirement for one academic approver
- Broaden the category of academic delegation for remediation decisions so that Faculties can determine the appropriate academic decision-maker based on faculty size and governance structure
- Procedures to support the centralisation of the special consideration and special arrangements applications and document assessment process
- Removal of reference to informal special consideration applications (simple extensions) in line with policy
- Inclusion of a university-wide replacement exam period
- Reduction in the timeframe for submission of a special consideration request from 5 to 3 working days to support the university-wide replacement exam period
- New requirement for students to retain original copies of supporting documentation for auditing purposes (including fraud prevention)
- Further clarification around what documentation is required in relation to Professional Practitioner’s Certificates to enable reporting and auditing and the inclusion of the requirement for students to set out the severity, duration and impact of their illness, injury or misadventure when using a statutory declaration as evidence

**Coursework Credit Procedures 2015 (new):**
- Retention of credit as an academic decision with the application of standard decisions (or precedents) applied by SAS PSU
- Inclusion of a time limit for credit offers to ensure currency of decision making and relevance to course and unit of study offerings particularly in cases where an applicant might defer their offer of enrolment
- Procedures to reflect current requirement for an applicant/student to accept or decline an offer of credit
• Provide discretion to approve requests made by students in cases where they have previously accepted a credit offer and subsequently seek to have the credit rescinded in line with policy
• Provide discretion for credit to be reinstated in cases where an applicant/student declines a credit offer which could have occurred in error or other similar circumstances in line with policy

As part of the SAS Project conceptual design phase, extensive consultation has taken place, consisting of approximately 228 academic and professional staff from across the University.

**Recommendation:**

That the Academic Board approve the amendments to the Coursework Policy 2014, the Assessment Procedures 2011 and the introduction of the Coursework Credit Procedures 2015 with effect from 1 January 2016 as set out in the report presented.

**Proposed changes to Coursework Policy 2014:**

**5 Definitions**

(1) In this policy:

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

**Part 11 Recognition of prior learning**

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) equivalent professional experience.

**Note 26:** An example of specific credit is credit given for Physics 1 [PHYS1001] at the University of Sydney for Physics 1 undertaken at the University of Adelaide.

**Note 27:** Examples of non-specific credit are: the University of Sydney does not teach Russian but a student may be granted credit for a full first year of study in Russian undertaken at the University of New South Wales, as 12 junior credit points; a student may be granted 48 junior credit points for the first year of an Arts degree completed at another Australian university.

**Note 27A:** Where possible, the University will assess credit before making an offer of admission. Where possible, the University will make an offer of credit to an applicant concurrently with his or her offer of admission. If accepted, credit offered to an applicant prior to enrolment will be granted at the time he or she is admitted to the award course. See the Coursework Credit Procedures 2015.

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

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

(a) in another award course at the University;

(b) in an award course at another Australian tertiary institution;

(c) at a recognised overseas tertiary institution;

(d) in an accredited higher education course offered by a registered private provider;

(e) in a course offered by the Vocational Education and Training Sector;

(f) in another award program approved by the Dean following an evaluation process; or

(g) in a non-award program approved by the Academic Board.

(2) Factors to be taken into account by an Associate Dean when evaluating a program for the purposes of subclause (1) include:
(a) the general educational practices and standards of the institution or system;
(b) the objectives of the particular course and the methods adopted to achieve those objectives;
(c) the duration of the course;
(d) the breadth, depth and balance of the course material;
(e) the methods of assessment in the course;
(f) the teaching staff conducting the course, including the numbers of teachers, and their professional qualifications, experience and educational expertise; and
(g) the accommodation and facilities offered to students undertaking the course, including equipment, library, laboratories, workshops and other instructional or research resources.

(3) Entry to the University's courses is competitive and eligibility for credit does not guarantee an applicant a place in a course.

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

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

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

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

Note 28: See clause 46 regarding waivers.

43 Awarding reduced volume of learning

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

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

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

(4) Reduced volume of learning will not be granted, except with the permission of the Associate Dean:
(a) where the reduced volume of learning was previously listed in an offer of credit made by the University prior to enrolment or during candidature, and declined by the applicant or student in accordance with sub-clause 43A(2); or
(b) to reinstate reduced volume of learning that has previously been rescinded, on request by the student in accordance with clause 43B.
43A Accepting and declining offers of specific credit, non-specific credit and reduced volume of learning
(1) The University may make offers to grant specific credit, non-specific credit and reduced volume of learning prior to enrolment or during candidature.
(2) An applicant or student must accept or decline (in whole or in part) any offer of credit made by the University:
   (a) prior to enrolment, on or before the date of his or her first enrolment in the award course for which credit is being offered;
   (b) during candidature, within twelve months of the date of the offer of credit.
(3) If an applicant or student does not accept or decline the offer of credit within the timeframe specified in subclause (2), the credit will not be processed and the University will regard the offer as having lapsed.
(4) The University may vary any offer to grant credit made to an applicant prior to enrolment, if the Dean has authorised a period of deferment of greater than one year.

Note 28A: See clause 38 regarding deferment.

43B Rescinding specific credit, non-specific credit and reduced volume of learning
(1) An Associate Dean may, in accordance with this policy and the course resolutions, and on request by a student, rescind any specific credit, non-specific credit or reduced volume of learning previously granted to the student in accordance with this policy.
(2) Except with the permission of the Associate Dean, once any specific credit, non-specific credit or reduced volume of learning has been rescinded in accordance with this clause, a student may not seek to have it reinstated.

Part 14 Assessment

67 Special consideration due to illness, injury or misadventure
(1) Generally, an illness, injury or misadventure will be taken into account when considering a student’s performance in a course or unit of study.
(2) Special consideration is provided in circumstances where well-attested illness, injury or misadventure occurs during a semester or at the time of an examination. It is an academic judgement which depends on the nature of the illness, misadventure or injury and its timing impact in relation to assessment or examination.
(3) Students who bear a primary carer responsibility toward another person at the time of an assessment may also apply for special consideration on the basis of illness, injury or misadventure on the part of the person for whom they care if their ability to prepare for or perform the assessment is adversely affected.
(4) Special consideration is also available to non-award students.
(5) Students who are granted special consideration must nonetheless be required to demonstrate achievement of designated learning outcomes.
(6) An informal application for special consideration may be made in relation to a non-examination task, which may result in an extension of up to five working days. Rescinded.
(7) A student who is reasonably capable of attempting an examination should do so, despite any accompanying application for special consideration.
(8) All applications for special consideration must be genuine and made in good faith.
   (a) Attempts to use special consideration as a means of gaining an unfair advantage in an assessment must be rejected.
   (b) Making an applications request for special consideration that is not genuine or in good faith may lead to disciplinary action against a student.
(9) An application for special consideration does not guarantee that the application will be granted.
(10) Special consideration must not be granted for:
   (a) balancing workloads from other units of study, disciplines or faculties;
   (b) information and communications technology-related problems, except where they could not have been prevented, avoided or the effects minimised by reasonable diligence by the student; or
   (c) jury service, military service, national sporting, religious or cultural commitments or other unforeseen events for which special arrangements may be provided in accordance with this policy.
(11) Special consideration granted to one or more students should not disadvantage other students.
69 Special arrangements for assessments

(1) The relevant delegate may make special arrangements available to any student who is unable to meet assessment requirements or attend examinations because of one or more of the following:

(a) essential religious commitments or essential beliefs (including cultural and ceremonial commitments);

(b) compulsory legal absence (such as jury duty or court summons);

(c) sporting or cultural commitments, including political or union commitments, where the student is representing the University, state or nation;

(d) birth or adoption of a child;

(e) Australian defence force or emergency service commitments (including Army Reserve);

(f) where the faculty relevant delegate can forms a the view that employment of an essential nature to the student would be jeopardised and that the student has little or no discretion with respect to the employment demand.

(2) Deans and or faculties The relevant delegate may consider make special arrangements for a student who is unable to meet assessment requirements or attend examinations for any other reason that is beyond the student’s reasonable control, situations other than those listed in subclause (1) at their the delegate’s own discretion, on a case-by-case basis.

(3) Special arrangements are intended to support the University’s commitment to flexible learning. However, while every reasonable attempt is made to accommodate student needs, it may not be possible to provide such arrangements in all cases. This is particularly so where clinical placements and practicums are involved.
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1 Purpose and application

(1) These procedures are to give effect to Part 14 of the Coursework Policy 2014 (“the policy”).

(2) These procedures apply to:

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

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

2 Commencement

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

3 Interpretation

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

   Note: See clause 5 of the policy.

(2) In these procedures:

   academic unit means a faculty, academic college, board of studies, school, department, centre or interdisciplinary committee of the University.
assessment rubrics means marking guides that state the criteria against which an assessment will be marked.

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

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

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

Note: See also the University Recordkeeping Manual, which at the date of this policy can be found at http://sydney.edu.au/arms/records_mgmt/uni_rec_manual.shtml

The State Records Act 1998 (NSW) can be found at: http://www.legislation.nsw.gov.au

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

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

4 Application of implementation statements to assessment principles

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note: See also Improving Learning and Teaching Through Collaboration, Benchmarking and Alliances Policy

(4) Peer review or moderation of assessment tasks should be used to ensure the appropriateness of the tasks set and their conformity with the policy.
Program learning outcomes must be consistent with the Academic Board Resolutions: Generic Attributes of Graduates of the University of Sydney, and assessed at appropriate points throughout the degree.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Informing students - Principles 1 and 2

The scope and nature of the assessment for each unit of study should be explicitly stated at the beginning of delivery of the unit. This statement should include:

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

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

(c) the weighting of items and of tasks or papers;

(d) the due date for submission or testing;

(e) the conditions under which examinations will be sat;

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

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

Unit of study outlines must comply with the requirements of the Management and Evaluation of Coursework Teaching resolutions of the Academic Board.

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

Students must be informed of the style of academic referencing required and given opportunities to practice and gain feedback on academic writing and relevant scholarly conventions in the course discipline, in accordance with the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy 2012.
7 Marking and determination of grades - Principles 2 and 3

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

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

Note: See for example the unit of study provisions in the Academic Board resolutions Management and Evaluation of Coursework Teaching.

(3) Assessment must be evaluated solely on the basis of students’ achievement against criteria and standards specified to align with learning outcomes. In the interests of transparency of grading the University uses a standards-based approach to assessing the achievements of students. In this approach, grades are allocated using pre-determined standards.

(4) Faculties and departments should implement the following aspects of standards-based assessment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(9) Due account must be taken of any special consideration granted under clause 67, and reasonable adjustment under clause 68, of the policy.
8 Conduct of assessment - Principles 1 to 4

(1) The principal examiner is responsible for:
(a) complying with and completing all administrative requirements for assessment;
(b) providing, as appropriate, a copy of any examination paper to the Examinations Office by the specified deadline, or, failing this, printing the examination paper(s) locally;
(c) providing copies of all final examination papers to Examinations Office for retention in the University archives;
(d) ensuring security of working papers developed in preparation for examinations; and
(e) ensuring that all secure papers are accounted for.

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

(3) Examinations during the formal period should normally be no longer than 2 hours. The responsible dean may make provision for 3 hour examinations or those that which are in total longer than the equivalent of 30 minutes per credit point.

(4) Where a final examination is conducted for a unit of study:
(a) any unit of study with a value of 6 or fewer credit points should be examined in no more than one examination in the formal examination period, apart from exceptional cases approved by the relevant dean;
(b) any unit of study with a value of more than 6 credit points should be examined in no more than 2 examinations sessions; and
(c) no student may be required to sit for more than 2 examinations on the same day. Where a student has 3 examinations scheduled for the same day, provision must be made for one of those examinations to be taken at an alternative time.

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

(6) Although there is no formal provision for supplementary examinations, departments are encouraged to timetable replacement examinations through the Examinations Office. Replacement examinations should typically be conducted 3 weeks after the date of the original examination.

Note: See also clauses 13 and 14 of these procedures.

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

(8) Examinations other than final examinations should typically be of lesser weight than the final examinations.

(9) The week after the end of teaching in each semester will be a study break (Stu-Vac) with final examinations to commence the following week.

(10) Faculties whose examination processes are fully quarantined or contained may conduct examinations outside the requirements of these procedures, but
consistently with their spirit. This dispensation does not apply, however, when it leads to timetable clashes (e.g. in the case of combined degree students).

9 Security of examination papers - Principles 1 to 4

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

10 Emergency evacuations during examinations - Principles 1 to 4

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

(a) should make a note of the time at which the examination is stopped;

(b) should adhere to the instructions of precinct officers or security staff;

(c) if time permits, should attempt to contact the Examinations Office to inform them of the evacuation.

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

(3) Examination supervisors should inform students that, until otherwise instructed, there must be no communication between them and that the use of mobile phones or other communication devices, is not permitted except in exceptional circumstances and under strict supervision.
If, after 20 minutes have elapsed from the time of evacuation, a student's circumstances require them to make electronic contact (for example, to telephone someone for whom they have carer's responsibilities or to an employer so as to ensure their employment is not adversely affected), the student may make a communication which is:

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

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

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

The relevant dean will determine whether the examination is to be resumed at the earliest opportunity, or whether it must be re-sat by the affected students. If the dean is not available, the following persons will be consulted, in the order below, and the first available will make the determination.

(a) the appropriate associate or sub-dean;
(b) the head of the relevant school or department.

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

The examination will be deemed to have been abandoned if:

(a) none of the individuals referred to in subclause 10(6) of these procedures is available; or
(b) the emergency or evacuation has compromised the examination room itself.

When a decision is taken to abandon an examination, the Examinations Office will notify the relevant presiding supervisors who will inform students that the University will contact them as soon as possible about alternative arrangements.

If an examination is abandoned due to an evacuation, only the examination sessions in the affected room(s) are deemed to have been abandoned. Where the examination is also being held in other locations unaffected by the emergency, those sessions will continue as normal.

When an examination is abandoned, students' work (such as answer booklets or computer answer sheets) is deemed null and void for the purposes of marking.

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

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

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

Serious incidents affecting more than one examination location should be assessed immediately by the Registrar who should obtain the advice of the
The Registrar should determine as soon as possible whether some examinations may proceed or the entire examination session should be postponed.

All relevant deans, heads of departments, examiners and students should be notified immediately.

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

11 Use of handheld computing devices in examinations - Principle 3

(1) Hand held computing devices, including computers, calculators and internet-capable devices, are not normally permitted in invigilated final examinations.

(2) Departments may develop examinations and assessments in which such devices are permitted but in doing so must consider the equity, supervisory and logistical implications of their use.

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

(a) A copy of this list must be provided to:
   (i) students sitting examinations which permit use of non-programmable calculators;
   (ii) principal examiners who specify that non-programmable calculators may be used by candidates for their papers; and
   (iii) examination supervisors.

(b) Examination supervisors must report any use of an unauthorised device in an examination.

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

12 Accessible examination and assessment arrangements - Principle 3

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

(2) At the time the examination timetable is released, Disability Services will send registered students an email asking students to submit their examination adjustment requirements by a specific date for accessible examination and assessment conditions to be provided.

(3) Disability Services will notify Examinations – Student Centre of approved reasonable adjustments.
In-department examinations, within-semester assessments, practical and oral assessments are managed by the faculty. Faculty responsibilities include:

(a) notifying students in a timely manner of the confirmed adjustments, and time and location of any adjusted examination;

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

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

(c) ensuring that adjustments approved for the original formal examination period apply to and are delivered for any replacement assessment, unless the form of assessment has changed, in which case Disability Services must be informed.

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

Note: As at the date of these procedures, these can be found at: http://www.comlaw.gov.au/Details/F2005L00767

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

Even if registered with Disability Services and reasonable accommodations or adjustments have been provided, a student with a disability may still make a claim for special consideration due to illness or misadventure.

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

13 Special arrangements for assessment or examinations - Principle 3

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

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

(3) A student seeking special arrangements for assessment or examination should advise the relevant faculty:

(a) in the case of religious beliefs or commitments relating to moveable feasts, prayer or worship times or other religious requirements which might have an impact on the types of assessment or examination they can undertake, at the date of time of enrolment in the commencement of semester; and

(b) in the case of other types of commitment, as soon as the student becomes aware of a requirement to be absent from the University.

Faculties must advise students of any cut-off dates for requests for special arrangements for assessments or examinations other than those held in formal University examination periods.
(4)(5) Late requests for special arrangements for assessment or examination will be considered only where the student provides a reasonable explanation for the delay.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(g) in the case of other situations, such documentation as is considered necessary by the relevant dean or faculty.

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

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

(1) In this section, relevant delegate means:

(a) an Associate Dean;

(b) a Deputy Dean;

(c) a Pro-Dean;

(d) a Sub-Dean;

(e) a Head of Department;

(f) a Head of School;

(g) a Program Coordinator; or

(h) a Unit of Study Coordinator.

(8)(2) All claims for special consideration should be considered in the same manner across the University, although the response may vary according to the circumstances.

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

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

Note: See Part 15 of the Coursework Policy 2014

(11) Informal applications for special consideration (simple extensions) must be made to the lecturer or teacher most immediately involved with the assessment.

(a) The student must clearly set out the basis for the claim.

(b) The request and the response must be recorded in writing (e.g. in an exchange of emails).

(c) The lecturer or teacher involved must consider the extent to which the applicant’s ability to prepare was affected and balance this against equity, fairness and consistency for all students.

(d) The outcome of such an application, if accepted, will be a simple extension of up to 5 working days.

(12) A student whose informal application is not accepted may make a formal application for special consideration.

(13)(5) Formal applications for special consideration should be lodged no later than three working days after the assessment.

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

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

(14)(6) A request for special consideration must:

(a) use the form specified for this purpose by the faculty; University;

(b) clearly set out the basis for the claim;

(c) for illness or injury, provide an appropriate professional practitioner certificate completed by a registered health practitioner or counsellor operating within the scope of their practice and who is not a family member and which includes:

(i) the practitioner’s name, contact details, provider number and signature;

(ii) the date of consultation;

(iii) an evaluation of the severity, duration and degree of effect on the student’s ability to attend classes, learn or complete assessment requirements; and

(iv) the date the certificate was written and issued; or.

(d) where a professional practitioner certificate is not possible, provide a statutory declaration;

(i) setting out the duration and degree of impact of the illness, injury or misadventure on the student’s ability to attend classes, learn or complete assessment requirements; and
(iv)(ii) attaching any other relevant supporting documents in circumstances where a professional practitioner certificate is not appropriate; and

d(e) provide details of any group work which might be affected.

(7) A formal application for special consideration must either provide all relevant supporting information, or describe any further information which will be provided but is unavailable at the time of submission. The University may contact the author of a professional practitioner certificate or other supporting document to verify its authenticity. Information not supplied with or noted in the original application will not be considered except at the discretion of the faculty.

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

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

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

(10) A student may withdraw an application request for special consideration made prior to, during or immediately after an assessment (usually an examination) at any time prior to the earlier of:

(a) release of results for that assessment; or

(b) completion of a replacement assessment.

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

(11) The University will maintain at least two academic staff must be involved in reaching an academic judgement regarding a formal application for special consideration.

(12) Detailed records must be maintained of the process of determination, and outcome, of any special consideration application request.

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

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

(a) Replacement assessment.

   (i) This may be made available where an application request relates to an examination based assessment, typically. All students who make a successful request for special consideration relating to a final examination will receive a replacement assessment. Other forms of examination assessment, such as weekly quizzes, may be more appropriately accommodated by reweighting or averaging.

   (ii) A replacement assessment should assess the same skills and knowledge, with appropriate preparation, as the original assessment.
(iii) Where a successful claim request for special consideration is made prior to, or during or immediately after an assessment, any replacement assessment will be treated by the faculty as a first attempt and the original attempt at the assessment will be deemed not to have occurred.

(iv) The faculty is responsible for setting the date of the replacement assessment, except for replacement assessments for examinations undertaken in a formal exam period, which will be set by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar). A student may lodge a further claim request for special consideration if they are unable to attend the replacement assessment due to injury, illness or misadventure.

(v) The faculty and the student must use their best endeavours to complete the replacement assessment for an examination undertaken in a formal exam period will be held within three weeks of the date of the final examination in the unit of study.

(vi) If the student is unable to attempt the replacement assessment due to injury, illness or misadventure within the specified time, or the faculty is unable to construct a valid form of replacement assessment, the faculty will determine alternative means of assessment. If this is not possible, the faculty will award a grade of DNFDC (discontinue not to count as failure).

(b) **Formal Extension**.

(i) This may be made available in relation to a non-examination based assessment task.

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

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

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

(c) **Reweighting or averaging**.

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

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

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

The following provisions will apply where one or more members of a group involved in group work suffer an illness, injury or misadventure.
(a) Consideration must be given to the interests of:
   (i) the member(s) suffering the illness injury or misadventure; and
   (ii) the remaining group members whose ability to complete the task as originally assigned may be impacted, and may therefore also be considered to have suffered a form of misadventure. Ideally special consideration applications should be submitted by all affected parties.

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

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

(d) If the faculty-relevant delegate considers that the group can no longer function, the assessment task will be redefined for the remaining active members, based on the contributions they were to make.
   (i) Assessment will then be based on the redefined task.
   (ii) The lecturer or teacher may also allow an extension of time.
   (iii) The group member(s) who suffered the illness, injury or misadventure will, if their application is accepted, be given an alternative assessment.

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

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

15 Processing and release of results - Principles 1 to 4

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

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

(f) keep appropriate records to justify the final mark.

Note: See Recordkeeping Manual.

(3) The Dean and head of the relevant academic unit must ensure that:

(a) the results for all units of study comply with applicable policies, procedures and local provisions;

(b) appropriate information and training about processes for entering results is provided to those who require it; and

(c) final results are entered and agreed in the student management system by the date determined by the Registrar.

(4) Late results must be:

(a) approved by the head of the relevant academic unit;

(b) entered into the student management system as soon as they become available; and

(c) released as soon as possible after the release date determined by the Registrar.

(5) Changes to marks or grades after entry into the student management system must be:

(a) approved by the relevant dean, deputy dean, pro-dean, sub-dean or associate dean after consideration of an explanation for the change;

(b) submitted and entered in the manner specified by the Registrar; and

(c) released as soon as possible after the release date determined by the Registrar.

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

(7) The Registrar must ensure that results are released to students by the dates determined.

(a) Final results of students in completed units of study will be provided to students through the student management system.

(8) Departments must, on request, provide students with the numerical mark for each assessment task which comprises the final numerical mark reported on the student’s Examination Result Notice.

(a) Records of such marks must be retained for 12 months.

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

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

Note: See also clause 16 of these procedures and University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.
(11) The faculty will determine the award of honours degrees and the levels at which they are awarded.

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

16 Appeals - Principles 1 to 4

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

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

17 Professional development - Principles 2 and 4

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

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

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

18 Effectiveness of assessment policies - Principle 4

(1) The Academic Board will ensure that the effectiveness of its policies is measured:
   (a) through a comparison of the University’s standards with those adopted elsewhere;
   (b) through information available from Academic Board faculty reviews; and
   (c) through feedback from students on assessment (directly and via unit of study evaluations and related feedback tools).
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### SCHEDULE 1 – Implementation table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle and implementation statements</th>
<th>Assessment Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Assessment practices must advance student learning</strong></td>
<td>clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Assessment practices align with goals, context, learning activities and learning outcomes.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 A variety of assessment tasks are used while ensuring that student and staff workloads are considered.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Assessment tasks reflect increasing levels of complexity across a program and foster enquiry-based learning.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Constructive, timely and respectful feedback develops student skills of self and peer evaluation and guides the development of future student work.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Assessment practices must be clearly communicated to students and staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Unit of study outlines are available in the first week of any offering of the unit and communicate the purposes, timing, weighting and extent of assessment in sufficient detail to allow students to plan their approach to assessment.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Unit of study outlines explain the rationale for the selection of assessment tasks (e.g. group task) in relation to learning outcomes.</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Procedures exist to ensure that all staff involved in teaching of a unit share a common understanding of assessment practices.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 The process of marking and of combining individual task marks is explicitly explained in the unit outline.</td>
<td>5, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Assessment practices must be valid and fair</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Assessment tasks are authentic and appropriate to disciplinary and/or professional context.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Assessment incorporates rigorous academic standards related to the discipline(s) and is based on pre-determined, clearly articulated criteria that students actively engage with.</td>
<td>7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Assessment will be evaluated solely on the basis of students’ achievement against criteria and standards specified to align with learning outcomes.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Assessment practices address issues of equity and inclusiveness to accommodate and build upon the diversity of the student body so as not to disadvantage any student.</td>
<td>12-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Assessment practices must be continuously improved and updated</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Assessment tasks and outcomes are moderated through academic peer review and used to inform subsequent practice.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Assessment is regularly updated to ensure alignment with program learning outcomes or graduate attributes.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Professional development opportunities that are related to design, implementation and moderation of assessment are provided to staff.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Purpose and application

(1) These procedures are to give effect to Part 11 of the Coursework Policy 2014 (“the policy”).

(2) These procedures apply to:
   (a) staff, affiliates, students and applicants for coursework award courses; and
   (b) non-award students, exchange students and study abroad students enrolled in a unit of study at the University.

2 Commencement

These procedures commence on [date].

3 Interpretation

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

4 Granting credit

(1) In accordance with the policy and these procedures, an Associate Dean may grant credit:
   (a) to individual students, following consideration and assessment of their individual circumstances; or
   (b) by approving credit precedents for his or her faculty.

(2) An Associate Dean may grant credit to a student:
   (a) at the time the student is admitted to an award course; or
   (b) during the course of the student’s candidature.
Note 1: Where possible, the University will make credit assessments based on precedents approved by the Associate Dean in the relevant faculty. Where a credit request falls outside the scope of an approved precedent, the University will refer the request to the relevant Associate Dean for decision.

5 Requests for credit

(1) Requests for credit must include:

   (a) for specific and non-specific credit, copies of academic transcripts and any other documentation required by the University, from a course or program recognised by the University in accordance with the policy;

   (b) for reduced volume of learning, evidence of a qualification or professional experience recognised by the University in accordance with the policy.

Note 2: See sub-clauses 42(1) and 43(1) of the policy.

(2) The University may also require a person requesting credit to undertake an interview or audition, submit a portfolio of work, or complete an assigned task that demonstrates attainment of learning outcomes.

(3) The University will not consider requests for credit that do not include the required information and documentation.

6 Offer of credit prior to enrolment

(1) Where possible, the University will assess requests for credit from applicants before making an offer of admission.

(2) Requests for credit will not be considered prior to an application for admission being received.

(3) Where possible, the University will make an offer of credit to an applicant concurrently with his or her offer of admission.

(4) Where an offer of credit and an offer of admission are made concurrently, the applicant must accept or decline the offer of credit before accepting the offer of admission.

Note 3: In some circumstances the University will make an offer of credit after an offer of admission. In that event, the applicant must accept or decline the offer of credit on or before the date of his or her first enrolment in the award course for which credit is being offered. See sub-clause 43A(2) of the policy.

(5) If accepted, credit offered to an applicant prior to enrolment will be granted at the time he or she is admitted to the award course.

7 Requesting, accepting and declining credit before enrolment

(1) Subject to these procedures, requests for credit before enrolment must be made directly to the University.

(2) On receipt of an offer of credit prior to enrolment, the applicant must:
8 Offer of credit during candidature

(1) The University will assess a student’s request for credit during candidature when:

(a) the University accepts that there is a reasonable explanation for the student’s failure to request credit before enrolment;

(b) it was impracticable for the University to assess the student’s request for credit before enrolment; or

(c) the student has completed study at another institution during the course of the student’s candidature.

(2) Where approved, the University will make an offer of credit during candidature to a student online.

9 Requesting, accepting and declining credit during candidature

(1) Requests for credit during candidature must be made online.

(2) The University will advise students of the outcome of their credit request.

(3) On receipt of an offer of credit during candidature, the student must:

(a) accept or decline specific credit for any one or more of the units of study listed in the offer;

(b) accept or decline any non-specific credit listed in the offer;

(c) accept or decline any reduced volume of learning listed in the offer;

within the timeframe required by the policy.

Note 6: A student must accept or decline (in whole or in part) any offer of credit made by the University during candidature within twelve months of the date of the offer. See paragraph 43A(2)(b) of the policy.

Note 7: If a student does not accept the offer of credit within twelve months of the date of the offer, the credit will not be processed and the University will regard the offer as having lapsed. See subclause 43A(3) of the policy.

Note 8: Except with the permission of the Associate Dean, credit will not be granted for units of study, non-specific credit or reduced volume of learning listed in an offer of credit made by the University prior to enrolment and declined by the applicant. See paragraphs 42(4)(d) and 43(4)(a) of the policy.
credit made by the University during candidature and declined by the student. See paragraphs 42(4)(d) and 43(4)(a) of the policy.

10 Credit in embedded programs, including embedded honours

Students who are enrolled in embedded programs, including embedded honours, are not required to submit a credit request. Their eligibility for credit will be assessed automatically.

Note 9: International students will be required to accept the credit offer where it changes the duration of their course.

11 Credit for students who transfer courses internally

Students who transfer internally from one course to another course at the University are not required to submit a credit request. Their eligibility for credit will be assessed automatically.

Note 10: International students will be required to accept the credit offer where it changes the duration of their course.

12 Requesting rescission of credit

(1) Students may submit a request for rescission of any specific credit, non-specific credit or reduced volume of learning previously granted in accordance with the policy and these procedures.

(2) The University will advise students of the outcome of their rescission request.

Note 11: Except with the permission of the Associate Dean, a student may not request to have rescinded credit reinstated under the policy or these procedures. See paragraphs 42(4)(e), 43(4)(b) and sub-clause 43B(2) of the policy.

13 Student appeals against credit decisions

(1) Applicants do not have a right of appeal under the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (‘Student Appeals Rule’) against decisions made prior to enrolment to award or not to award credit.

(2) Students have a right of appeal under the Student Appeals Rule against decisions made prior to enrolment or during candidature to award or not to award credit.

(3) Students have a right of appeal under the Student Appeals Rule against decisions made during candidature to reject rescission or reinstatement of credit.
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The new taskforce on academic misconduct and plagiarism has released its first report, which details some of the ways the University could improve the prevention and detection of academic dishonesty among students in the digital age.

The Vice-Chancellor created the Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce in April, asking it to review the effectiveness of the University’s policies and procedures relating to academic misconduct, including plagiarism, on the part of its coursework and research students.

The new report, “An Approach to Minimising Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism at the University of Sydney - Part 1: Prevention and Detection”, is the result of the taskforce’s investigations during May and June, including interviews with representatives from each of the University’s 16 faculties.

Specifically, the paper presents a number of recommendations:

- Mandatory academic honesty education and an early focus on written communication skills to be embedded into all undergraduate and postgraduate coursework award courses.
- For each unit of study, formal consideration should be given to the academic integrity of the assessment tasks at the point of approval and as part of ongoing review to ensure that they eliminate or minimise opportunities for academic dishonesty.
- An accessible, searchable and complete recordkeeping facility that reduces administrative load on academics, streamlines workflow and facilitates reporting should be implemented across the University.
- A liaison and coordination point should be created within the Education Portfolio to support staff and students.
- Where appropriate, changes should be made to the University’s policies to implement best practice prevention and detection.

A second report focusing on other topics, including staff training, remediation, sanctions, issues unique to research students, communication and culture is planned for release later this year.

**Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board:*  

(1) note the report of the Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce “An Approach to Minimising Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism at the University of Sydney - Part 1: Prevention and Detection”;  

(2) endorse the recommendations of the report and undertake the review of assessment strategy and policy outlined in that recommendation; and  

(3) note that the Academic Standards and Policy Committee has established a working party to undertake the policy reviews outlined in recommendation (3).
An Approach to Minimising Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism at the University of Sydney

Part 1. Prevention and Detection

Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce
Executive Summary

The following report is the result of the Taskforce Working Party’s investigations into ways to prevent and detect academic dishonesty and misconduct among students at the University of Sydney. A second report focusing on other topics, including staff training, remediation, sanctions, and issues unique to research students, is planned for the 2 September meeting of the Taskforce and some preliminary ideas for this report are outlined here.

The Working Party undertook a number of investigations during May and June 2015, including interviews with representatives from each of the University’s 16 faculties.

Academic dishonesty is most effectively addressed through the application of both education strategies and detection measures (Owens and White 2013). A significant amount of upheld cases across the University are classed as ‘negligent’ plagiarism (about 53% in 2014), cases where students seem not to understand the correct ways to cite and reference material that is not their own. Addressing this issue is core business for the University and must be part of every student’s experience.

Recommendation 1 is that mandatory academic honesty education and an early focus on written communication skills be embedded into all undergraduate and postgraduate coursework award courses should. A small number of existing online modules, targeted to rigorous tertiary education, could be adopted, endorsed and promoted for use across the University. Each Faculty or School must also give consideration to what students need to know within the context of their specific discipline and take the time to provide material that is consistent with University policy but tailored to their requirements, and these should be embedded in every first year course.

Recommendation 2 is that for each unit of study, consideration should be given to the academic integrity of the assessment tasks to ensure that they limit the opportunities for academic dishonesty. The Taskforce recognises that, due to the diversity of disciplines and assessment types within the University, this cannot be done through a one-size-fits-all solution. Using similarity-detection software such as Turnitin should be a basic line of defence for all written assignments. However, it is only effective for certain types of academic dishonesty and there are some examples of good and relevant assessment tasks across the University where the use of Turnitin would not be sensible. It is therefore appropriate to develop guidelines on best-practice assessments that assure academic integrity, and to ask that each unit of study coordinator take responsibility for reviewing the academic integrity risk of their unit. This should in turn be recorded at the Faculty or School level through such measures as, for example, a formal plan for each unit, a faculty assessment matrix or statements integrated into the unit approval template.

Recommendation 3 is to provide an accessible, searchable and complete recordkeeping facility across the University. Effective recordkeeping is an essential part of ensuring that cases of repeated misconduct are detected and dealt with appropriately. Tracking and reporting on occurrences across the University can also support research into questions such as why academic misconduct takes place and which students are most at risk. This report suggests an existing faculty-based tool for modification and university-wide implementation.

Recommendation 4 is to develop within the Education Portfolio a liaison and coordination point to support staff and students. This could be an office of educational integrity which would champion academic integrity for coursework students in the University, support students and staff and track trends. The office would provide a single point of contact at the University for matters relating to academic misconduct in coursework and allow the University community to seek authoritative information on policy and procedures and best practice prevention and detection strategies.

Recommendation 5 is to make changes to the University’s policies as appropriate to implement best practice prevention and detection. These changes are suggested as a result of policy inconsistencies raised in faculty discussions; to support the other recommendations made in this report, and to suggest policy improvements.
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Recommendations

The following recommendations are made in-principle, with acknowledgement that implementation will necessarily see some of the detail evolve.

1. **Education**

   Approaches to delivering academic honesty and information about the University's relevant policies vary widely among faculties. There is a need for more consistency across the University, and to ensure students engage with the material and understand their responsibilities early in their studies.

   • Academic honesty education oriented towards rigorous tertiary study should be embedded in the first year curriculum with at least one tutorial or lecture session in a first year unit of every course (undergraduate and postgraduate) given over to training in academic honesty matters specific to that discipline, such that each student receives this training. These should ideally be integrated with an online component.

   • The University should introduce a small number of endorsed university-wide academic honesty education modules and require students to complete these. Online best-practice modules managed through the learning management system are currently in use in Science and Business (Attachment 1) and these should be adapted, endorsed and promoted for use in other faculties (see section 2.1).

   • There should be early focus in every curriculum on written communication skills. Students should complete an early assignment that is scaffolded and teaches referencing, proper paraphrasing, and other appropriate techniques for their discipline, with appropriate feedback.

   • Consistent information on University policy should be quickly and easily available to staff and students.

2. **Assessment**

   Assessment and curriculum design form a key part of prevention strategies. A global review of our assessment strategy is an implicit part of the Education Strategy paper. The recommendations here are intended to complement that review and should be implemented so as to align with the University’s strategic direction in education. Ensuring the academic integrity of a unit of study can best be done through using assessment techniques that are authentic and difficult to cheat. Section 2.3 explores this issue in more detail and outlines some best-practice assessment types.

   • Each unit of study should specifically and formally address how academic integrity will be assured and this should be documented at each point of approval by the Faculty. Assurance of academic integrity for existing units of study should be done through ongoing review or through a School or Faculty stocktake. Such assurance may take the form of a formal plan for each unit, a faculty assessment matrix, or statements integrated into the unit-approval template. Assurance of academic integrity must canvas the range of possible breaches, including plagiarism, ghost-writing, receiving or passing on inappropriate knowledge of examinations, inappropriate collusion and other forms of academic dishonesty. Unit of study coordinators should have responsibility for continuously reviewing the academic integrity risk within the unit as part of the ongoing review of the unit. Faculties should ensure that processes exist at the faculty level for review of academic integrity as part of the ongoing review and approval of new and amended units of study.

   • The Academic Board should be asked to consider policy requiring each faculty to develop assessment guidelines that give consideration to the degree of risk inherent in each assessment type used within that faculty. Guidelines on best-practice assessment to assure academic integrity should be developed, and these should be maintained by the office of educational integrity within the Education Portfolio (see recommendation 4).

   • Review of assessment practices and policy undertaken by faculties and as part of the Education Strategy should include formal consideration of assurance of academic integrity (including top-down approaches working across the curriculum such as capstone assessments of learning outcomes and graduate qualities) along with broader issues such as the number of assessments across the curriculum.
3. Recordkeeping

Essential to the ability to deal appropriately with cases of academic dishonesty and misconduct is more consistent recordkeeping and a searchable recordkeeping system. The records kept should be for notifications, investigations, findings, and, if appropriate, appeals and appeal outcomes that can assist in detecting cases of repeated dishonesty and misconduct. Improved and automated reporting capability will also assist in detecting and addressing trends while further reducing faculty workloads.

- Use a simple recordkeeping technology that reduces workload for academics but ensures all records are kept centrally. An example of a best practice system already used in the University is in section 2.5.
- Provide an accessible, searchable database to allow staff to check quickly and easily for previous offences. Ideas for how to develop such a system are in section 2.5.

4. Coordination and Support

There is a clear need for the University to provide a clear point of contact and support for staff and students in matters related to coursework academic integrity (including Honours theses and other theses completed as part of coursework programs). It is recommended that a liaison point and responsibility centre in the form of an office of educational integrity be established and managed within the Education Portfolio. This would liaise with and complement the Office of Research Integrity, though would be lighter in terms of resources and budgetary implications. Through this office or liaison point, the Education Portfolio would:

- Champion and promote academic integrity for coursework students in the University.
- Serve as a point of contact and coordination for matters concerning academic integrity.
- Lead the development and implementation across the University of practices promoting academic integrity.
- Provide academic and relevant professional staff with professional learning and support relevant to academic integrity.
- Support the development and use of learning resources and learning experiences for students that promote academic integrity, including the University-endorsed online education modules mentioned in Recommendation 1.
- Monitor trends within the University and the higher education sector relevant to academic integrity and use these to inform the development of educational materials, policies, and so forth.

More detail on this office is in section 2.6.

5. Policy Changes

A number of changes to University policies will be necessary to address the current situation and to enact the recommendations made above. Among those to be considered are:

- Allow Nominated Academics to send students they believe committed only minor negligent plagiarism to further education courses and require appropriate follow-up (such as assignment resubmission) without a meeting if the student so chooses (such cases would still be reported through the online record system).
- Consider whether the distinction between negligent and dishonest plagiarism is useful in all cases when education is provided and mandatory; student ignorance is no defence under other policies, and the code of conduct requires them to be aware of all policies pertaining to them.
- Consider whether Recycling should remain part of the current academic dishonesty policy, for coursework students.
- Consider whether students should have a duty to report dishonesty behavior.
- Change the Coursework policy to require Turnitin to be used for all appropriate written assignments.
- Change the Teaching and Learning Policy to require integrity assurance measures to be part of assessments for each unit of study.
- Develop a set of guidelines on proofreading and editing for coursework, comparable to those for Higher Degrees by Research.
- Provide improved guidelines on educationally beneficial cooperation vs. collusion.
• Ensure the intention of the policy around the appointment and identification of Nominated Academics within each faculty is clear.
• Review examinations policy and procedures.

These policy changes are further explained in section 2.7.

Implications

The recommendations suggested here have a number of clear implications.

Reputation

Improving detection, even through as simple a measure as requiring Turnitin in those units where written assignments are used, along with improved record keeping is likely to result in a significant apparent increase in reported cases. Statistics from the Business School show a rise of 120% in notifications following the introduction of mandatory Turnitin use (from 2% of student instances in 2009 to 4% in 2010). Based on the current numbers reported to the Academic Board, this could mean a rise across the University to as many as 5000-6000 notifications per year, noting that this number includes many cases that will be minor and dealt with through education. The rise in cases could be much less than this, however. A comparison with first year Science units in which Turnitin was used showed a much lower rate of incidence (see section 1.1). This may be the result of a difference in the standards applied, or in the nature of the assignments, but it may also indicate some difference in the rate of occurrence by faculty (Attachment 2).

Such a rise is likely to be relatively short-lived. Examples of cases where prevention and detection practices have been improved, such as in the Business School or in Psychology, show that rates of occurrence can be brought down and kept low long-term by sustained effort. In Psychology, rates are now so low as to be unable to be significantly reduced again (Owens and White, 2013). There is, however, a risk that improving detection of one type of dishonesty will result in the rise in occurrence of a different type (eg. plagiarism may be replaced by ghost writing), and for this reason education, cultural change, and assessment practices all must be addressed.

The Business School also provides evidence that efforts to reduce academic dishonesty can result in significant reputational enhancement for the University. The Working Party was told that employer feedback prior to the introduction of the current academic honesty regime was that graduates were not able to write. After the current measures were put in place one employer’s feedback was that “only University of Sydney graduates are able to write”.

Resourcing

• Resourcing implications for Nominated Academics (time to deal with a potential rise in cases) and for faculty administrative support staff.
• Time for unit of study coordinators to review their assessment methods and any improvements necessary.
• Resourcing implications for the Education Portfolio in providing coordination and support.
• Changes to structure of some first year units.
• Training time for all staff on policy, tools such as Turnitin, etc.
• Computing resources including data storage and designer time to create recordkeeping workflows or adjust online modules.
• Provision for education on academic honesty and detection work in the teaching and marking staff workload allocations and in remuneration for sessional staff.
• Office of General Counsel time to review and revise policies.
Next Report

The Working Party will bring to the Taskforce a second report at its 2 September meeting. That report will cover the following topics. Some ideas for further investigation within these topic areas are outlined below. Feedback on these is welcomed by the Taskforce.

Staff Training

- Ensure coordinated staff training is offered in dishonesty and misconduct policies and procedures and detection (including Turnitin use).
- Nominated Academics are appropriately identified within faculties and receive training in policies, procedures, but also in resilience and interpersonal skills to assist with interview/counseling processes.
- Nominated Academics to review and agree on a framework for decision-making guidance to provide consistency and fairness across penalties by reference to example cases.
- Nominated Academics to agree criteria for referral of cases by examiners to ensure consistency across the University.
- Ensure part-time and casual staff are supported and fully trained.

Research Students

- Ensure a record is kept of Honours theses.
- Introduce Turnitin for thesis work prior to Faculty signoff to submit for marking.
- Ensure consistent penalties are applied across the University when dishonesty and misconduct is encountered in research theses.
- Ensure research students have easy access to information on policies that apply to them.
- Ensure coordinated staff training for supervisors in dishonesty and misconduct policies as they apply to research students.

Remediation

- Evaluate current remediation courses offered by ITL and the Business School with a view to broadening use across the University

Sanctions

- Review role of OGC to review faculty investigations, and consider final scrutiny of the case by the DVC-E (or Registrar?) and streamline cases where the facts are clear, in concert with policy clarifications.
- Use a filter mechanism so that the only cases that reach the Vice-Chancellor for decision are those with major penalties such as exclusions, suspensions or expulsions.
- Review the ‘suspended suspension’ as a penalty.
- Consider the use of a ‘Fail due to dishonesty’ grade that would appear on the student transcript.

Culture and Communication

- Ensure the loop is closed between OGC, the Registrar, and referring faculties so that staff understand the reasoning behind the final decisions in cases, and the implications of the findings for future cases.
- Promote (internally) suitably de-identified details of cases that have been identified and dealt with by the University, including the penalties applied.
- Consider ways to encourage a culture in which students are supportive of efforts to ensure academic honesty within the University and more likely to report dishonesty when they observe it.
- Hold a University-wide debate on acceptable assistance.
- Ensure staff are motivated and supported to detect, report, and remediate academic dishonesty.
• Develop recommendations on strategic approaches to audit and sustaining high levels of academic integrity to be taken forward by the Education Portfolio.
• Consider the use and effectiveness of honour pledges for students, including a requirement to inform.
1. **Current State**

There is widespread media interest in stories related to academic dishonesty and misconduct, and this interest appears to have increased of late. Several cases involving the University of Sydney have been the focus of media stories. Whether this is related to an actual rise in incidence of dishonesty is difficult to discern (see section 1.1).

The literature on the reasons why students plagiarise is extensive. As McGrail and McGrail (2015) noted, a particularly contentious area is the issue of intentionality. McCabe and Trevino (1993), as cited in McGrail and McGrail (2015), linked the occurrence of academic dishonesty with understanding of policy, perceptions of being caught, severity of sanctions and perceptions of the behaviour and attitudes of other students. Other studies have examined the influence of student perception of the seriousness of different types of academic dishonesty and differences based on gender and socio-economic status. Notwithstanding the recent focus on technologically-enabled dishonesty, academic dishonesty is an old problem.

Spiller and Crown (as cited in Molnar 2015) were unable to find a statistically significant trend in student cheating in studies dating back to the 1900s. Nevertheless, there is certainly a perception that academic dishonesty is now more common than it was at some point in the past, and that this may be related to wider cultural changes regarding changing attitudes to intellectual property; internet-driven technologies or markets that increase the ease and availability of tools with which to engage in dishonest behavior, or market changes within higher education. In contrast to this perception, Molnar (2015), in a study of 1800 students at both a small college and a large university in the US, showed that student acceptance of academically dishonest behavior had decreased over the period 2005-2013.

At the moment, both academic dishonesty and academic misconduct are dealt with under the same policy, using academic penalties unless the behaviour fits the definition of misconduct in the University of Sydney By-Law. The Working Party has described the most common types of academic dishonesty reported in section 3. Attachment 3 describes academic dishonesty and plagiarism in more detail and gives an overview of the external provider environment.

### 1.1 Trends

The Academic Standards and Policy Committee of the Academic Board requires faculties to report the total number of notifications of potential academic dishonesty and plagiarism, the total number of findings and their category (negligent/dishonest plagiarism, academic dishonesty), and the total number of allegations referred to the Registrar. Table 1 shows the trend in these reports over the period from 2010 – 2014.

In general, the number of cases across the University is consistent over this time period, both in the numbers of notifications, the total number of findings, and the number of allegations referred to the Registrar. Across undergraduate and postgraduate enrolments the numbers are also fairly constant, with about 500-600 postgraduate notifications per year and between 800 – 950 undergraduate notifications (Attachment 4). There are considerable inconsistencies in these data, however, that make it difficult to rely on these numbers. The Academic Board has not always received reports from each faculty and has often had to ask for the data to be reviewed. In addition, there are vastly different faculty practices in reporting, in recordkeeping, in detection, and in findings, which make it difficult to rely on this data as a complete picture of occurrence at the University. The categories reported are also consistent with current University policy, but, as staff members pointed out when speaking with the Working Party, there are cases that do not comfortably fit into these categories and so where the faculties choose to classify them may vary.
Table 1. Numbers of notifications of academic dishonesty and plagiarism reported to the Academic Board by all faculties of the University.

At the University level, the Academic Board data is all that is available to understand the trends. The Business School, however, has been collecting detailed data on cases of academic dishonesty and plagiarism since 2006, and serves as a useful case study to understand what might be occurring across the University.

For example, the rate of occurrence of academic dishonesty and plagiarism among the international vs domestic student cohort is impossible to discern at the University level, as student status is not commonly recorded in the incident case file. The Business School, however, has been keeping a record of this, and reports a very small difference in the rate of notifications made for international vs domestic students (Table 2). This difference is statistically significant, but it may be a result of the very high numbers of students involved. Attachment 5 describes incidence rates across the Business School in more detail.

Table 2: Business School notifications for international and domestic students from 2006 – 2014. Note that the unit is ‘student instances’ which describes the number of unit of study enrollments rather than simply the number of students, with the rationale that each unit provides an opportunity for a student to engage in academic dishonesty and plagiarism and multiple allegations may be made against the same student.
The significant rise in notifications within the Business School which can be seen in Table 2 accompanies the introduction of compulsory Turnitin in all units, which occurred in 2010. Table 3 shows the number of notifications and notifications per student instances for each year. ‘Student instance’ is a measure of the number of unit of study enrollments – so one student enrolled in eight units would be counted as eight student instances. This is used as the denominator rather than student numbers as each student may have multiple notifications in a single year. The notification rate in Business seems to vary between 1.5 – 3% annually. In 2014, the number of findings was 2% of student enrolments.

While Turnitin is not mandatory in the Science Faculty, there are units of study within Science that have also introduced and are using Turnitin. Tellingly, those units of study that do not use Turnitin, reported no notifications of dishonesty, while those with Turnitin reported a rate of 0.6%. Comparing equivalent first year units of study between Business and Science that use Turnitin, there remains a much lower rate of notifications within Science for the period from 2012-2014, with Science averaging around 0.5% while Business averages 4% (Attachment 2). This may indicate a real difference in the rate of occurrence of dishonesty within Science, either as a result of a difference in student cohorts or a difference in the prevention strategies employed. This may, however, also be a result of different reporting standards in the relevant faculties.

The Working Party considers that there is clear, and clearly significant, underreporting and under detection at the University. The literature reports widely divergent figures on the percentages of students who engage in academic dishonesty depending on the definition used. The Academic Integrity Research Project found that between a quarter and a half of undergraduate students reported instances of plagiarism observed by them (McCabe 2005). Estimating the effect of addressing this problem on the numbers reported to the Academic Board is complicated. It could be the case that the numbers in Business reflect the real rate of occurrence University wide, in which case the number of notifications should rise to 5000-6000 per year. If the numbers for Science are more reflective of the level expected, then the number of cases expected could be closer to 2500.

Business also provides some information on what might happen once an effective regime of education and detection practices is in place (Table 4). There are a relatively high number of cases where two notifications are made against one student, but these are likely to result from concurrent notifications, where two incidents occur at the same time and these are both treated as ‘first offences’. Even including these, multiple notifications are very low, especially as a percentage of student instances (Attachment 6).

Across the University, there were 102 cases referred to the Registrar, and referred to OGC during the period 2009-2014 (Attachment 7). Note that these figures include those sent to the Registrar for
special consideration fraud (false medical certificates etc., see section 3.3). Of these, approximately equal numbers are international and domestic students. This year, 44 cases have been referred before the end of semester one, while the total referred in both semesters last year was 46, indicating a spike in misconduct cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of notifications for the same student</th>
<th>Number of Business School notifications</th>
<th>% of Business School cases</th>
<th>% student instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only 1 notification</td>
<td>3995</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple notifications for the same student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 notifications</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 notifications</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 notifications</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 notifications</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 notifications</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total notifications 2007-2014</td>
<td>5778</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Recidivism rates by student instances. The number of multiple notifications for an individual student in the Business School 2007 – 2014.

1.2 Policy

The University’s Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy outlines the process to be used across the University.

- An examiner who suspects academic dishonesty or plagiarism must report this to a Nominated Academic in the relevant faculty.
- The Nominated Academic must consult with the examiner to formulate a clear expression of the alleged conduct, and to form a view of whether the conduct would, if proven, constitute negligent or dishonest plagiarism, or some other form of academic misconduct.
- If the Nominated Academic forms the view that there is a matter for concern: the student is informed in writing of the concern, invited to a meeting with the Nominated Academic, informed that they may bring a representative, and provided with supporting documentation.
- The Nominated Academic may then make a finding and decide the appropriate action to be taken, informing the student, the examiner, and making a record of the decision and any counseling undertaken.
- If the Nominated Academic makes a preliminary finding of that the conduct would, if proven, be sufficiently serious to constitute misconduct under Chapter 8 of the University of Sydney By-Law, it is referred to the Registrar to be investigated in accordance with that Chapter.

1.3 How it works in practice

The Working Party interviewed representatives from each of the University’s faculties to discover how the current policy is implemented and the view of staff as to its efficacy. In doing so, significant variation in application of the policy was discovered. In summary:

- There is not always a single ‘Nominated Academic’ to whom notifications are made. In larger faculties, this can be because of workload – it is sensible to spread the role across a number of people with a single person giving oversight to the group. In others, however, the role appears to be interpreted as part of the work of a unit of study coordinator or similar. Given the intent of the policy is to ensure that oversight of a faculty’s cases is maintained, to provide consistency in application, the latter interpretation is problematic.
- In some faculties, a step is inserted between notification and interview. This is usually because the Nominated Academic forms the view that the conduct represents minor negligent plagiarism, and refers the student directly to further compulsory education, offering them an interview only if the student wishes to contest the finding. Faculties who do this report that very few students choose to proceed to interview, and, where recidivism rates can be determined, these are low.
• While in some faculties, the Nominated Academic is given workload relief to deal with the time demands of the role, this is lacking in others. There is also great variation in the administrative support afforded to staff, whether the examiner or Nominated Academic, which affects detection and reporting practice.

• Recordkeeping is highly variable. Some faculties use online forms that report to TRIM folders, while others store records only on individual staff members' computers or even on paper files. Cases handled at faculty level, are reported by some faculties to Student Affairs for recordkeeping and some faculties check for repeat cases with Student Affairs, while others do not. Many struggle to assemble the annual report to the Academic Board.

• There is a general reluctance to refer cases to the Registrar, usually as a result of anecdotal reports of long turn-around times and results of investigations which staff do not understand and have found discouraging.

• While the use of a single Nominated Academic is to assist in providing consistency of application of the policy within faculties, there is no similar way to calibrate application across faculties. Often when speaking to the Working Party, staff noted parts of the policy they were unsure of, or expressed interest in hearing how the policy was being applied in other areas of the University.

1.4 Education and information

Across the University, a variety of different educational materials have been developed to assist student learning and to prevent non-intentional cases of academic dishonesty. Almost all faculties provide information on the policy to students in some manner, usually through unit of study outlines and the website. Most also give some form of introduction to academic integrity and the University policies in either orientation or early lecture programs. Many also refer students to the online module on the library website, and some even require students to present their certificate of completion from that module – though the Working Party also heard that there is a ‘black market’ in this certificate among students; it can be bought to cheat the requirement.

The effectiveness of education programs was reported anecdotally to the Working Party by staff who have introduced them, particularly in the Business School, the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASS) and the Faculty of Science. In the Faculty of Science case, this is also part of a longitudinal study on plagiarism reduction techniques that has been published by Owens and White (2013) and is ongoing.

FASS reported that since the introduction of their module on paraphrasing, the cases that now occur are almost all dishonest plagiarism, and very few cases of negligent plagiarism are being reported to the Nominated Academic.

A lot of faculties referred to their web information and the Working Party undertook a brief survey of information on this topic available through the University’s public website. This survey found that each faculty has approximately 2-3 pages covering related content, with additional content from the Library and Student Affairs. Google searches revealed old pages that are not accessible via the websites menus but are still visible to students and others. There is a broad range of often inconsistent information and instructions that can require students to initiate several additional action steps to view the information. Broken web links, obsolete policies, confusing and contradictory information and guidelines for both students and staff were all found.

1.5 Turnitin

The University has had Turnitin available and a policy regarding its use since 2012. The current policy allows for Deans to decide whether to require that similarity detecting software, approved by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), is used in all units of study within the faculty.

The Working Party investigated the current level of usage of Turnitin across the University. In consultations, the Working Party often heard that faculties had recently made the decision to move to compulsory usage of Turnitin for all written assignments, usually to be introduced in second semester 2015 or in 2016. Many faculties currently require its use in large first year units only, or only in those
units where significant written work is submitted. For example, the Conservatorium requires Turnitin to be used for Music History units but does not require it in other subjects.

In the University, Blackboard is used to interface with Turnitin, so to use Turnitin, a unit of study must have a Blackboard site and use online submission of assignments. For Semester 1 2015, there were 1268 Blackboard sites across the University that had content available. Approximately 3500 units of study were offered in that semester, which would mean about 36% of units of study had Blackboard sites. The number of Blackboard sites does not fully correlate to the units of study offered, however, as some faculties, such as Dentistry, use one Blackboard site for multiple units of study. The number of Blackboard sites counted in this analysis also does not include the bulk of the Business School as that faculty’s Blackboard sites work on a different server. A majority (63%) of Blackboard sites are using some form of online assignment submission, and of those, about half (29%) are using Turnitin (Attachment 8). Noting the limitations in the data, this means about 10% of units of study offered in Semester 1 2015 used Turnitin.

To use the Turnitin tool within Blackboard requires faculties to move to online submissions for written assignments. The Working Party often heard of cases where faculties, were still using hardcopy submission, though sometimes, such as the Sydney Nursing School, this is in combination with online submission, so that Turnitin checking can occur. Matching of online submissions to the written assignment is not routinely undertaken, however, raising the possibility that the assignment with a clear Turnitin report is not the same as the hardcopy assignment marked. Other faculties, such as Engineering and IT or schools such as Mathematics, continue to use substantially paper-based submission. There are broader issues here too, regarding the security of the assignment 'box' to which the submission is made, which, at least in the case of Engineering, is not closely controlled.

The School of Mathematics made a submission to the Taskforce arguing that hardcopy submission is necessary to retain within the discipline, and arguing against any blanket imposition of Turnitin as a result. Engineering and IT was similarly concerned as to how such a requirement would work in practice and Science and Medicine noted the use of assessment types such as lab reports and case notes that they did not feel would be amenable to Turnitin analyses. Some of these concerns appear based on an outdated understanding of the capabilities of the Turnitin tool and clearly require further staff training in the use of the tool, while others are valid concerns related to the nature of the discipline and its appropriate assessment. The approach considered by the Working Party (section 2.1 and 2.3) should allow faculties and disciplines to assess for themselves cases where Turnitin is really not appropriate and consider how else they may assure the academic integrity of their assessment tasks.

### 1.6 Recordkeeping

What is currently missing from the recordkeeping done in the University is consistency of practice across faculties. There is also no way to search for previous cases, not only within faculties, where reliance on staff memories is often used, but also across faculties, or to search for cases that have gone to the Registrar. While TRIM may be available, many staff report that they do not have time to manually search TRIM, where such a search is not simple. Most records, in any event, do not seem to reach TRIM.

The Working Party heard a great variety of recordkeeping practices across the University. For most faculties, records are kept on the Nominated Academic’s computer: this was the case in Veterinary Science, the Faculty of Education and Social Work, and many others. Some faculties have developed their own centralised recordkeeping function with access for the Nominated Academic and relevant Associate Dean, such as the Sydney Nursing School. Some, such as Law, ensure the appropriate letters are recorded on the student file, keep their own local records and have an aspiration to keep a TRIM file but have not been able to due to workload.

FASS, however, has developed a solution, outlined below, which utilises TRIM to provide swift and easy online reporting for staff and clear and simple decision points for the Nominated Academic, while all the time recording relevant details to TRIM in the background. This system has been in place for 18 months and handled 230 cases so far with no issues. While it does not, as yet, automate searching or reporting functions, these could be developed and integrated with some ease, as discussed below (section 2.5).
Separately, for cases referred to the Registrar, the Student Affairs Unit keeps track of these in a Filemaker system, which has not been linked to TRIM. Once a case is concluded, the final decision is placed on the student file manually by staff.

2. Detailed Proposals

More information on the recommendations proposed is outlined here. Many of these proposals arose in the course of the investigation, as the Working Party discovered examples of best practice already at work in the University.

2.1 Education

A majority (53% in 2014) of the upheld cases reported to the Academic Board are classed as negligent plagiarism, indicating that students have been careless, ill-informed or confused about how to cite the work of others and have failed to develop an authorial voice. Previous studies have shown the effectiveness of online learning modules in reducing cases of plagiarism (eg. Du Pre 2009 in Owens and White, 2013) and the Working Party also heard from FASS that since the introduction of their learning module on paraphrasing cases of negligent plagiarism had dropped to almost nil.

The study by Owens and White (2013) carried out in first year psychology units at the University of Sydney, further demonstrated the effectiveness of educational intervention in reducing rates of plagiarism. This was demonstrated firstly through a significant reduction in cases following the introduction of both detection software and an education module, and through a second significant reduction in cases following the introduction of a writing mastery quiz. Importantly, these authors also demonstrated that this major reduction in cases during first year led to a subsequent drop in cases in later years.

The most effective approach to education in this area appears to be multi-pronged.

- Firstly, academic integrity education must be embedded in the courses that students undertake, rather than provided in addition to course material. Simply providing students with links to the policy is not enough to ensure engagement with the material has occurred and for this reason a lecture and/or tutorial should be devoted to this topic in every first year (undergraduate and postgraduate) course. This also provides an opportunity for the information to be tailored to any unique disciplinary practice and requirements.

- Secondly, students should be required to complete a compulsory task, such as an online module, that tests their understanding of the concepts presented. This does not have to form a component of the grade for that unit (could be a compulsory component worth zero marks), but it should present a mandatory barrier to continuing at the University. The issue of ensuring the module is complete should ideally be managed through the learning management system. Three well-organised cases of online training and testing material were found and assessed by the Working Party, and it is recommended that the Taskforce consider using these as a basis to create material that can be rolled out across the University (see Attachment 1).

- Finally, students should work with their instructor to develop their first assignment in a ‘scaffolded’ fashion, with feedback on drafts as they apply the techniques of paraphrasing, citation and referencing. This could be a minor in-class assessment task or part of a larger assignment as appropriate.

The materials used in Psychology were reviewed by the Working Party along with the other units available across the University (Attachment 1). While interactivity in the modules is important, too much video was found to result in material being skipped, and text-based material was more likely to be engaged with. The difficulty of the test and the score required to pass were also important, and the Psychology unit test is strongest in this regard, with impossible to guess questions and a high pass mark required, forcing students to engage with the material. The Business module is unique in its automatic reporting which means that students who do not complete the module will automatically receive a fail...
in their units of study. This negates the ability to purchase certificates through a ‘black market’ and reduces the workload for staff.

To provide consistent, University-wide information, the refresh of the University website provides an opportunity to remove the multiple pages on academic dishonesty and misconduct and establish a single-point-of-truth web resource, potentially hosted by the Education Portfolio. When the student intranet is developed, this structure should be maintained within that environment. In addition to information about the University’s policies on academic dishonesty and misconduct, information on proper research and writing practices, time management, expectations for behavior and what to do when students do run out of time, are sick or find themselves struggling would assist in lowering incidence rates.

2.2 Turnitin

Turnitin should be used as a matter of course for all written assessments completed by students and the process for managing the checking of Turnitin reports needs management and planning for large units. Its use should also be considered for honours and coursework masters theses as well as those by higher degree research students (Report 2 will explore this issue). Once fully trained in the current capabilities of Turnitin, each faculty’s Nominated Academic should provide advice to the Teaching Committee or its equivalent within each faculty as to the appropriateness of any exception to this requirement.

To use Turnitin will require the use of a Blackboard site and online submission. Using Turnitin well requires a number of additional practices to be in place and the lessons learned by the Business School during the roll-out of compulsory Turnitin across that faculty are informative (Attachment 9). In brief, staff training in the use of Turnitin is essential, particularly in how to interpret the similarity report produced by the software. Under no circumstances should the ‘percentage match’ be used for decision making or to provide a ‘cut-off’ score. This is for three reasons: the percentage is highly dependent on the length of the assignment submitted; it does not adequately account for false positives; and it counts short phrases scattered throughout the piece in a similar manner to a short block of text, when these should be treated very differently. The rankings of the reports, however, uses a more sophisticated algorithm and thus is informative, but only if the settings of the program are left at default.

Once fully trained, staff should find checking the similarity reports generated by Turnitin a relatively speedy task. Due to the training involved and the need for consistency, the person who reviews the reports for a large unit should be the same and the time required for this role can be balanced by reducing the marking load for this staff member. It is also preferable, for these reasons, that this task be given to a permanent staff member, rather than a casual – the unit of study coordinator is likely to be the ideal candidate for this role. The Business School has also found it necessary to check staff use of Turnitin (Attachment 9) and this could be undertaken by the Nominated Academic for each faculty, on an annual basis.

If the staff member checking the Turnitin reports detects a problem, this should be reported ideally via a simple online form (section 2.5). At this stage, the Turnitin report and the problem report will be sent to an administrative staff member who can prepare these for the Nominated Academic to review. If, on review, the Nominated Academic finds a problem, the policy process described in section 1.2 can begin. Note that it is important that each faculty has resourcing to provide a trained and dedicated administrative staff member to support this process.

2.3 Assessments

The Taskforce requested that a literature review be conducted investigating what is known about the impact of assessment policy on the occurrence of academic misconduct. This was undertaken by personnel within the Education portfolio and is at Attachment 10.

There is little available evidence of a direct interaction between assessment policies and misconduct incidence, however, several studies have emphasised the need to maximise student engagement with assessment tasks. There is also an increasing focus within the literature on assessment design-based prevention, rather than detection. In general, this focuses on designing assessments that draw on student
personal experiences, on individualised assignments, and on what we here term ‘scaffolded’ assignments that are built over a period of time in close consultation with a teacher (Attachment 10).

Examples of assessments that appeared to be best-practice in relation to assuring academic integrity were heard by the Working Party. In some units, students at the University complete a project over the course of a semester, such as a design, a composition or a piece of research, with multiple points of contact with and feedback from their teacher. This means that the staff member can be fairly certain the submitted work accurately reflects the student’s knowledge and understanding. Even a single cycle of submission, feedback and re-submission has substantial learning benefits and should be relatively easy to implement. Peer feedback can also be useful, and the quality of the feedback itself can be assessed if so desired.

Where research projects and written tasks are used, ensuring these are varied from semester to semester assists in combating recycling of previous students’ work. More widespread use of Turnitin would also assist in detecting and discouraging this practice.

Professional faculties also often use internships, clinical placements and other situations where students are individually supervised and observed. These are very good ways to ensure that the student in question can demonstrate the skills that they are required to learn. For many of the professional faculties, failure in clinical skills, whether demonstrated via an exam or via placements, will automatically trigger a failure in the unit of study whether or not other areas have apparently been performed well. This further ensures the criticality of demonstrating key skills to the granting of a qualification and thus assures academic integrity. This ‘authentic’ assessment approach can be broadened to other areas of the University as appropriate.

Finally, ensuring that students can apply the skills they have learnt to an unseen problem is an excellent way of assuring the academic integrity of a unit of study. The Working Party heard from a number of faculties who considered that, while they had some difficulty in assuring the semester-long work undertaken by their students, the final exam they required the students to pass would ensure that only those who truly understood the content could complete the unit. To be effective, this exam must be administered according to best practice as outlined below, and it must also form a true barrier — that is, like the clinical exams or placements, a certain grade in the exam must be required, rather than allowing a student to pass the unit based entirely on performance in earlier, un-assured, pieces of assessment. This grade does not have to be a pass — there are some units where the level of difficulty is such that the appropriate barrier mark will be lower.

There are a number of other assessment forms that discourage participation in academic dishonesty. Regular, automated, low stakes formative feedback assists the learning process while also removing incentives to cheat. In addition, these tasks could provide useful diagnostic tools with which to judge a student’s authentic voice and capabilities in the case of a suspect piece of work being identified. ‘Design’ tasks, oral assessments and assessments where students are asked to identify key questions or issues, rather than simply to write, are all more creative approaches to assessment that are more difficult to cheat. An overall reduction in the use of summative assessment is also likely to lower the stakes for students and reduce incentives.

The above are all examples of best practice in assessment design-based prevention of academic dishonesty. They are provided as an initial sketch towards the development of best practice guidelines to assure the academic integrity of assessment tasks that the office of educational integrity could maintain to assist staff.

Unit of study coordinators should be required to review and assess the academic integrity risk within their unit of study. Such an assessment should also be recorded by the School or the Faculty at the point of review or through a stocktake and could take the form of a formal plan for each unit, a faculty assessment matrix, or statements integrated into the unit approval template. This should cover the range of possible breaches (see section 3) which could be updated by reference to a current-state list also maintained by the office of educational integrity. The working party considered what an academic integrity assurance plan that assessed the robustness of the assessment tasks within a unit of study might look like, and an example is at Attachment 12.
What this approach does not address is the broader curriculum design question of the volume of assessment experienced by coursework students and what impact, if any, this may have on the incidence of academic misconduct and plagiarism. This issue is, however, part of a much broader conversation about workload, curriculum design and assessment for learning. As such, the Taskforce may wish to ensure that the education strategy discussion currently underway give due consideration to this question at a whole-of-university level. This could include considering top-down approaches to assuring academic integrity across the curriculum, such as through capstone assessments of learning outcomes and graduate qualities.

2.4 Exams

Best practice in exams can vary by the type of exam to be undertaken. There are some basic principles, however, that will apply regardless of the type of exam. To be effective as an academic assurance measure, the exam must a) be conducted under effective invigilation with adequate separation of students and b) contain genuinely unseen material. The identity of the student must also be verified. Whether or not an exam is open or closed book, or what format the exam may take must be adjusted as relevant to discipline. In discussing the subject of exams with faculties across the University, the Working Party noted a strong willingness among staff to use this method of assessment in most disciplines. Some noted that a final exam may not make up a large proportion of the final mark for various reasons but did not see an issue with requiring completion of the exam to a set standard as a barrier to completion of the unit. For example, the College of the Arts did not think a large weighting for a written task in the studio units was appropriate, but did think that requiring students to contextualize their work while under invigilation could be valid.

Effective invigilation is key and practices in this vary across the University, from that provided by the Examinations Unit to that undertaken by staff in faculty-run exams and that done by clinical educators. The venues for examinations matter, as these affect sight-lines for students in the exams and simple measures such as scrambling multiple choice answers between candidates can make any such cheating not only easy to detect but also unrewarding (Attachment 13). Sorted seating where students completing different exams sit together is another easy solution to in-room cheating.

An awareness of the technologies readily available to students that enable cheating and measures to combat these must also be part of invigilation. This includes considering ways to block internet signals, requiring personal electronic devices to be handed in for the duration of the exam, providing pens and calculators rather than allowing students to bring their own, and so forth. Assuring student identity could be done using technological solutions such as biometric scanners, but there are low-tech solutions available as well: staff could attend the exam and determine for themselves that their students are present.

Ideally, genuinely unseen material must be used to examine students. This means creating new exams every time, as recycling of exam questions, even from within a large question bank, is problematic for the reasons outlined above. There are in some disciplines, however, valid academic reasons for considering allowing students to study a number of problems prior to an exam, and asking them to reproduce one or more of these under exam conditions. Staff should also no longer assume any exam can be kept confidential; there were many instances cited to the Working Party of supposedly confidential exams available on the internet.

In clinical exams where students demonstrate a skill under invigilation, rigorous invigilation is required. One faculty in particular discussed instances of cheating within these that they have become aware of and believe they have addressed by tightening invigilation guidelines. Where students must undergo the clinical exam in serial, difficulty arises when an unseen portion is introduced. It would be best, therefore, to restrict this type of exam to demonstrating skills, or otherwise be able to vary the unseen portion for each student cohort.
2.5 Recordkeeping

The recordkeeping system in use by FASS provides an example of what best-practice recordkeeping across the University could look like. At present, there is a TRIM workflow in place where:

- The reporting examiner uses a simple online form to report a suspected case.
- The online form opens a TRIM file in the background and begins recording relevant actions taken.
- The system sends the case to an administrative staff member who checks the evidence submitted and prepares the case for review by the Nominated Academic.
- The Nominated Academic is emailed the case for review and enters his or her preliminary findings via email. This then triggers further appropriate steps in the chain, such as sending an email back to the examiner with a finding of minor issues requiring education, or:
  - If the finding is such that the student will be asked to an interview, the system prepares the notification letter based on the selections made by the Nominated Academic and sends the letter to the student.
  - The Nominated Academic records the outcomes of the interview in an email the system sends, and this triggers further steps, including sending to the registrar if appropriate, and keeping the reporting examiner informed.
- The TRIM file is complete and has been maintained without any of the academic staff needing to interact directly with TRIM.

Material provided by the Recordkeeping Unit that demonstrates the workflow above, along with sample emails is at Attachment 14. The Working Party has been advised that rolling out this system University wide could take as little as a month, with minimum staff training required.

What this system currently lacks is a way to search the files created to check for recidivism. The University is in need of a way for all faculties to be able to search the files created by others, and for these to link with the files created in the Registrar’s office in the case of a referral there. The Working Party has heard that such a system should be possible to create within TRIM, in a similar fashion to the above, so that it will require minimal training or effort on the part of staff. To link with the Registrar’s office, the Filemaker system used could also be connected to TRIM.

TRIM is also capable of generating reports on the data collected, such that reporting to the Academic Board on the number of cases will no longer need to be done manually by faculties, and these data could be further interrogated for informative trends (Attachment 13).

The current system is such that notifications, investigations and findings are all recorded in TRIM. Where an outcome letter is sent to a student, this is also recorded on the student file. The TRIM record allows for previous notifications and investigations to be searched and reviewed, regardless of whether a finding that would be recorded on the student file has been made. Further investigation is necessary to consider how appeal and appeal outcomes records should be kept, but some integration with this system would likely be of use.

It will also be necessary to consider what time period TRIM records should be kept for, as at present, destruction of records regarding cases that are not subsequently referred to the Registrar’s office for action takes place after two years, though the metadata is retained indefinitely. There is a good case to be made that these records be kept for at least the duration of a students’ time at University, if not longer, and the Taskforce may wish to consider whether to recommend an extension of retention time for these cases. As any outcome letters are recorded on the student file, they will be kept for six years post-graduation. For students entering some professions, such as Law, a longer retention period may in fact be necessary as the University can be asked to support claims made by former students as to their record at any point during their career.

2.6 Coordination and Support

A common feature of the Working Party’s discussion with the Nominated Academics from each faculty was the lack of support that these staff felt in interpreting the policy, determining appropriate
penalties, understanding best practice prevention and detection techniques and so forth. The Working Party’s discussions also often resulted in information sharing across the University, where staff discovered that a problem they had been facing on their own had been elegantly solved in another area in a manner that was entirely transferrable. Sometimes, due to poor lines of communication, staff had been working with outdated versions of policy, impressions of processes created from incidents that took place decades ago, or had understood an interpretation from OGC on an individual case as constituting a kind of ‘case law’ that changed their application of the policy.

There is student confusion, too. From Law, the Working Party heard that a student representative had brought to the Faculty’s attention an ‘essay help’ site advertising its services. Because the advertisements were in lecture halls, elevators and chalked outside the building, students were confused as to whether such services were allowed and endorsed by the Faculty. In addition, in the time since the last Taskforce meeting a number of cases of suspected ghost writing and solicitation by ghost writers have come to the attention of University staff and students, who have no clear place to send such information for action by the University.

The Working Party considers that these, and other examples, provide a clear case for the creation of a liaison point and centre of responsibility within the Education Portfolio, termed the office of educational integrity and focused on coursework (including Honours theses and other theses completed as part of coursework degrees). This would liaise with and complement the existing Office of Research Integrity and have carriage of policy in this area. It would lead the development and implementation of practices promoting academic integrity, by: providing training and support to Nominated Academics, convening a ‘community of practice’ across the University to share novel solutions and information, and maintaining high quality educational materials that could be used in every faculty. It would also provide a single point of contact on academic honesty matters for staff and students, and maintain expertise in the types of misconduct and the external provider environment.

Important, too, is leading a University-wide conversation on academic integrity. The Working Party heard from one Nominated Academic who felt that within her faculty, there was a perception that subtleties in the debate, for example over legitimate artistic uses of others’ work, were being lost. Acknowledging this view and working with those staff who hold it to discuss what academic dishonesty might look like within these disciplines is an important part of engaging staff on this issue and students should be part of this conversation as well. Report 2 will explore creating a culture within the University of academic honesty, and it is likely that the office will lead this work.

Finally, as this report shows, there are potentially interesting differences in the occurrence and type of misconduct across the student cohort which are unable to be addressed with current University data. Once an improved recordkeeping and reporting function is in place, these data should improve, which would allow the office to undertake research on this question, as well as to evaluate different prevention and detection strategies to underpin its work on best practice.

The office need not have significant budget or other resource implications and could be established by assigning the relevant responsibilities to an appropriate officer within the Education Portfolio. As the changes made by the Taskforce and its work develop, consideration could then be given to whether any more is needed in terms of more permanent resourcing and structure. Once established, it may, for example, be sensible to consider centralising recordkeeping and some coordination and education tasks.

2.7 Policy changes
In discussions with Nominated Academics, the Working Party heard of a number of instances where staff had adjusted the procedures slightly. Most strikingly, at least four different faculties had come to the conclusion that there was a class of offence that was minor but indicated a need for further education, and could be evaluated on the evidence alone, such that an interview with the student was unnecessary from the academic’s point of view. These faculties had developed a method whereby the student was offered an interview, as required under the policy, but it was emphasised that this was optional and the student could choose simply to complete an addition educational unit. The Working
Party agrees that this is a sensible approach and considers that the policy should be modified to clearly include this option.

Some concern was heard by the Working Party that the current policy does not separate the person in the faculty who prepares the case from the person who decides the case at the faculty level.

There were also some points of apparent inconsistency within University policies more broadly that were raised with the Working Party. At present, the current policy allows a defence of negligent plagiarism, which essentially argues that the student was not aware of the policy. At the same time, under the Student Code of Conduct, students are required to be aware of all policies pertaining to them, and ignorance of other policies is not an acceptable reason for breaching them. The Academic Board may wish to consider how to resolve this apparent inconsistency.

The extent of proofreading and editing by third parties that is currently allowable is also an area of policy inconsistency. At present, the policies are silent on how this is to be addressed for coursework students, but the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Policy and its procedures does address this. Clear guidance should also be provided to both staff and students as to what is expected in this area for coursework.

If the Taskforce makes any of the recommendations suggested by the Working Party, there are further policy changes that will need to be made, such as adjusting the Coursework Policy to require Turnitin to be used for all written assignments in the University and changing the Teaching and Learning Policy to require integrity assurance plans for each unit of study.

3. Types of Academic Dishonesty

3.1 Plagiarism and ghost writing

For text-based assignments, the major forms of academic dishonesty observed fall into the categories of plagiarism, collusion, recycling and ghost writing. Most of the cases of academic dishonesty reported across the University fall into this category, whether copied from published material, other students, recycled or bought. There are also a minor number of instances of discipline-specific forms of academic dishonesty – such as the insertion of a pre-prepared tooth into a simulation exam in Dentistry.

Plagiarism is divided by the current policy into negligent and dishonest plagiarism. These are defined by that policy as:

- Negligent plagiarism: “innocently, recklessly or carelessly presenting another person’s work as one’s own work without appropriate acknowledgement of the source”
- Dishonest plagiarism: “knowingly presenting another person’s work as one’s own work without appropriate acknowledgement of the source”

Collusion and recycling are not straightforward to deal with under the current policy. It is difficult to make a finding of ‘negligent’ plagiarism for collusion or recycling, yet for minor issues, it may not be appropriate to apply a ‘dishonest plagiarism’ or academic dishonesty finding and the more serious penalties that this would attract. Some professional faculties, such as Law, are particularly loathe to make findings of ‘dishonest’ plagiarism as a record of this finding during a student’s degree has serious implications for their admission to practice.

In addition, current penalties that faculties can apply are designed for situations where the student committing the offence is enrolled in the relevant unit of study. In some cases, however, students have stolen copies of exams or dishonestly colluded with students for units they are not enrolled in, and failing them in that unit is therefore not a relevant, or even possible, penalty.

Ghost writing, where a person who is not the student completes the assignment and the work is then submitted as the students’ own, is an old problem, but new technology has enabled a rapid growth. It has always been possible for students to source papers or other assignment types from others, such as family members, friends and so forth. The rise of the sharing economy, facilitated by the internet, has provided both easy access to strangers willing to complete student assignments for pay, and has dropped the price for such services, as accessing workers in developing economies is made easier. There are large numbers of various types of websites that can be classified as ‘paper mills’, ‘swap sites’, ‘freelancing sites’, and so forth (Attachment 3).

Service and quality of ghost writing can vary quite widely, but it is possible to buy unique work that will not raise alarms on Turnitin or other similarity matching software. Sites may advise, or students may know, to check and change the work before submission to more accurately match the students’ voice. Back-translation programs on the internet are sometimes used to scramble the voice of the original author for this purpose. Some sites will provide full-service for scaffolded assignments, and others even offer a full PhD service, taking the student’s data and providing drafts at regular intervals, incorporating supervisor feedback until ultimately a thesis is produced (see, for example: www.fairpriceessays.com). Clearly, ghost writing is much more difficult to detect than simple “copy/paste” academic dishonesty.

The Working Party heard that of the cases where ghost writing has been identified across the University, these are detected due to unoriginality of the ghost-written essay, an academic’s suspicion that the work did not reflect the student’s usual style of writing or level of understanding, or because of ‘whistleblowers’, sometimes including ghost writers who were not paid. Nominated academics struggle to produce evidence of ghost writing, though the Working Party did hear of cases where experts in linguistics were retained to provide an analysis of the students’ previous work compared to the suspect assignment. Clearly, it would be extremely resource intensive to roll out such a solution University-wide. There are, however, a number of companies, including Turnitin, who are working on an algorithm to undertake such syntax analysis. In the absence of clear evidence of ghost writing, the Working Party considers that such determinations could rely on academic judgments, which are subject to review by the Student Appeals Body on appeal. Changes to assessments outlined earlier in this report (sections 2.3, 2.4) are recommended to tackle the problem of ghost writing.

3.2 Exam cheating
Exam cheating has also been facilitated by the internet and the rise of portable personal devices, particularly smartphones with photographic and internet browsing capabilities. Social media facilitates students disseminating stolen exam papers or questions rapidly, and there have been several recent cases of this across the University. Computer security breaches where exams can be stolen are also not uncommon, and any exam that is not changed constantly should be assumed to be in the public domain. In addition, exams done under less than ideal conditions are highly vulnerable to simple forms of cheating. Invigilation must be rigorous, devices confiscated, and some way to deal with the situation of students using toilet breaks to search the internet for answers must be found. An increase in students using impersonators to complete exams is being seen internationally, and while biometric identification forms can be used, there are also ways to cheat these (eg. fingerprint film) already in common use. The problem of cheating in exams is not trivial – a study on multiple choice exams within the University revealed an average level of cheating of about 5% (Attachment 12).

3.3 Other forms of fraud and dishonesty
When speaking with faculties about academic dishonesty, the Working Party heard much concern about other forms of fraud. These were often in the category of fraudulent medical certificates and other ways to exploit special consideration policies. This can occur in relation to any assessment task, but a large area of concern for faculty is in relation to exams, particularly where students who have attended an exam subsequently claim illness and apply to re-sit the exam at a later date. Where the medical certificate has indeed been issued by a medical professional in good faith, there is little that can be done, even if the staff member suspects fraud. There are also cases where such certificates are
faked or even sold. The Working Party considers that the current review of special consideration will need to deal with these concerns separately to the Taskforce’s work.

Data fabrication is another form of dishonesty that can be very hard to detect and mostly applies in the case of Research Students, so this will be addressed in the Working Party’s second report to the Taskforce.

4. Methods

Work to date undertaken by the Working Party has included:
- Preparation of a literature review on best practice;
- Reviews of: web information in the University; best practice prevention of exam cheating; analysis of business school data and those provided by other faculties;
- Consultations with the Dean’s nominee from each of the University’s faculties and with key personnel within the Registrar’s office and in Records.

The Working Party’s members are listed below and its Terms of Reference are at Attachment 13.
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Attachment 1 – Education Modules Review

Across the University of Sydney there are four major modules teaching academic honesty. These are:

- Library and Write Site
- FASS – combination library material and Faculty created material
- Science – Faculty / School created material
- Business – Faculty created material

Mention has also been made of the external module “Avoiding Plagiarism” which is marked by Epigeum. Epigeum is the external marketing wing of Imperial College London whose task is to market and sell products developed by ICL to other universities. Epigeum’s “Avoiding Plagiarism” has been included in this review.

Key parameters varied across the modules. The internal University of Sydney modules were all developed to be undertaken in 20 – 30 minutes. They are additional add-ons to in Faculty embedded teaching. The Epigeum product is designed to take a student over an hour to undertake. The Epigeum product is designed as a standalone product where no other teaching is occurring.

The suite of products – information, embedded teaching in units, remedial teaching and the module – are best in the Business School suite. The Business School has general information and large numbers of workshops available to assist students. Embedded teaching in each first year unit with dedicated tutorials and sections of each assignment on referencing and honesty ensure that students are scaffolded in their learning and know it is important since it is part of actual units taught. Remedial workshops are offered twice a week for those students who still have not mastered the skills needed and a diagnostic test detects students with serious problems who undertake a free extra unit dedicated to writing and academic honesty. The other University of Sydney modules are supported to less extent than the Business School module. Often it is an individual UOS Coordinator who does something so that there is patchy coverage for students. The Write Site had interesting activities but stood alone. The Epigeum product has no suite attached. The Learning Centre offers remedial workshops but these are quickly filled since there are not enough of them offered.

Proof of completion varied. The Library, FASS and Science modules requires a student to complete the module, collect a certificate of completion and then send that certificate to Unit of Study Coordinators as proof that the student undertook the module. The Business School module and the Epigeum module collect and store which students have completed the module and which students have not completed the module. The Epigeum module does nothing more than store and report completions. The Business School module stores and reports completion but also automatically integrates with the marks system so that a student who does not undertake the module receives a fail in all units undertaken.

Multimedia quality varies across the modules. The Library and FASS modules are rich in video content, drag and drop visuals and other multimedia. The Epigeum module is very multimedia oriented with video, cartoons and well as text. The Business and Science modules are text based. They cover a lot of material in a text based format but other than the tests do not employ multimedia.

Interactivity is constant across the modules. Each requires the reader to carry out tasks. Multimedia and interactivity are considered important for engaging students. As such those modules with higher multimedia content may be perceived as more interesting and so students are likely to carry them out. The modules were carried out and tested by two research assistants aged under 22 and myself, aged over 40. Those with too much multimedia were found by all 3 testers to result in reduced learning since the video was simply skipped through. Where the module was short, all text based readings and activities were carried out.

Each module is completed by a test. The standard - or how difficult – the test was perceived to be varied greatly. The Library modules only had activities but not test. The FASS module test was the easiest with all testers gaining 100%. The Epigeum test was only observed but it was similar in standard to the FASS test. The Business and Science tests were difficult to undertake and required all
materials given to be read and understood in order to pass the test. The Science test was the hardest due to the type of questions and the format of those questions.

- The modules – and suites – developed within University of Sydney are more than adequate for use. The Epigeum product is simply an externally developed product of what has already been developed within University of Sydney.
- The suite of products in use in the Business School should serve as the model for developing a suite of items that any Faculty can use.
  - The Orientation Sessions should be taken over by the Learning Centre or other entity and offered in sufficient repetitions that all interested students can attend.
  - The embedded learning in lectures, fixed tutorial on academic honesty and scaffolding into actual assignments can be adopted from the Business School module – or the Science or FASS instances.
  - The remedial twice weekly workshops need to be taken over and centrally run in sufficient numbers that any student referred can access them.
  - The diagnostic test and additional unit should remain a Faculty decision since the teaching and focus will vary according to the learning and assessments in each Faculty.
- Decisions need to be made about the goal and key achievements of the module. Similarly, how long should the module take a student, how often should the student need to undertake the module etc. Once these decisions are made, the existing modules can be combined so that there is an online module that is common across all Faculties. If there is budget, a small working party can work with a learning designer to add more interactivity and the correct amount of multimedia.
- The module test should be based on the Science test in both format and also standard required to be achieved.
- Automatic collection and reporting of who has completed the module must be a feature of what is developed. In this respect the Business School model can be used across the University. Whether the Business School’s add-on which links to marks and potential fails should be used across the University is a matter for policy.
Attachment 2 – Science/Business Incidence Comparison

The Business School has been keeping detailed records since 2004. The Faculty of Science has made available records between 2012 and 2014. These data have been combined into the spreadsheet attached.

Faculty of Science and School of Business shows notifications by student enrolments/instances.

Table 1: Total notifications from Science and Business as function student instances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Science figures are significantly lower than Business School equivalent figures. The Science figures remain ambiguous – is there non reporting or underreporting which explains the lower figures or are Business students as a cohort worse than Science students?

Units within the Faculty of Science that used TII across 2012 – 2014 reported .58% notifications. Units that did not use TII reported 0% notifications. There would appear to be underreporting where TII is not in use, and also some underreporting where TII is in use.

By careful selection, there are a group of units within Faculty of Science and the Business School where there is full use of TII and they have been checked and those units are reporting notifications. These units are equivalent and are listed in the attached spreadsheet. Focus has been placed on first year units to keep the sample equivalent.

Table 2: Total notifications from selected units using TII and reporting notifications as function student instances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
<td>4.88%</td>
<td>4.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 compares Faculty of Science and Business School units that are checked and are confirmed as using TII and reporting notifications. Underreporting units have been excluded. The Business School has far higher rates of detected notifications than does the Faculty of Science. There are two explanations for this difference:
1. Business Students, as a cohort, engage in far more academic dishonesty than Science students.
2. There is a difference in the standard used when a report is looked at and the decision that there is a problem in regards to academic honesty is made. The Business school has set a standard that anything more than a minor breach that could be corrected by an annotation in the margin must be reported. It is not known what standard the Faculty of Science is using. If Science is using a different standard, then different rates of notifications will be reported. If different standards are being used, there is no possibility of comparing across Faculties or indeed the ability to combine any data.

There is still a large amount of work that needs to be undertaken before anything predictive – or even a report of what is happening at present - can be undertaken. It is possible to undertake these investigations but access to check has not been given.
Attachment 3 – Academic Dishonesty Types and External Providers

A review of academic problems, external providers, and what our students take from them. This review does not cover general misconduct issues or professional misconduct issues.

Overview: Major conduct and countermeasure

There are a number of behaviours that the university currently considers as academic dishonesty and plagiarism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic dishonesty types and possible countermeasures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic dishonesty instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghost writing – submitting work written by someone else as your own work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newly created work, sometimes reused work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally by a stranger for payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghost writing websites, forums, Facebook etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghost writing – submitting work written by someone else as your own work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonators – someone other than the student attends and completes an in person assessment e.g. exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A form of in person ghost writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swap site – submitting work written by someone else as your own work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reused work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student to student copying (within the unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student to student copying (across semesters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling – student submitting own work a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism – taking someone else’s work and pretending work undertaken by self. Copying words or ideas without attribution. Work typically taken from the internet or books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable collaboration – More than one person working on an individual piece of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable editing – a person other than the student significantly modifying or adding to the content or meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabrication of attendance, achievement of required skills, observation of procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabrication of reflections / experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabrication of data – intentionally falsifying results which are reported in, or relied on for the purposes of, a piece of assessable work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraudulent documents – submitting a fraudulent doctors certificate in an application for special consideration or a fraudulent transcript or certificate for admission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited materials brought into an exam room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmable or internet enabled devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing confidential exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying and distribution of confidential exams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and tests
After first use of the exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Service provided</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Study help         | Study aids or tutoring services   | • Spoonfeedme.com.au provides video tutorials for specific units of study
|                    |                                   | • StudentVIP.com.au provides a textbook exchange and tutoring from current and past students
|                    |                                   | • OneClass.com allows students to share lecture, tutorial and revision notes |
| Forums and social media | Current and former students can post and answer questions | • Bored of Studies.org provides forums by university and faculty
|                    |                                   | • Whirlpool.net.au has a number of forum threads on misconduct
|                    |                                   | • Gumtree Australia allows members to post ads offering or requesting services, including ghost writing
|                    |                                   | • Facebook has been highlighted in recent media coverage for profiles advertising ghost writing services |
| Share sites        | Notes or completed assessments from | • Scribd.com provides online access to books and documents including student notes |

Assisting dishonesty – providing material or information to another person with knowledge that these materials or information may be used improperly. This includes both deliberate and inadvertent actions.

Grey area. Is giving another student the answers assisting dishonesty? Improved guidelines and institution wide debate on acceptable assistance.

External providers

Many external providers exist to help students with their coursework. Websites range from those providing legitimate study help to share sites and writing services.

Sharing previous assessments or engaging someone to complete an assessment can be a breach of the current Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy however not all the services available from external providers are necessarily problematic e.g. sharing notes, offering tutoring services or posting on forums.

The sites can be open access, free with sign up, free once you donate a paper, or require payment. Many writing services allow free previews of some papers and require payment to access the full database with higher quality papers. Most share sites and writing services do have a small disclaimer which states that the material is for research purposes only. The table below outlines the types of services available to students.

External providers, the services provided, and examples of websites where these services are available.
| previous students | • Slideshow.net allows sharing of PowerPoint presentation slides  
• Brainia.com provides access to free papers after sharing one of your own  
• S2scommunity.com.au online resources include exam study notes and assignments  
• Thinkswap.com provides access to free notes and papers after sharing one of your own for credit  
• Studymode.com browse notes and assignments |
| Writing services | Custom papers, essay mills, ghost writing |
| • Bestessays.com.au advertises essay-writing services from professional writers  
• Delegateyourassignment.com advertises assignment writing services |

An additional category which is potentially a problem but has not been looked at in detail is proof-reading and editing services. The University’s Learning Centre offers some brief guidance for students looking for someone to proof-read or edit their assessment including that “there is no objection to a friend helping you with editing and proofreading, but this kind of assistance should not break the rules on academic honesty… by significantly modifying or adding to the content or meaning of your work” (Learning Centre website, accessed 24/6/2015, http://sydney.edu.au/stuserv/learning_centre/help/grammar/gr_editUni.shtml).

The screenshots below highlight external websites that provide academically problematic services. Where possible screenshots were taken to highlight material relevant to University of Sydney courses.

### Study help sites

- Spoonfeedme.com.au
- StudentVIP.com.au
- OneClass.com

STUDENTVIP AT UNIV. OF SYDNEY

StudentVIP members only.
You're invited!

Main campus Change campus
56,106 members at Univ. of Sydney

StudentVIP at Univ. of Sydney

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Subject Ratings</th>
<th>Textbooks</th>
<th>Tutor Requests</th>
<th>Tutors</th>
<th>Campus App</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56,106</td>
<td>6,379</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>23,825</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,544</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,969</td>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36,428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Forums

- BoredofStudies.org
- Whirlpool.net.au
- Gumtree.com.au


**Share sites**

- Scribd.com
- Slideshare.net
- Brainia.com
Image from Slideshare, accessed 15/6/2015, 
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Writing services/essay mills

- Bestessays.com.au
- Delegateyourassignment.com

Why Choose Bestessays.com.au?

1. Courteous Australian students are satisfied with our professional writing services
2. Custom written essays, original term papers, and professional research help
3. Educated, professional writers with proven experience writing academic papers
4. Valuable savings - our discount savings program saves you time and money
5. Our customer service is available 24/7 - when you need help, we are here for you
6. 100% privacy guaranteed - your private information is strictly confidential
7. Free revisions on any academic paper until you are fully satisfied with your order
8. Free title page, contents page, reference page, and proper formatting


College assignments are causing headaches? Rely on our assignment writing service!

Before you started your college studies, you expected to work harder than usual to get good grades. However, you didn’t imagine you would have to cover so much academic writing on a daily basis. Although college professionals realize that students don’t have enough time to handle all tasks, they are not willing to make things easier.

If you tried to complete different types of papers for all courses at once, you wouldn’t have time for anything else. You weren’t planning to spend your entire college years with academic writing assignments, were you? Thanks to our assistance, you don’t have to. Our assignment writing services will help you maintain a great academic record while preserving a healthy social life.

An easy way to get your assignments done

Place your custom order > Our writers do your paper > Keep track of the progress > Receive your paper!

It’s important to choose the right assignment writing company!

Students are thrilled when they realize they can hire professional academic writers whenever they need assistance with their papers. However, you have to be careful with the website you choose. Several assignment writing companies offer pre-written papers and assignments for sale that feature plagiarized content, while others will take your money without delivering any content by your deadline.

When you choose our company, your satisfaction will be guaranteed! Our writers complete custom-tailored content of highest level of quality.

Information relevant to assessment in University of Sydney courses

These sites were found by searching for material relevant to University of Sydney or specific units of study. Teaching staff with specific knowledge of the course content and assessments would be able to do a much more thorough search of material that may be problematic for their unit of study.

A search of study help and paper swap sites shows that information relevant to courses in all faculties is available online. Some sites allow you to browse the material by university, so you can easily access material relevant to a specific unit of study. Material available includes course notes, completed assessments and past exam papers which are outside the University’s official past paper repositories.

In the case of written assignments, if the original assessment is from a unit which uses Turnitin, it may be possible to detect students who use this material in their own assessments. However, if the original assessment was not run through Turnitin, it will be very difficult to detect students who submit this as their own work.

For every website found in English, there are even more in languages other than English that could not be accessed.

Websites with assessments available online

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Sydney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences, Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study Notes and more from students at University of Sydney


Usyd Essays and Term Papers

Examples of University of Sydney assessments available online

The two tables below highlight a range of University of Sydney assessment material which was available online as at 15th June 2015. This includes various assessment types across all faculties, including the text of an oral presentation given in French.

Examples of University of Sydney assessments (excluding exams) available online.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Assessment type (notes, assignment, exam)</th>
<th>Assessment name</th>
<th>Date of assessment/date uploaded</th>
<th>Can identify student?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>AGEC2103</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Assignment 1</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>ECOP2001</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Major essay</td>
<td>Sem 1, 2005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>FRNC1631</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>GCST1601</td>
<td>Exam</td>
<td>Take home exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>GCST1602</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Final essay</td>
<td>Sem 2, 2012</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>GOVT1105</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Major essay</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>GOVT1105</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>HSTY2628</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Proposal &amp; annotated bibliography</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>PHIL1010</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Critical Essay</td>
<td>Sem 2, 2012</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>SCLG2604</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Authoethnography</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>WRIT1000</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Sentence task</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>ACCT3011</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Group assignment</td>
<td>Sem 1, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>BUSS1001</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>ABC2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>BUSS1020</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Major assignment</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>FINC3017</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>CAPM essay</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>INFS1000</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Article annotations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>MKTG3120</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Blog 1</td>
<td>Sem 1, 2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>EDUF1018</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Essay 1</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>CIVL3205</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>All assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>ELEC2104</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Lab report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>ENGG1061</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Group EWB challenge report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>BACH1145</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Module 1 assignment</td>
<td>Sem 2, 2008</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>HSBH1006</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Power point presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>LAWS1015</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer School 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>LAWS2011</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Group assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>IMMU3102</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>PCOL3021</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Beta Blockers Report</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>PHAR1812</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Group assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>MBLG1001</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>DNA electrophoresis report</td>
<td>Sem 2, 2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>PSYC3011</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Blocking experiment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studymode.com</td>
<td>FINC5001</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sep 18, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studymode.com</td>
<td>CLAW1001</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 2, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of University of Sydney exams available online

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Assessment type (notes, assignment, exam)</th>
<th>Assessment name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Attachment 4 – Academic Board Data

The following figures draw on the data reported annually to the Academic Board by faculties, via the Academic Standards and Policy Committee. Faculties are asked to report on: the numbers of cases, the penalties applied, how the notifications were handled, the steps taken by the faculty to promote compliance with the education strategies, which units mandate Turnitin use, and how data on these cases is collected and stored.

Figure 1. Number of cases reported to the Academic Board, from 2010 – 2014.

Figure 2. Number of findings as a percentage of student enrolments, by faculty.
Figures 1 and 2 include data from the Business School on findings, and those notifications that were dealt with educationally.

Figures 3 and 4 only include data from the Business School on findings. It does not include notifications dealt with educationally.
Attachment 5 – Business School Incidence

The Business School has been recording data notifications relating to academic dishonesty and plagiarism since 2004. The Business School started a systematic program of education and detection of plagiarism in 2007. This report will report only 2007 – 2014 data.

A separate spreadsheet records all data and shows the breakdown of these cases by various categories, including the number of cases for domestic students compared to international students, the number of cases for undergraduate and postgraduate students, home Discipline and other divisions.

The data set is based on the number of notifications made against Business School students, or the instances of reported plagiarism and has been compared to total student instances. Student instances refers to the instances where students are able to engage in academic dishonesty. For example, if a student undertook 8 units of study in a year, they are counted 8 times. Please note: As the data below is based on the number of notifications made against Business School students it therefore includes cases where the matter was dealt with educationally, an informal warning was given, or after investigation no academic issues were found and so no action was taken.

Incidence of notifications of academic dishonesty and plagiarism

![Graph 1: Number of notifications made for students enrolled in Business School units from 2006-2014](image)

The Business School has been recording the number of notifications of academic dishonesty and plagiarism against students enrolled in a Business School unit since 2004. The University only holds data for student enrolment numbers from 2006 so incidence rates can only be calculated from 2006 onwards.

In 2007, the Business School commenced a formal program of embedded education teaching students about academic honesty and how not to engage in plagiarism or academic dishonesty. Teaching occurred in first year units with an entire tutorial in all core/compulsory first year units on academic honesty and referencing and writing. This teaching was then scaffolded through all assignments in every first year unit with specific further training and feedback on the basis of
submitted work. Significant resources are made available to students within each unit of study as well as on external facing sites. Additional teaching occurs in orientation and transition settings, twice weekly remedial workshops available on a drop in basis and a compulsory online module on academic honesty and good writing. A diagnostic assessment identifies students with very poor writing or referencing abilities and these students are offered an additional unit of study. This unit is a zero credit point free unit of study dedicated to writing support. It mirrors the core first year unit of study and allows in depth extended teaching of the core writing and analytic skills taught in the first year unit.

At the same time, the Business School commenced a project such that all assignments were submitted electronically into a text matching software – Turnitin. The project started as a trial in 2007 and was in use in all units of study across the Business School by 2010.

Graph 1 records both the number of notifications and also the incidence of notifications detected between 2006 and 2014. The raw number of notifications appears high (over 1000 in 2012 for instance) but these numbers must be taken in context with the very high number of students within the Business School. Across 2007 – 2014, the Business School recorded a total of 1.7% of total student instances or 3.7% of students having had notifications of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them in Business School units.

There is a steady increase in notifications detected between 2006 until 2012 but after that there is a significant decrease in the incidence of notifications of academic dishonesty. A combination of intense embedded education combined with visible and active detection of incidences of academic dishonesty has reduced the incidence of detected notifications from 2.93% of student instances to 1.65% of student instances.

Comparison of notifications of academic dishonesty and plagiarism against Business School students across different categories of student

The Business School recorded both the notification but also additional details allowing a comparison of incidence rates across different categories of students.

A comparison of incidence rates between admission status – that is local student or international student – shows that the difference in the incidence rate of notifications of academic dishonesty and plagiarism between local and international students, though small, is statistically significant, although this is still under review. This has been consistent across all years in which the Business School has recorded data.

The notifications represent 0.92% of total domestic student instances from 2006-2014 and 1.5% of total international student instances from 2006-2014 having had notifications of plagiarism or academic dishonesty in Business School units. This compares with a rate of 1.7% of total student instances.
A comparison of incidence rates between degree status – that is undergraduate student or postgraduate student – shows that there is no discernible difference in the incidence rate of notifications of academic dishonesty and plagiarism between local and international students. There is no consistent trend in the comparison between undergraduate and postgraduate students.

The notifications represent 1.15% of total undergraduate student instances from 2006-2014 and 1.39% of total postgraduate student instances from 2006-2014 having had notifications of plagiarism or academic dishonesty in Business School units. This compares with a rate of 1.7% of total student instances.

Incidence rates tracked back to major studied showed no discernible trends. Differences in assessment regimes and training levels in detection mean that the data does not disclose any meaningful information.
Attachment 6 – Business School Recidivism

The Business School has been recording data on students who have notifications of academic dishonesty and plagiarism made against them since 2004. The Business School started a systematic program of education and detection of plagiarism in 2007. This report will report only 2007 – 2014 data.

The Business School data on students who have notifications of academic dishonesty and plagiarism made against them has been used to check for recidivism rates, specifically the number of times each individual student who has a notifiable case has had a previous or concurrent cases within the Business School. Students who have previously received a written warning or had an notification made that was dealt with educationally have been individually informed of what is expected of them, undergone specific remedial education that was tested and warned about the consequences of any further breaches of the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy & Procedures. Students who have a second or subsequent notification may therefore receive a more serious penalty or may be referred to the Registrar if the nominated academic considers the conduct is sufficiently serious to potentially constitute student misconduct.

The data below is based on the number of notifications for students in Business School units, or the instances of plagiarism. Student instances refers to the instances where students are able to engage in academic dishonesty. For example, if a student undertook 8 units of study in a year, they are counted 8 times. A student refers to a unique SID. If a student undertook 8 units in a year, they are counted as one student.

Please note: As the data below is based on the number of notifications it therefore includes cases where the matter was dealt with educationally, an informal warning was given, or after investigation no academic issues were found and so no action was taken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of notifications for the same student</th>
<th>Number of Business School notifications</th>
<th>% of Business School cases</th>
<th>% student instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only 1 notification</td>
<td>3995</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple notifications for the same student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 notifications</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 notifications</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 notifications</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 notifications</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 notifications</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total notifications 2007-2014</td>
<td>5778</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recidivism rates by student instances – The number of times multiple notifications were made for an individual student in the Business School 2007 - 2014.

The Business School recorded 5778 total notifications between 2007 and 2014. This represents 1.7% of total student instances or 3.7% of students from 2007-2014 having had notifications of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made for Business School units.

Multiple notifications against an individual student account for 0.5% of student instances between 2007 and 2014. This percentage includes those students who had two notifications but both were in fact first times through the system (see following paragraph). Multiple notifications for students who
had undergone remedial education and received formal warning accounts for 0.12% of student instances.

The high number of cases where two notifications were made for one student is likely to be caused by concurrent notifications. Concurrent notifications occur where a student has more than one notification at the same time, often in different units of study with assessments due around the same time. The Business School deals with these cases as being separate notifications at the same level e.g. a second first notification, because the student will not have had the opportunity to change their behaviour. Both assessments will have been submitted before the student underwent any remedial education or received any counselling or warnings.

Repeat notifications, in the sense of repeated behaviour by a student who has been fully educated and warned about the consequences of repeated behaviour is therefore best counted from those instances where there are three or more notifications.

An analysis of the types of academic honesty that occurred within the repeated notifications was carried out. Instances of three notifications and four notifications tend to include an instance of a concurrent notification and a different form of academic honesty. There may have been concurrent plagiarisms, and an instance of recycling an assignment from a previous semester. Or, concurrent plagiarisms, an instance of recycling a previously submitted assignment and an instance of collusion in an individual assignment. Instances of three notifications and most of the four notifications tended to be different breaches within the academic dishonesty sphere.

Instances of five or six notifications being made against an individual student involved repeated behaviour by the student in respect of previously warned behaviour and breach of academic honesty. (There was 1 student with 6 notifications and 7 students with 5 notifications.) Any high repeat rate is noted and tracked by the Business School. In the large majority of cases, the student was facing medical or personal crises and was wrongly trying to handle the issue through less than desirable methods. All students were given the assistance required. Around a quarter of the very high repeat rates, however, had no explaining factor other than the student chose to consciously repeat the behaviour.
Attachment 7 – OGC/Student Affairs Centre Data

Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Academic Misconduct</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Dishonesty**</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This does not include students whose candidature was terminated due to ‘disqualifying circumstances’, defined in clause 101 of the *University of Sydney Coursework Policy 2014* as:

  (a) the student, or someone acting on the student’s behalf, made a material misrepresentation in applying for admission to an award course;

  (b) the student failed to disclose to the University a fact or circumstance material to its decision to admit the person to an award course; or

  (c) the student was admitted to an award course on the basis of a degree, diploma or certificate obtained wholly or partly by fraud, academic misconduct or other dishonesty.

** This includes all forms of academic dishonesty other than plagiarism and fraud.
Attachment 8 - Turnitin Metrics and Faculty Use

Turnitin Use by Unit of Study in the University LMS

The table below shows the number of Blackboard assignments versus Turnitin assignments that have been made available in each unit of study, referred to as “courses” in the software. Note that the Business School uses a different server on which most of its Blackboard sites are housed, thus is not available for analysis by these metrics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distinct Courses</th>
<th>Sub-Total All Course Item Types *</th>
<th>% of Courses Using Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turnitin Assignment</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Business School)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law (Sydney Law School)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (Sydney Medical School)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No SIS College Mapped</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (Sydney Nursing School)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-wide</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Semester 1 2015 - Percentage and number of units of study using the Turnitin.
Interpreting Table 1.

1. The first column (Turnitin) shows the number of unit of study websites that have used the Turnitin tool.
2. The second column (Assignment) shows the number of unit of study websites that have used the Blackboard assignment tool.
   
   Note that some UoS websites appear to have used both Turnitin and the Blackboard assignment tool. Each Blackboard website may be used by one or more UoS, this is especially the case in Dentistry.

3. The third column (Content) shows the total number of websites per faculty that have content, usually 100%.
4. The fourth column (Sub-Total Assessment) shows the distinct number of websites that use either Blackboard assignments or Turnitin, e.g. Dentistry has 2 websites using Turnitin, and 1 using assignment, the sub-total assessment figure is 2 meaning that one of the websites is using both Turnitin and the assignment tool.

5. The fifth column (Sub-Total All Course Item Types) shows the distinct total number of active Blackboard sites per faculty.
   
   Note this figure is about 110 websites lower than what we know to be in Blackboard, this may be because the websites level of activity falls below a threshold (there are a number of websites with 5 or less students). We are working with Blackboard to explain this discrepancy as well as eliminating the “No SIS College Mapped figure”.

6. The sixth column (Turnitin) shows the percentage of websites using Turnitin.
7. The seventh column (Assignment) shows the percentage of websites using the Blackboard Assignment tool.
8. The eight column (Content) shows the percentage of websites using content.
9. The ninth column (Sub-Total Assessment) shows the percentage of websites using either Turnitin or Assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distinct Courses or Item</th>
<th>% courses using item out of total courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Content (TII) Assignment (SubTotal) Unit (Units with website in LMS) Total number of Units of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TII</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT BlackBoard</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School BlackBoard</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Semester 1 2015 Percentage and number of units of study using TII

ICT figures are for rest of university. Business School figures are units of study within Business School Blackboard.
Attachment 9 – Business School Lessons Learned on Turnitin Introduction

Mandating compulsory use of text matching software for all assignments across the University will be a multistep process and will involve significant cultural change. The Business School has undertaken this change and so experiences from within the Business School could assist a university wide process. Information from the 2014 ASPC reports provides a snapshot of current Turnitin use across all faculties.

Every unit of study must have a functional teaching web site

Before any opportunity to submit electronically, there must be somewhere to submit to. Every unit of study must have a functional teaching web site. The Business School requires every unit of study to have a functioning teaching web site. A roughly two year process from around 2004 to 2006 saw every unit of study operating a functional teaching web site.

Teaching staff underwent training in opening and creating a Blackboard (BB) web site. Training was in house and provided by Business School eLearning staff. Every staff member underwent local training. Further at desk support is offered.

While all academic staff are trained in building teaching web sites, a large amount of the set up and common loading of information into teaching websites is undertaken at a Faculty level through the use of templates and automatic loading of information. This significantly reduces the amount of work any individual academic must undertake. [Templates etc. are in use in Business BB. The situation may not be the same in ICT BB.]

Students were trained in navigating through the BB teaching sites when teaching websites were first used. This training is no longer being carried out beyond familiarity with where the websites are located and where key features will be found. Students are now fully familiar with websites and teaching websites.

Electronic submission of assignments

The Business School moved from every assignment being submitted in paper format to every assignment being electronically submitted within two years 2007 - 2009 – specifically at the end of 4 semesters all assignments were being submitted electronically.

Academic staff underwent training in how to build the link such that students can submit their assessment.

Students needed to undergo training in the electronic submission process. There was a training implemented for all current students. Ongoing training to each new first year cohort is provided. Students have not had any difficulty in receiving this training. They often express there is no need for training since they already know how to attach a file. Students were surveyed through the change process as to their perceptions of paper and electronic submission. Students were overwhelmingly in favour of electronic submission. There has been no student who wanted to continue needing to be on campus to submit work when there is an alternative.

Electronic submission of assignments into a text matching software

The Business School mandated that every assignment that could be checked by Turnitin (TII) had to be submitted into TII. At first this was only word based assignments. As TII increased its capabilities, assignments with characters and mathematics were able to be submitted. TII can now accept all file formats and content so every assignment, no matter content, is able to be submitted into TII. Very little additional training was needed. The process to create a link for an electronic submission is the same as the process for creating a link to submit electronically through a text matching software TII. Creating a submission link for an electronic assignment requires clicking on a drop down list of assessment types. That same link contains the creation of the link through text matching. [Note – this has been set up within Business BB. ICT BB may be more complex.]
Screenshot of Turnitin assignment set up in Business School Blackboard

Collection / printing of electronically submitted assignments
Within the Business School administrative staff print electronically submitted assignments. The Business School has developed spooling tools that ensure that every assignment is counted and printed and nothing is accidentally lost. Fixed file naming protocols taught to students means that assignments can be alphabetised or otherwise ordered before printing so that assignments are printed in fixed order to allow for later data entry of marks. Training is also given in bulk collection and download of electronically submitted assignments if an academic chooses to print themselves.

Checking of text matching reports
Checking reports, even for a large unit does not take more than an hour. It is an academic decision as to whether there is a problem. This is undertaken by each marker or unit coordinator. In some units every marker will check the report for the assignments they are marking. In other units, one marker is assigned to check all reports and then marking load is taken on by the other markers. Where casual markers are employed, additional time and pay is allocated to cover checking the reports.

Online marking
There is no requirement to mark online within the Business School. If an academic wishes to mark the paper assignment, administrative staff print the assignment and the academic marks it in the normal course.

Online marking is close to 40% usage across the Business School. This has been a word of mouth viral spread. The online marking tools are so sophisticated and easy to use that staff do not go back to inefficient paper marking once they have test online marking. (Students seems to prefer online marking since feedback is more detailed and timely).

Processes followed if a potential problem is found within an assignment
Where a potential problem is found in an assignment, all the marker or unit of study coordinator needs to do is send an email with the SID, unit code and assignment name to the Academic Honesty Office within the Business School. All subsequent work to collect the assignment, mark up a sample assignment showing problems, preliminary decisions, letters to students onwards are undertaken by the Academic Honesty Office.

The Business School centralised all functions following the markers detection of a potential problem in an assignment. The Academic Honesty Office is fully trained in all matters. They are quicker and far more efficient than the typical academic – certainly in collecting the evidence needed before any
preliminary decisions can be made. They also know exactly what to do regarding notifications, timelines etc. far better than the typical academic who might only deal with this task once a semester.

The Business School centralised all functions subsequent to the markers detection of a potential problem since academic staff reported it was too much work for them to undertake. They were willing and understood the need to check each assignment but the follow through work was too much for them and better undertaken by a trained specialist.

Voluntary compliance within the Business School towards checking plagiarism and using Turnitin. While the Business School has mandated the use of text matching software for all assignments, that does not mean that it is fully used. The Business school checks for usage rates and the follows through with additional training for staff. The process is a constant and ongoing one.

### Overall Business School - by UOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>TII Checked - All units</th>
<th>TII Checked - exclude developing units</th>
<th>TII not checked - All units</th>
<th>TII not checked - exclude specials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 sem 2 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 sem 1 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 sem 2 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 sem 1 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 sem 2 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 sem 1 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 sem 2 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Business School units where there was correct and incorrect use of text matching software.

Table 1 records the number of units that fully used text matching software and the number of units that did not use text matching software. Units and programs that are under development educationally have a longer timeframe to be fully compliant with text matching software use. Excluding this developmental areas, the Business School has achieved up to 85% full compliance in all units. 15% of units, however, still did not comply.
Of those assignments not checked, what occurred (by UOS)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No assignments</th>
<th>Link to TII not set up</th>
<th>TII set up but did not check report</th>
<th>Wrongly setting up TII report</th>
<th>Not handling drafts correctly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 sem 2 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 sem 1 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 sem 2 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 sem 1 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 sem 2 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 sem 1 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 sem 2 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Business School units that did not fully comply with the requirement to use text matching software.

Non-compliance and other issues
The Business School has tracked which units have not complied with the requirement that all assignments are checked using TII. Possible reasons for this are outlined in Table 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TII set up for assessment submission, uses correct settings and</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Students not engaging in problem behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>originality reports are checked correctly but there are no issues. That</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is, no students engaged in plagiarism or other academically dishonest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behaviour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments NOT capable of being checked by text-matching software e.g.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Other checking methods should be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excel spreadsheet assignments from accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments ARE capable of being checked by text-matching software but</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were not due to format of assignment e.g. telling students to present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orally without handing in written report. This section also include first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year maths and statistics where handwritten non digital assignments are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used since students do not yet know how to use math notation to hand in</td>
<td>Non-compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electronically.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TII not set up for assessment submission</td>
<td>Non-compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TII set up for assessment submission but uses optional settings</td>
<td>Non-compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incorrectly e.g. not set to produce originality report, or originality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report excludes matches over 5%, excludes quotes, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TII set up for assessment submission and uses correct settings, but TII</td>
<td>Non-compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reports are not checked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TII set up for assessment submission and uses correct settings, TII</td>
<td>Education of examiner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reports are checked but the examiner does not understand the originality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TII set up for assessment submission and uses correct settings, TII</td>
<td>Non-compliance; Education of</td>
<td>Non-compliance: if deliberate OR if resource issue; Education of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reports are checked but the examiner does not refer an assessment</td>
<td>examiner</td>
<td>examiner: if examiner does not understand the criteria for referral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate hard copy and TII submission</td>
<td>Non-compliance</td>
<td>Non-compliance where paper copy is marked as it is possible for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>students to submit different electronic version to avoid TII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>detection (can be avoided by use of tools to bulk download and print)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical or TII failure</td>
<td>Technical issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Situations where there would be no referrals for plagiarism or academic dishonesty in units where use of Turnitin is mandated

Common non-compliance issues in the Business School

- No assignment: There has been a slight but steady increase in units that do not have an assignment and instead have another test or exam. This may have been for educational reasons but the change was quite sudden following the requirement that all assignments undergo text matching software.

- No link is created for the student to submit the assignment into. If the link is not created there will never be text matching and so no report generated. In these units, paper based assignments are collected. This is a very small number of units and is getting smaller each semester. This decrease is being driven by students. They do not want to be submitting paper based assignments and so tend to report and protest against any unit that suggests the practice.

- The assignment is submitted electronically and undergoes text matching but the text matching report is not looked at and so no detections are made. Within the Business School this had been stable for a while at around 1.5% of units. Not reading or acting on reports has recently increased within the Business School. Active measures to ensure staff have the capacity and training to read the reports are underway.

- Miss-setting the TII report settings such that no detections are shown. The text matching software allow tweaking of settings in an attempt to reduce false positives. There is some intentional misuse of these settings such that every assignment shows 0% matches and so the academic need not check the reports. For instance, setting the match parameter to exclude matches under 20% means that the academic has directed the text matching software to only report on matches that are larger than 20% of the entire document in a continuous unbroken string. Except for the most gross plagiarism this does not occur and so every assignment is shown with absolutely no text matches when, if set correctly, it would have shown actionable matches. Active measures to ensure staff have the capacity and training to set up reports are underway.
Current use of Turnitin across all faculties

The annual reports to ASPC require faculties to list the units of study in which TII use has been mandated. Table 4 below collates the data from the 2014 ASPC reports, providing a comparison of TII use across all faculties. Data has also been obtained from the Business School and the faculty of Science on the breakdown of notifications by unit of study for 2014.

Only three faculties currently mandate TII use across all units of study. In Business and Science notifications were made in approximately 25% of units using TII in 2014 (23% in Science and 25% in Business). This suggests that mandating use of TII does not always result in notifications of plagiarism or academic dishonesty. Most students do not engage in plagiarism or academic dishonesty, therefore there will be no notifications made in those units. Other reasons for no notifications were outlined in Table 3. Please note that information is not available on the compliance levels for each faculty and it is not currently known if each faculty uses the same criteria for referral. Without this information it is difficult to compare across faculties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th># units in faculty</th>
<th># units mandated TII from ASPC report</th>
<th># of those units where allegations made</th>
<th># units not using TII where allegations made</th>
<th># allegations</th>
<th>Units mandated TII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AGEN1001 compulsory unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FASS</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>Not disclosed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Not disclosed, 23 units mandated in 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>TII mandated in all units - see list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>TII mandated in all units in Faculty of Dentistry programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and IT</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>See list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>See list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>TII mandated in all units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>Not disclosed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Not disclosed, no units mandated in 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and midwifery</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>See list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>See list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>See list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>All undergraduate Critical Studies units of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCM</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>MCGYxxxx and MUSCxxxx - see list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Science</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>See list</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Number of units using Turnitin in 2014, and the number of those units where notifications of plagiarism or academic dishonesty were made, where known. The number of units in faculty is based on Sydney Student data and in the Business School the actual number of units run is less than indicated. Therefore the number of units in other faculties may also be incorrect.

Tables 5 and 6 below provide the full list of units known to be using TII in 2014 and the number of notifications per unit where known.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th># Allegations/Unit</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th># Allegations/Unit</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th># Allegations/Unit</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th># Allegations/Unit</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th># Allegations/Unit</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th># Allegations/Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 CEMS6003</td>
<td>FINC2011 4 INF30001</td>
<td>MKTG2001 2</td>
<td>SMBA6000</td>
<td>ATE1001</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 CEMS6004</td>
<td>FINC2012 27 INF30001</td>
<td>MKTG2112 3</td>
<td>SMBA6002</td>
<td>BLO1001</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 CEMS6005</td>
<td>FINC3011 INF30010</td>
<td>MKTG2113</td>
<td>SMBA6003</td>
<td>BLO1002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 CEMS6007</td>
<td>INF30020</td>
<td>MKTG3112</td>
<td>SMBA6004</td>
<td>BLO1003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 CEMS6008</td>
<td>INF30030</td>
<td>MKTG2130</td>
<td>SMBA6005</td>
<td>BLO1004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 CEMS6011</td>
<td>INF30040</td>
<td>MKTG3134</td>
<td>SMBA6006</td>
<td>BLO1006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 CEMS6012</td>
<td>INF30050</td>
<td>MKTG3117</td>
<td>SMBA6011</td>
<td>BLO1007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CEMS6013</td>
<td>INF30070</td>
<td>MKTG3118</td>
<td>SMBA6010</td>
<td>BLO1009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 CEMS6014</td>
<td>INF30090</td>
<td>2 MKTG3119</td>
<td>SMBA6012</td>
<td>BLO1010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 CEMS6015</td>
<td>INF30010</td>
<td>12 MKTG3120</td>
<td>SMBA6011</td>
<td>BLO1024</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 CEMS6016</td>
<td>INF30001</td>
<td>2 SMBA6001</td>
<td>BLO1012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6: List of units in other faculties using Turnitin in 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering (21 units using TII, 9 units using other software)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and midwifery (4 units using TII)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Science (6 units using TII)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts (23 units using TII reported in 2013 ASPC report - not disclosed in 2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Board Report of the Academic Standard and Policy Committee – Appendix G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 August 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page G91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 10 - Literature Review on Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism

1.0 Introduction
An overview of the enormous amount of literature on the causes and prevention of academic misconduct and plagiarism reveals some disagreement on the effectiveness of individual approaches, but broad agreement that a range of approaches is needed. This is referred to as a holistic approach, as summarised by Macdonald & Carroll (2006). In this review we will include some literature on the individual approaches, but emphasise throughout the consistent call for a holistic strategy.
The review concentrates on information from recent conferences, from recent peer reviewed literature and, importantly, from an extensive study undertaken at this University over 5 years by Caleb Owens and colleagues in the School of Psychology and reported in Australian Journal of Psychology in 2013. It also includes a brief analysis of the match between current university policy and this literature.
The review is structured as requested, focusing on two questions — on prevention strategies, focussing on education of students (2.0 and 3.0) and on assessment and reporting policy (4.0) — but as noted above, responses are likely to be most effective when they are combined. An example is the use of policy on assessment design as a key pro-active measure in plagiarism prevention (section 4.0). Most Australian universities now provide information to both staff and students, based on the holistic conclusions from this literature. For example Melbourne University suggest the following four plagiarism minimisation strategies, with the first three being pro-active and the fourth reactive:

1. A collaborative effort to recognise and counter plagiarism at every level from policy, through faculty/division and school/department procedures, to individual staff practices;
2. Thoroughly educating students about the expected conventions for authorship and the appropriate use and acknowledgment of all forms of intellectual material;
3. Designing approaches to assessment that minimise the possibility for students to submit plagiarised material, while not reducing the quality and rigour of assessment requirements;
4. Installing highly visible procedures for monitoring and detecting cheating, including appropriate punishment and re-education measures. [University of Melbourne, CSHE website]

To some extent the rise of plagiarism and academic misconduct has accompanied the rise of assessment for learning, and related shift away from what was once the main purpose of assessment — the judgement of learning achievement. A considerable reduction in academic misconduct and in plagiarism (effectively to zero) could be achieved by a reversion to totally invigilated, closed-book, judgement-oriented assessments. However this is not a recommended approach in any of the current literature and Carless (2015) in his book on Excellence in University Assessment argues strongly for more assessment for learning, and the effective use of this approach to reduce plagiarism.

2.0 Effective prevention strategies

What is known about effective prevention strategies including whether different strategies are effective in different subject areas or different types of study (ie: coursework vs. research training, undergraduate vs. postgraduate, clinical vs. theoretical etc.)?

A great deal of the literature on plagiarism has been generated by Plagiarism Advice, an organisation started by the UK-based Joint Information Systems Committee in 2004. It lists TurnItIn first among its International Partners. They run a biennial conference:
http://www.plagiarismadvice.org/research-papers/category/conference-proceedings

A key statement from their website re-iterates the need for a multi-dimensional approach and sums up the dilemmas and challenge for an institution thus:

Addressing student plagiarism and implementing policies and procedures in this area is undoubtedly a challenge for any institution. Whilst providing a robust framework for dealing with potential instances of malpractice any guidance should also represent an empowering and positive journey towards academic integrity for students. The importance of transparency in developing institutional guidelines and procedures in addressing plagiarism is paramount in order to prevent any accusations of unfair treatment or bias from students.
In many ways developing this framework is a process of change management and key to success is developing policies and procedures with buy-in from stakeholders from all areas of the institution. Teaching staff should also be included in any discussions so as to ensure that they know what is expected of them as part of the wider assessment process and how their individual teaching practice aligns with the policy.

Given that learning remains one aim of assessment, there is no tool, policy or procedure that will completely eliminate plagiarism from any institution, even when assessment is redesigned to minimise the chance of copying (assessment policy will be discussed in more detail in Section 4 below). Wherever students have the ability to purchase material for submission or to copy from other texts, some will choose to do that; moral positions on plagiarism are not generally helpful in its prevention (Katins, 2013). Effort can be focused on detection, which may reduce the incidence. But the best results (i.e. the lowest detectable plagiarism in student work) come from “a multilayered, evidence-based, longitudinal strategy”. (Owens & White, 2013, p. 16).

There are several different motivations for plagiarism, but the attitude of the Institution has been shown to be significant in a student’s decision to plagiarise (i.e. the fear of getting caught may deter some) (Bennett, 2005)). However, moving beyond simple detection, there seems to be general agreement that the best strategies are local ones, involving the inclusion of information management, good writing practice and development of authorial voice into all first-year subjects (Onens & Anderson, 2014; Owens & White, 2013). A comprehensive institution-wide program, focussed on local staff training and support, provision of good student resources and central supply of software, can be successful in changing institutional culture regarding plagiarism as demonstrated by Pickard (2004) in her study of University College Northampton (UCN). This is an institution with 500 academic staff and approximately 10,000 students, providing a wide range of undergraduate, postgraduate and research degrees and a policy of actively widening participation from students who had not previously considered higher education. The study is interesting because it showed that students and staff had differing understandings of plagiarism, and also that staff often avoided the University’s procedures for dealing with plagiarising students. The study led to several initiatives (online modules for students, face-to face training for staff, streamlining of policy) and these was reported in a JISC compilation in 2010 (JISC Academic Integrity Service, 2010) as having improved both student understanding and staff compliance.

Institutional-level strategies for student education and detection reported in all of the literature can be summarised as combinations of the following:

- training and support for local strategies
- provision of detection software and training in its use
- and perhaps most difficult but also most effective, support for information management teaching, especially for first-year students.

Boden and Holloway (2004) summarise the teaching implications of academic integrity polices thus:

Teaching students about plagiarism is more than teaching them the difference between right and wrong, between collusion and collaboration or between cheating and good academic practice. A really effective anti-plagiarism programme needs to address the main causes of plagiarism by teaching students about information management. (p. 5)

2.1 Local-level programs

Owens and White (2013) suggest that a sophisticated approach to plagiarism prevention is necessary within an institution:

Because of the complex nature of plagiarism, the various types of plagiarism, and diverse motivations to plagiarise … no single strategy is likely to be completely successful in reducing student plagiarism rates. More specifically, the literature suggests that a one-size-fits-all approach to plagiarism reduction is ineffective (Park, 2004), and what is needed is a multilayered, evidence-based, longitudinal strategy (p. 16).

The desirable outcomes of local programs suggested by Owens & White might be:

- Students understand the principles and practice of referencing
- Students develop their authorial voice
\begin{itemize}
\item detection software is understood by staff and used as a teaching tool, not as punishment
\item students understand their responsibilities as academic writers.
\end{itemize}

An interesting discipline-specific use of TurnItIn is reported in an Arts College (McKie, 2014). In this institution students were given access to TurnItIn to “develop a better understanding of what plagiarism looks like, the importance of paraphrasing and why they need to reference their sources.” It increased students’ understanding of their own writing processes and their responsibility as academic writers.

\section*{3.0 Systems for limitation of plagiarism}

\textbf{What sorts of systems are needed and how do these differ from those the University currently has in place?}

NB: Any detection system requires students to submit online — this is not presently mandatory at The University of Sydney.

Plagiarism detection softwares (Sydney University presently supports TurnItIn) are necessary but not transparent. There are different ways to use them, each of which teaches students different things (Owens & White, 2013). Owens and White (2013) report an extensive study (5 years and over 14,000 students) following the development of their writing program in 1st year psychology. They tried these things (in order):

\begin{itemize}
\item deterrent use of detection software (not very effective on its own).
\item an in-class writing exercise with online constructive feedback module, made from student writing examples (helped with paraphrasing skills).
\item online mastery quiz to teach technical aspects of referencing and citing in discipline.
\item a writing tutorial that used in self-directed learning to facilitate the development of critical analysis skills and development of authorial voice.
\end{itemize}

In their view, the cumulative effect of these interventions has been successful to the extent that their plagiarism problems in very large (sometimes more than 2000) first-year classes dropped to ‘negligible’ by 2011, measured with the same free plagiarism software, WCopyfind, over five years (this study was conducted before the University undertook support of TurnItIn). When they began the study (2007) they were detecting up to 2.5% of written assignments as containing copied work, either from other students or from published sources.

\textbf{What changes might be feasible within the scope of this Taskforce and what might need to be referred to further work?}

\begin{itemize}
\item TurnItIn could be incorporated into all assessment practice. All faculties have agreed to its use, but anecdotally many staff members are still unsure how they could or should use it in their own marking. (And not all UoS have LMS sites, and not all assessments are submitted online.)
\item All UoS LMS sites could include a link to on-line educational resources that assist students to understand what plagiarism is and how to avoid it. These already exist on university servers, for example:
  \begin{itemize}
  \item the iResearch module in the University library http://www.library.usyd.edu.au/skills/elearning/learn/referencing/index.php can be easily incorporated into UoS – results can appear in the LMS grade centre or the student can download a certificate of completion
  \item the WriteSite at http://writesite.elearn.usyd.edu.au/m2/m2u1/index.htm describes the types of sources used in academic writing, gives reasons for using them and explains why it is important to reference them
  \item Resources from the Learning Centre such as http://sydney.edu.au/stuserv/documents/learning_centre/plag.pdf give information on successfully avoiding plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty.
  \end{itemize}
\item Faculties could be supported to develop writing tutorials incorporating plagiarism detection and thus prevention for first-year students, with or without online feedback (see Owens & White, 2013).
\item First year UoS could be selected to ensure that all students encounter a Unit in which assessment tasks are scaffolded to allow development of the skills of paraphrasing and
citation. For example the first assessment task might require students to compare the ideas presented in two journal articles on a topic relevant to a subsequent larger assessment task. The marking rubric for this task contains explicit reference to these skills. (This is the basis of the study conducted by Owens and White.)

- The University could develop technical capability for detection of plagiarism within higher degree by research theses and policy on its use.

An OLT project, the Exemplary Academic Integrity Project (EAIP), identified “five core elements of policy for ‘exemplary academic integrity’: access, approach, responsibility, detail and support” (Exemplary Academic Integrity Project (EAIP), 2013). They developed a ‘toolkit’ for institutions who wish to develop policies for academic integrity. There is as yet no publication on the use of this tool, although there are descriptions of some projects in train in the proceedings of the 6th Asia Pacific Forum on Educational Integrity (2013) at http://web.science.mq.edu.au/conferences/6apcei/Proceedings/6APCEI_Proceedings.pdf. However, compliance with policy at an institution is not always easy to ensure; one study indicated that staff may be more inclined to follow local practice than institutional policy (DeMaio, Dixon, Dunworth, & Yeo, 2013).

The final paragraph from Owens and White (2013) brings the focus back to the best outcome for the student:

> While is it difficult to disentangle the independent contribution of each of our strategies, we believe that this multifaceted approach to reducing rates of plagiarism has been a success precisely because it captures all students at all levels of ability and attitude. On the one hand, deterrence strategies are an essential component because educational strategies in isolation will not affect students who are committed to cheating. On the other hand, an educational approach to both writing and referencing is essential for those students who genuinely have little understanding of referencing rules. As we face an increasing threat of plagiarism from better technology, we should use technology to create interesting and engaging resources to assist our students to become better writers (p. 20).

3.1 A note on cheating in examinations

Cheating in paper exams (in MCQs, which offer the possibility of students copying the placing of their answers quite easily from desk to desk) has been studied intensively in some institutions over decades (e.g. a large study at McGill over more than 20 years reported by Harpp (2008)). Gareth Denyer (SMB) has published on a novel, fairly low-tech solution that he and a colleague used to ensure that paper quizzes in science showed random patterns of correct answers (Denyer & Hancock, 2006). There is a lot of literature on technical issues associated with online exams and take-home exams. However, technology moves on, and there should no longer be major issue with on-campus online exams at Sydney University as we now have the facility to use a lock-down browser for exams being done on campus computers to prevent students browsing for answers. (This has been used by some languages units.) Blackboard provides the facility to randomize multiple-choice questions in quite complex ways to reduce copying of answers. What the university does lack is very large computer labs to use for exams.

Additionally, there are emerging biometric or other technological approaches designed to ensure that students doing exams off campus are who they say they are – measuring users’ keystrokes for example. Medicine has recently piloted one of these and is reporting on this to the Academic Board shortly. There are also a number of third-party proctoring services for online examinations. It will be important for the University to monitor and, where appropriate, test and utilize such developments to ensure effective approaches to the minimization of cheating.

4.0 Assessment Policy

What is known about the impact of assessment policy on the occurrence of academic misconduct; what strategies are effective in different subject areas or different types of study; what sorts of systems are needed and how do these differ from those the University currently has in place;
what changes might be made within the scope of this Taskforce; what might need to be referred for further work?

Direct empirical evidence of an effect of policy on the occurrence of misconduct and plagiarism is difficult to find. Glendinning (2014) makes references to articles by Bretag et al. (2011) on a preliminary analysis of the academic integrity policies at Australian universities, by East (2009) on a lack of alignment between policy and practice in language learning, and by Tennant and Duggan (2008) on the recorded incidence of student plagiarism and the penalties applied in the UK, but none of the three are currently accessible. While not involving a study of impact, in her own report on policy and practice in the European Union Glendinning (2014) concluded:

The findings confirmed that HEIs in many parts of Europe had poorly defined policies and systems for assurance of academic integrity. In some countries and institutions where policies were in place, there was little evidence of monitoring and review. … Perhaps the greatest impediments to progress in academic integrity across the EU are the lack of consensus over what constitutes plagiarism, differences in academic standards, expectations of academic tutors and educational priorities. (pp17-18)

As noted in Sections 2 and 3, there is evidence that piecemeal, uncoordinated approaches may not be effective, and growing support for holistic responses in which the complexity of the issue is acknowledged.

Considerable recent research is shifting in focus from detection-based studies to prevention based on assessment design. A need for the shift was described by Youmans (2011) in his study of Californian students, in which he concluded:

In short, the instructional techniques and the use of the Turnitin.com system failed to prevent plagiarism to the satisfaction of the researcher. Instead, this study showed that the amount of plagiarism that instructors can expect may depend on the type of writing assignment that students are required to complete. [Youmans, p.758]

A strong case for a holistic approach involving detection and with more emphasis on design is provided by Macdonald and Carroll (2006) and the abstract of their paper is produced here in full.

Recent years have seen a growing awareness of the incidence of plagiarism, though the response has largely been to focus on deterrence through detection and punishment. However, student plagiarism is a much more complex issue than suggested by a one-solution response and this paper argues for a more holistic institutional approach that recognises the need for a shared responsibility between the student, staff and institution, supported by external quality agencies. Case studies from three institutions are used to illustrate possible triggers for adopting a holistic approach. The paper presents a checklist for identifying the absence of a holistic approach to dealing with student plagiarism and concludes that a key aspect is to adopt assessment-led solutions which focus on using low stakes, formative (as distinct from high stakes, summative) assessment. (p.233)

One of the cases they describe is from Newcastle University in Australia. The other two are from the UK. In addition to illustrating through case studies how assessment reviews have been triggered and conducted, their main point is about the shift away from high stakes assessment that encourages plagiarism or conduct in which students take risks in attempting those high stakes events. This view has been adopted widely and developed further in recent reports that articulate the sort of assessment design that might be envisaged.

Carless (2015) concludes his short section on plagiarism by describing some of the engaging assessment tasks that are likely to act in ways that discourage cheating or plagiarism. He emphasises the use of tasks involving “students in working towards divergent rather than convergent goals, through the use of individualised negotiated assignments, or assignments that draw on personal experience or require evidence of it” (p.20) that might look different in differing disciplines. For example a case
study in first year History involves the use of fieldwork reports (30% of the UoS assessment) and One Sentence Responses (15%) in which students in each lecture write a short note connecting what they are studying to their personal experiences. They might be asked to describe the essential qualities of a good museum, or say which is more valuable – history in books or history in the movies (p.74). In first year Law the use of Reflective Media Diaries (20%) requires students to "identify and analyse a range of events related to torts reported in the print media" (p91). It involves a regular and deepening analysis throughout the semester and provides sufficient choice for the student to explore their own interests.

The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences already encourage the design of plagiarism “unfriendly” assessment in a set of plagiarism reduction strategies:

8. Design tasks which work against the possibility of plagiarism. For instance stagger due dates to prevent students from being overwhelmed with assignment demands. Request brief annotations with list of references, submission of essay plans and research notes, or ask for transcripts if interviews are part of the assignment. [Step 8; Le Masurier, 2010, p.7]

However, the focus of the Carless suggestion goes beyond the FASS strategies by also asking for the topic and nature of the assessment to be included in the assessment design.

Carroll & Appleton (2001) prepared the ground for the design-based approach in a Plagiarism Good Practice Guide that builds on Carroll's earlier work. Their suggestions include: Removing easy cheating options that appear in the use of the same sorts of questions each year; creating a context in which rewards for engagement are valued over detection and punishment; using assessment that integrates theory or principles with personal experience; create tasks that go beyond the requirement to collect-describe-present information to the inclusion of an analysis or evaluation; design assessment tasks with multiple solutions or that create artifacts to capture individual effort. The adoption of these sorts of suggestions may need to be seen as staff development work involving all academic teaching staff.

**What changes might be made within the scope of this Taskforce**

The AMP Taskforce may see this as a good opportunity to initiate the joint investigation of three aspects related to assessment that are currently topical in the university – 1) this issue of academic misconduct and plagiarism, 2) encouraging a shift to assessment for learning and, 3) the perceived workload for staff and students of some of the current approaches. The investigation might ask: What is currently known about the nature of the assessment tasks used across the university? To what extent are these tasks considered to lead to encouragement of plagiarism, assessment for learning and unreasonable workloads?

At the very least, and more immediately, the Taskforce may wish to consider two policy aspects highlighted in the recent literature. The first is the adequacy of the current University policy. The second is the extent to which policy is being implemented.

Given the evidence emerging from the literature on the need for a holistic approach that includes the importance of assessment design, the current assessment policy of The University of Sydney may be incomplete. The assessment policy, now Part 14 of the Coursework Policy 2014, does not include any specific reference to misconduct or plagiarism. The policy also only indirectly encourages good assessment design, in requiring assessment tasks to foster enquiry-based learning (Principle 1 (3)) and to be authentic (Principle 3 (1)). While the literature is clear in noting that these are elements that help prevent plagiarism, they will not be effective if that purpose of the design is not articulated. Links between assessment design and academic misconduct could be considered for inclusion in the policy.

The Assessment Procedures 2011 include only one mention of misconduct and plagiarism (Section 6 (4)) with a reference to the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy:

(4) Students must be informed of the style of academic referencing required and given opportunities to practice and gain feedback on academic writing and relevant scholarly conventions in the course discipline, in accordance with the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy 2012.
This refers only to the idea of educating students about the issues. In terms of the holistic framework, the Procedures include nothing on the important area of assessment design.

Specific reference to assessment design is provided in the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy in Section 4.2.2 (d) in terms of not encouraging plagiarism rather than in terms of designs that help prevent plagiarism, and the principles described to foster academic honesty in 4.2.3 are vague in only referring to the inclusion of discipline or subject specific examples where appropriate (4.2.3 (b)).

4.2.2 (d) Assessment which encourages demonstrated academic achievement, including academic integrity. Assessment should encourage scholarship, creativity and originality in ways consistent with research enriched learning. It should not encourage or pressure students to plagiarise or to engage in other forms of academic dishonesty.

Amendment of the policies/procedures would provide a stronger basis for action. However, a potentially bigger issue is in the implementation of the policy, as noted in the following examples from the literature and in one case of local practice.

Plagiarism and academic misconduct prevention approaches consistently make reference to the education of students about inappropriate practice and the need to have a consistent and transparent policy approach (see for example Carroll and Appleton (2001); University of Melbourne). Recent research reports into the application of this approach suggest that it is in the interpretation and enactment of the policies that shortcomings occur and that prevention opportunities are lost. Glendinning (2014) in her review of the prevalence of policy in higher education across Europe reports that while many institutions had policies in place not all these policies were enforced or applied consistently (p16). Gullifer and Tyson (2014) in a study in one Australian institution report:

An invitation to complete a survey examining students’ understanding of the institutional policy on academic integrity was sent to all domestic students enrolled at an Australian university. A total of 3405 students completed the survey. The data were examined by year of study, faculty, and whether the students were studying on campus or by distance education. Findings indicate that only half of the participants had read the policy on plagiarism and that confusion regarding what behaviour constitutes plagiarism was evident. The implications of these findings are that a systematic educative approach to academic integrity is warranted. [p. 1202]

The University of Sydney assessment policy Principle 2 (3) requires that procedures exist to ensure that all staff involved in teaching a unit of study share a common understanding of assessment practice. Yet cases have been encountered where students are not given the assignment until a week or two before it is due, thus increasing the risk that students will not have time to do it as well as they would like, and might consequently be under pressure to find shortcuts. This variation in approach is not consistent with the policy, and the consequences, such as time available being a factor in misconduct, was also noted by Youmans (2011):

One of the four students who was caught and punished for plagiarizing did state that he had made a conscious decision to plagiarize. He reported that he had done so because he had waited too long to complete the assignment, and having weighed the odds of being detected by the Turnitin.com system, he felt that plagiarizing was the only way he could finish in time and that it was worth the risk. [Youmans p. 759]

Academic Standards and Policy Committee of the Academic Board has for several years been struggling to achieve any systematic reporting of the form outlined in the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy and as described below:

4.5 Academic Board Reporting
4.5.1 In March each year, faculties will report to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee of the Academic Board on:
   (a) the number of notifications of academic dishonesty and plagiarism received by the faculty during the previous year;
(b) the manner in which the faculty handled any notifications of academic dishonesty or plagiarism; and
(c) steps taken by the faculty to promote compliance with this policy, including maintenance of a register of units of study or groups of units of study in which similarity detecting software has been used.

The effective application of this policy has been hindered by the variability between faculties in reporting and in the level of faculty responsibility accepted for this process.

Finally, and from a different perspective, more could be done on the assessment of students’ skills in relation to academic honesty. For example in report writing, specific outcomes could relate to students' awareness of the issues of plagiarism. As described by Barrie et al. (2012) in AAGLO Summary 7, the use of report writing, including an analysis of both process and outcome is not uncommon in assessing graduate learning outcomes. They provide examples in engineering, veterinary science, business, chemistry and archaeology, though the detail at the level of the assessment rubrics used is not included.
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**Attachment 11 - Cheating in Examinations**

**Multiple Choice Exams**

**Scope**
This review focuses on cheating in examinations that are rich in **Multiple Choice Questions** (MCQs) and is exclusively concerned with transcribing answers from nearby students. At this stage, it does not deal with other example of examination fraud; for example, smuggling in cheat-sheets, pre-meditated inter-student communication during the exam or, the rapidly-rising substitution and impersonation. It also does not deal with the copying of written answers as, in a traditional setting, this is much less common, although the recent ‘innovation’ of conducting examinations in tiered lecture theatres makes this an intriguing new area of investigation for those of us interested in detection.

**Addressing this is simple**
The measures required to stamp out MCQ cheating (and, markedly reduce the risk of other forms of exam cheating) are inexpensive and generally straightforward. They could be implemented immediately. Whilst basing drastic action on a scholarly ‘literature review’ and cost-benefit analysis would be sensible, the simplicity, common sense and immediate return of the solutions should short-circuit such caution. Regardless of whether the Taskforce believes that cheating occurs in exams, our examination processes would be greatly improved by implementing the suggested solutions.

**Grades of cheating**
I agreement with other Unis which have bothered to check, for example, McGill University (Harpp, 2008), cheating in our MCQ exams run at about an average of 5%. However, it is important to define what this means. There are various levels of engagement in the process

**Full on.** About 1% of students copy the entire paper from those around them. These students have made NO attempt to answer the questions themselves. They even copy ‘calibration questions’ which should uniquely identify their own paper! The ramifications of this should not be underestimated – it means that 1 in 100 our students have passed or have even achieved higher grades (!) without doing any study at all.

**Sectional.** Up until recently, the data shows that about 7% of students resort to copying particular sections from those around them. This is a strategic approach; the student may feel that a particular batch of lectures or a specific topic is too difficult and so they study for all the other sections but plan (or simply find it too easy) to plagiarise the tricky part. Recently, the move to hold examinations in tiered rooms (e.g., lecture theatres) has increased the frequency of this type of cheating to 15% for some (but not all) venues.

**Grazing.** This is an opportunistic type of copying in which strings of 3-6 answers are copied from neighbouring students. It is sporadic but clustered and, again, the frequency depends on how one defines and identifies actual copying. The close proximity of students to each other in the exam room and the ease at which humans ‘pattern match’ make this very common. There is some degree of seduction/entrapment in the way the exams are conducted that encourages this activity but, not surprisingly, it is much more likely to happen with the weaker students who lack confidence in their choices when they see that others around them have selected differently.

**So why can’t we do away with MCQs?**
As class sizes increase more and more of these examinations can contain a significant proportion of multiple choice questions (MCQs). As a testing tool, MCQs are efficient for large classes, and if thoughtfully set, can assess student understanding at a deep level (Marrelli, 1995; Athanosou and Lamprianou, 2005) especially when integrated with a partial marking system to reward “near misses” (Denyer & Hancock, 2002).
However, as is claimed above, one of the major drawbacks of MCQ-based examinations is the ease with which ill-prepared students can cheat. The answer sheets are designed to be accurately scanned by computer-based scanners but, as a consequence, this makes the pattern of student responses very easy to spot even from several metres away.

As a consequence, the literature tells us that cheating in all its forms (casual or opportunistic through to organised and pre-meditated) is widespread in MCQ exams (Bellezza and Bellezza 1989; Frary 1993; Sotaridona and Meijer 2001; van der Linden and Sotaridona 2002).

Of course, considerable resources are devoted to ensuring the correct conduct of our examinations. Invigilators patrol the examination hall and strictly enforce issues of silence, timing and movement. However, although students with “wandering eyes” might attract close attention of observant invigilators, proving that any misdemeanour had occurred is very difficult.

Actually challenging the students during the exam would lead to an unpleasant and disruptive confrontation. This, combined with the fact that surreptitious copying can be done so easily and subtly, means that it is exceptionally rare for invigilators to accuse students of looking at another’s answer sheet.

So how do we tell if cheating has occurred?

This can only occur post-exam, with access to each student’s answers and an accurate seating plan. However, with conventional MCQ exams, actually proving that copying has happened is almost impossible. This is because detection involves finding students with identical responses to questions. However, of course, two well-prepared students would be expected to have identical answers, both for correct options and distractors. Therefore, the standard way of identifying cheats is to match wrong answers (see the figure on the right). There are several major problems with this approach: a) if a poor student copies off an very good student, the cheating will, by definition, go undetected, b) most University’s are unwilling to act on this type of statistical evidence and c) either student could claim that the other was guilty. In short, a lose-lose conflict situation is created for all parties.

More objective evidence is obtained by deploying different versions of the exam paper, altering the option order for each question in each version. Four versions are adequate as these can be laid out in such a manner so that no student has a direct line of sight to the same version.

Note that an exceptional benefit of this type scheme is that if a
student copies any of their neighbours’ correct answers then, by definition, they choose the wrong answer on their own sheet. This is important because it means that the cheating student has got fair reward for their misbehaviour without any unpleasant confrontation or investigation. Crucially, however, and in contrast to the post-exam analysis for a regular MCQ exam, if the academic wants to pursue a case, it is now very easy to identify exactly who has cheated of whom. In our own institution, the evidence has stood up to analysis, even when tested at the highest level (OGC). Furthermore, it is possible to conduct the enquiry and administer any disciplinary actions without the student that was copied off even being aware. In this scheme, University is in control; no-one innocent is punished and no-one guilty benefits (Denyer and Hancock, 2006)

Recommendations

**Easy, low-tech and could be implemented right now**

- Do not conduct examinations with substantial MCQ components in sloping lecture theatres.
- Conduct two or more different exams in the same room, arranging students doing the two different exams in alternating columns (the most common form of cheating is diagonally in front!).
- Instigate fully randomised (but well documented) seating. Do not let students know where (or near whom) they will be sitting until they actually get to the exam room. On no account allow close-knit cohorts to sit near each other.

**More advanced solutions which would eliminate cheating completely**

- Deployment of multiple versions of each exam paper (with rotated/scrambled options) as described above. This is actually very simple to administer and just involves having multiple key sheets.
- Subjecting the results of every MCQ examination to plagiarism detection analysis
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## Attachment 12 - Example Academic Integrity Plan for a Science Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Deployment Mode</th>
<th>Likelihood/ Opportunity</th>
<th>Consequence/ Impact</th>
<th>Comments/ Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concept Quiz</td>
<td>Online, unsupervised</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Minor. 2% final. Revision of basic concepts</td>
<td>New questions this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory A</td>
<td>Online, unsupervised</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Minor. 3% final.</td>
<td>Recycled questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical A</td>
<td>Student results at bench</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Minor. 3% final.</td>
<td>Original data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical B</td>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium. 10% final</td>
<td>Content based on original data but could have assistance in preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam A (Theory of Prac)</td>
<td>Invigilated exam</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Very High. 25% final.</td>
<td>Scrambled MCQ answers. No cheating possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory B</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory C</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 13 - FASS TRIM Workflow for Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism

The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences have worked with Records to design a TRIM workflow for the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism policy. This has been in use in the faculty for 18 months and has handled approximately 230 cases without any issues. Staff feedback to date is that the system is easy to use and significantly reduces workload.

To begin, the reporting examiner uses an online form to lodge a case:

The case lodged is then assessed by an administrative staff member (academic honesty assistant) to ensure that all the evidence the academic honesty coordinator (the nominated academic) needs is attached to the file. If not, they will return the case to the examiner for further information. If so, they will check it as complete in the system, which will then send the following email to the nominated academic:

Submission of case to the Academic Honesty Coordinator
Dear Academic Honesty Coordinator,
A new case of alleged academic dishonesty or plagiarism has been lodged for your consideration. You may view the relevant documents for this case as listed in the table below by clicking on the available link. This will require your UniKey login. You must not forward this email to any other email account.
After reading through the available documentation, you need to take one of the following actions:

**Conclude that there is no academic dishonesty or plagiarism present:**

No further action should be taken and the work should be assessed based on its academic merit in accordance with clause 5.5 of the *Policy*.

- **Conclude that there is no academic dishonesty or plagiarism present, however minor referencing errors have been detected**

No further action should be taken against the student and the work should be assessed based on its academic merit in accordance with clause 5.5 of the *Policy*. However, the UoS Coordinator or School representative should provide remedial education to assist the student.

- **Conclude that a meeting with the student is required, as sufficient evidence exists to support an notification of academic dishonesty or plagiarism:**
  - evidence exists to support an notification of academic dishonesty or plagiarism:
    - If this action is taken, you must provide a preliminary view of the type of misconduct, which will be included in the letter to the student. In accordance with clause 5.2.1(a) of the *Policy*, the preliminary view must be in sufficient detail to enable the student to understand the precise nature of the notifications and properly to consider and respond to them.

**Next step**

To proceed, you must select the appropriate action button below. If you select 'meeting required with the student' you must provide your preliminary view of the notification, as required under clause 5.3.4 of the *Policy*, at the top of the return email. Please do not delete any of the information below in the return email as this relates to the TRIM process.

**What happens after I have made my decision?**

If you select one of the first two options, a TRIM email will be generated advising the relevant UoS Coordinator of the outcome. If a meeting with the student is requested, the Academic Integrity Assistant will draft the student letter requesting the meeting and forward it to the student and relevant UoS Coordinator. Once this has occurred, you will receive a TRIM generated email for you to action at the meeting with the student.

Please choose the relevant action for this case.

Thank you,

*Academic Integrity Assistant*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision to meet with student</td>
<td>Decision to meet with student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor referencing errors found</td>
<td>Minor referencing errors found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No academic dishonesty or plagiarism found</td>
<td>No academic dishonesty or plagiarism found</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEMONSTRATION, University Of Sydney 299900001 Student Assessment</td>
<td>DOC2015/1713</td>
<td>Document</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMONSTRATION, University Of Sydney 299900001 UOS Outline</td>
<td>DOC2015/1714</td>
<td>Document</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMONSTRATION, University Of Sydney 299900001 FASS AHP Web Form</td>
<td>DOC2015/1712</td>
<td>Document</td>
<td>HTM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the email received, the nominated academic can select the outcome, which will be recorded in the system and the next steps triggered. These may include sending the reporting examiner an email such as this:

Dear UoS Coordinator,
You recently submitted a case of alleged academic dishonesty or plagiarism. I have reviewed the case and have determined that I need to meet with the student. You are not required to take any further action until I have met with the student and made my final decision.
Below you will find a link to the letter that I have sent to the student for your information. In order to meet privacy requirements, you are not permitted to download or save the letter. You will require your UniKey login to open the document.
The student has approximately 2 weeks to respond to the notification and attend the meeting. Once the meeting has been held, you will receive an email providing instruction on the next step in the process.
Kind Regards,
Academic Honesty Coordinator

The system also emails the student with the invitation to a meeting, with the outcome decision, and sends an email to the coordinator to discover the decision. At all times, these steps are recorded into TRIM. TRIMs reporting capabilities would allow any of the fields listed at the top of the below screenshot to be searched. A workflow could be developed to create reports from this information. Note that this is real information from TRIM so student names have been blanked out, causing the white space in the screenshot.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Workflow Outcome</th>
<th>Workflow:Department</th>
<th>Workflow:School</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMP SLAM 1</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>SLAM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP SLAM 2</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>SLAM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP SLAM 3</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>SLAM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP SLAM 4</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>SLAM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP SLAM 5</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>SLAM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP SLAM 6</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>SLAM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP SLC 31</td>
<td>Dishonest plagiarism</td>
<td>French Studies</td>
<td>SLC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP SLC 32</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>French Studies</td>
<td>SLC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP SLC 33</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>French Studies</td>
<td>SLC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP SLC 44</td>
<td>No academic dishonesty</td>
<td>French Studies</td>
<td>SLC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP SOPHE 1</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHE</td>
<td>SOPHE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP SOPHE 2</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHE</td>
<td>SOPHE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP SOPHE 3</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHE</td>
<td>SOPHE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP SOPHE 4</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHE</td>
<td>SOPHE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP SOPHE 5</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHE</td>
<td>SOPHE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP SOPHE 6</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHE</td>
<td>SOPHE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP SOPHE 7</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHE</td>
<td>SOPHE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP SOPHE 8</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHE</td>
<td>SOPHE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP SOPHE 9</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHE</td>
<td>SOPHE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP SOPHE 10</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHE</td>
<td>SOPHE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Attachment 14 – Working Party’s Terms of Reference

Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce – Working Party
DRAFT Terms of Reference

The Working Party is established to support the Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce. The Taskforce is required to review the effectiveness of the University’s policies and procedures relating to academic misconduct, including plagiarism, on the part of its coursework and research students.

The Working Party will:

• Scope and design each piece of work to be undertaken under the Taskforce’s approved work plan
• Undertake the work, including through gathering information, analysing results, and providing advice and recommendations to the Taskforce
• Report to the Taskforce (via the Chair and Secretariat) on progress against the work plan
• Manage consultations on behalf of the Taskforce
• Support the Taskforce in any other work required under the Taskforce Terms of Reference

The Working Party will meet every two weeks during the tenure of the Taskforce.

Membership of the Working Party is as follows:

Associate Professor Peter McCallum, Chair Academic Board (Chair)
Professor Pip Pattison, Deputy Vice-Chancellor Education
Professor Tyrone Carlin, Registrar (as needed)
Craig Prosser, Director, Audit and Risk Management
Rebecca Halligan, Director Research Integrity and Ethics
Sarah Heesom, Solicitor and consultant (OGC rep)
Pearl Rozenberg, Sub Dean Business School
Kerrie Henderson, University Policy Manager
Dr Sarah Jones, Vice-Chancellor’s Office
Beth Quinlivan, Manager of Strategy, Sydney Medical School
Dr Leah Schwartz - Executive Officer, Higher Education Policy (Secretariat)
Attachment 15 – Taskforce’s Terms of Reference

Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce
DRAFT Terms of Reference

The University proposes to establish a Taskforce to review the effectiveness of its policies and procedures relating to academic misconduct, including plagiarism, on the part of its coursework and research students.

By establishing the Taskforce, the University is concerned to ensure that it has in place policies, procedures and practices that promote and uphold the academic and research integrity of all of its courses and units of study, research and research training activities, and which ensure that allegations of misconduct are managed fairly, efficiently and effectively.

1. In particular, the Taskforce is to review and report to the Senate on:

(a) The coverage and adequacy of programs offered to inform students about the academic standards and the conduct which is expected of them in relation to both the various processes of assessment in which they will participate and the conduct of research which they may undertake whilst students of the University, together with the guidance that is provided to students for the duration of their studies about the development of good practices in maintaining academic and research integrity;

(b) The appropriateness and effectiveness of practices adopted by the Faculties and Schools of the University, which are calculated to preclude or mitigate the foreseeable risks of students engaging in academic misconduct, whether in respect of coursework or research activity including misrepresentation, fabrication, cheating, plagiarism, collusion and misuse of intellectual property, and to prevent recurrences of breaches;

(c) the adequacy of practices adopted by the Faculties and Schools of the University, and the procedures which are made available by the University, to detect academic misconduct and, in particular, to detect plagiarism;

(d) the extent to which electronic plagiarism detection technology is used in the University’s coursework and research programs, and the areas where increased use of such technology may be appropriate or inappropriate;

(e) the sanctions applied by the Faculties and Schools of the University when they detect academic misconduct, including plagiarism, as well as the differing circumstances which attract the application of those sanctions;

(f) where the imposition of a sanction involves a requirement on the part of a coursework or research student to undertake a program of remediation, the appropriateness of the various programs of remediation which students may be required to undertake;

(g) the expectations placed on staff who suspect a student has engaged in academic misconduct, the levels of guidance and support provided to staff about how to manage such matters, and the timeliness and effectiveness of the University’s policies and processes for investigating and acting upon allegations of academic misconduct;

(h) the extent to which there is consistency across the University in respect of the programs referred to in (a), the practices referred to in (b), the practices and procedures referred to in (c), the use of technology referred to in (d) the sanctions referred to in (e), the programs of remediation referred to in (f), and the expectations referred to in (g); and
(i) the efficiency of the procedures established under Chapter 8 of the University of Sydney By-law 1999 (as amended) for the administration of student discipline.

2. The Taskforce will review Chapter 8 of the University of Sydney By-law 1999 (as amended), the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy and the Research Code of Conduct, as well as the Procedures adopted to support the operation of that Policy and that Code and recommend such amendments to Policy, the Code and Procedures, and their implementation, as seem to the Taskforce to be desirable having regard to:

(a) the importance of ensuring that students are adequately informed about the standards of academic and research integrity that are expected of them, whether undertaking coursework or engaged in research, as well as being given appropriate guidance about the development of good practices in maintaining academic and research integrity;

(b) the importance of ensuring that University staff are provided with clear guidance, ongoing training and support in relation to the implementation of relevant policies and procedures;

(c) the need for preventative action to be taken to mitigate foreseeable risks to academic and research integrity including misrepresentation, fabrication, cheating, plagiarism, collusion and misuse of intellectual property, and to prevent recurrences of breaches;

(d) the need for rigour when ensuring observance by students of academic standards and research integrity; and

(e) the requirement for consistency between the Faculties and Schools of the University when promoting appropriate academic standards, reporting and investigating potential breaches, and applying sanctions in instances where breaches are found to have occurred; and

(f) the desirability of the procedures for administering student discipline being both fair and efficient.

3. The Taskforce will also recommend any changes that are, in its opinion, required in the University to ensure it maintains effective oversight of academic and research integrity on the part of students, including monitoring of potential risks, and promoting the adoption of best practice approaches from within the University, nationally and internationally.
SUBMISSION TO THE ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY COMMITTEE
21 July 2015
FOR ENDORSEMENT: THE HAGUE DECLARATION ON KNOWLEDGE DISCOVERY IN THE DIGITAL AGE

Lisa McIntosh, Director, Access Services, University Library
Sten Christensen, Associate Director, Publishing and Data, Access Services
Kate Stanton, Senior Manager, Copyright and Information Policy, Access Services 2015/08

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
The Hague Declaration on Knowledge Discovery in the Digital Age (The Hague Declaration) aims to foster agreement among research, education and knowledge institutions about how best to enable access to facts, information and ideas for knowledge discovery in the Digital Age. The Hague Declaration sets forth the idea that the free flow of information and ideas is an essential human right; aims to remove legal and policy barriers to accessing data and facts; and aims to enable researchers to develop novel ways answer research questions.

Central to the principles of The Hague Declaration is the idea that the right to read equals the right to mine, wherever individuals have lawful access to content. If a user can legitimately access, select, read and copy content for the purposes of research and study, then this “right to read” should extend to that user instructing a program or script to select, read and copy that content for the purposes of research or study.

In Australia, there is no specific exception in the Copyright Act (1968) for text, data or content mining. Where text, data or content mining processes involve the copying, digitisation or reformatting of copyright materials without permission, it may be interpreted as copyright infringement. In other countries, copyright law in particular has been interpreted to restrict the ability to apply computer or machine reading and analysis to otherwise legally available content. The Hague Declaration argues that when intellectual property law allows content to be accessed, read and analysed by humans but not by machines, it has failed its original purpose.

Nothing in the principles of The Hague Declaration endorses or encourages the mining of restricted, private, commercially sensitive or password protected data, or endorses the publication or sharing minded data sets without citation (or permission where appropriate). The authors interpret The Hague Declaration to be consistent with principles of academic integrity and responsible conduct in research.

The authors propose that that the University of Sydney become a signatory to The Hague Declaration. In becoming a signatory, the University:

- Demonstrates leadership in open access and information policy; and
- Reaffirms the key principles of free and responsible pursuit of knowledge and the broadest possible dissemination of information and research within the University’s Charter of Academic Freedom (2008), Open Access to University Research Policy (2015) and Research Data Management Policy (2015).

Recommendation
That the Academic Board endorse the University becoming a signatory to the Hague Declaration on Knowledge Discovery in the Digital Age.

---

4 See the University Policy Register: http://sydney.edu.au/policies/
**Vision**

New technologies are revolutionising the way humans can learn about the world and about themselves. These technologies are not only a means of dealing with Big Data\(^1\), they are also a key to knowledge discovery in the digital age; and their power is predicated on the increasing availability of data itself. Factors such as increasing computing power, the growth of the web, and governmental commitment to open access\(^2\) to publicly-funded research are serving to increase the availability of facts, data and ideas.

However, current legislative frameworks in different legal jurisdictions may not be cast in a way which supports the introduction of new approaches to undertaking research, in particular content mining. Content mining is the process of deriving information from machine-readable material. It works by copying large quantities of material, extracting the data, and recombining it to identify patterns and trends.

At the same time, intellectual property laws from a time well before the advent of the web limit the power of digital content analysis techniques such as text and data mining (for text and data) or content mining (for computer analysis of content in all formats)\(^3\). These factors are also creating inequalities in access to knowledge discovery in the digital age. The legislation in question might be copyright law, law governing patents or database laws – all of which may restrict the ability of the user to perform detailed content analysis.

Researchers should have the freedom to analyse and pursue intellectual curiosity without fear of monitoring or repercussions. These freedoms must not be eroded in the digital environment. Likewise, ethics around the use of data and content mining continue to evolve in response to changing technology.

Computer analysis of content in all formats, that is content mining, enables access to undiscovered public knowledge and provides important insights across every aspect of our economic, social and cultural life. Content mining will also have a profound impact for understanding society and societal movements (for example, predicting political uprisings, analysing demographical changes). Use of such techniques has the potential to revolutionise the way research is performed – both academic and commercial.


\(^3\) Where the term text and data mining / TDM is used in the Declaration, it is used to mean the mining of all forms of data irrespective of whether in text, images, sound recordings or film.
Benefits of Content Mining

The potential benefits of content mining are vast and include:

• Addressing grand challenges such as climate change and global epidemics
• Improving population health, wealth and development
• Creating new jobs and employment
• Exponentially increasing the speed and progress of science through new insights and greater efficiency of research
• Increasing transparency of governments and their actions
• Fostering innovation and collaboration and boosting the impact of open science
• Creating tools for education and research
• Providing new and richer cultural insights
• Speeding economic and social development in all parts of the globe

Researchers, SMEs (Small and Medium Sized Enterprises) and big technological companies have been content mining for at least 10 years, but the potential for extracting significant benefits from this work has been limited due to ongoing legal uncertainties and restrictions. However, in this age of opportunity, it is important that all members of society can benefit equally from advances in the availability of digital technology and content. This requires the creation of new principles around access to facts, data and ideas.

Principles

Therefore we, the undersigned, in recognition of the huge potential economic and societal benefits of knowledge discovery in the digital age, endorse the following principles:

1. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY WAS NOT DESIGNED TO REGULATE THE FREE FLOW OF FACTS, DATA AND IDEAS, BUT HAS AS A KEY OBJECTIVE THE PROMOTION OF RESEARCH ACTIVITY

The free flow of information and ideas is an essential human right. It is a catalyst for the production of human knowledge, which underpins welfare and prosperity. Societies around the world have chosen to protect certain limited rights in intellectual property as incentives both to innovation and the dissemination of knowledge. Intellectual property law was never intended to cover facts, ideas and pure data. The modern application of intellectual property law is increasingly becoming an obstacle to the creation and sharing of knowledge, as it can pose constraints and limitations to free sharing even when simple building blocks such as facts and data are being used.

In some countries, copyright law has in particular been interpreted to restrict the ability to apply computer reading and analysis to otherwise legally-available content. Other legislative frameworks such as patent law and database law may have a similar impact. When intellectual property law allows content to be read and analysed manually by humans but not by their machines, it has failed its original purposes.

5 And in the European Union database laws also in the form of the Database Directive.
2. PEOPLE SHOULD HAVE THE FREEDOM TO ANALYSE AND PURSUE INTELLECTUAL CURIOSITY WITHOUT FEAR OF MONITORING OR REPERCUSSIONS

Providers of content should respect the intellectual privacy of individual readers and should take measures to protect readers’ privacy from interference by any external body. Any exception, which for example would result in an encroachment of individual privacy, will need to be necessary and proportionate and provided for by law. The use of facts, data and ideas must not prejudice the legitimate rights of individuals to privacy and a private life.

3. LICENSES AND CONTRACT TERMS SHOULD NOT RESTRICT INDIVIDUALS FROM USING FACTS, DATA AND IDEAS

Generally, licences and contract terms that regulate and restrict how individuals may analyse and use facts, data and ideas are unacceptable and inhibit innovation and the creation of new knowledge and, therefore, should not be adopted. Similarly, it is unacceptable that technical measures in digital rights management systems should inhibit the lawful right to perform content mining.

4. ETHICS AROUND THE USE OF CONTENT MINING TECHNIQUES WILL NEED TO CONTINUE TO EVOLVE IN RESPONSE TO CHANGING TECHNOLOGY

The observation of well-established ethical norms in research and business, as well as the continued development of such standards and laws, must be supported and encouraged in order to ensure that content mining technologies are deployed for the benefit of society.

5. INNOVATION AND COMMERCIAL RESEARCH BASED ON THE USE OF FACTS, DATA, AND IDEAS SHOULD NOT BE RESTRICTED BY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

As facts, data, and ideas are not copyrightable it does not make sense to restrict ethical commercial use of those facts, data, and ideas extracted from content which has been obtained legally. It is recognised that while patent law is designed to protect innovations and inventions, this is not meant to encompass facts and data. Restrictions on the use of facts, data and ideas can have a serious impact on innovation and on economic development globally. It can also reduce the ability to use tools and processes which can benefit citizens in the areas of health, science, employment, research, the environment and culture.
Roadmap for Action

ACCEPTING THE VISION AND PRINCIPLES

1. The vision embodied in this Declaration is that intellectual property was not designed to regulate the free flow of facts, data and ideas, but has as a key objective the promotion of research activity.
2. Where copyright frameworks do not currently support such a vision, legislators should immediately work to support the introduction of changes which would allow users to undertake content mining on materials to which they have lawful access.
3. Where Exceptions or Limitations are introduced into copyright law to allow content mining, these should be mandatory and may not be overridden by contracts.
4. It is unacceptable that technical measures in digital rights management systems should inhibit the legal right to perform content mining.
5. There should be no need to sign separate licences to undertake content mining activity, since the right to read is the right to mine where those performing mining activities already have lawful access to relevant content.

POLICY AND INCENTIVES

6. Policy makers should aim to provide legal clarity by ensuring that content mining is not an infringement of copyright or related rights. We believe that the right to read includes the right to mine, but only where individuals have lawful access to that content.
7. Where research funders or other bodies require, and where authors wish, research outputs to be made available under specific licences, these should typically be CC-BY for publications and CC0 for research data.
8. Every university, research organisation, research funder and commercial business should ensure that their policies advocate content mining as a research methodology which has the potential to transform the way research is performed. The growth of open access and open data has been, and will continue to be, a key enabler of content mining.
9. Researchers should recognise the right of the authors of publications to be acknowledged as such, and to be respected and acknowledged as data producers, wherever possible.
10. Policies on content mining should respect the legitimate rights of authors and publishers, and be driven by the needs of researchers and businesses in the digital age.
11. To encourage the uptake of content mining activity, universities, research organisations, research funders and businesses should consider introducing incentives to reward those who use these new techniques – for example, content mining activities should be noted and commended in appraisal/evaluation processes.
INFRASTRUCTURE AND TOOLS

12. Research organisations, universities and businesses should ensure that they maintain and develop repository infrastructures to provide storage for, and access to, publications which can legally be made available for content mining. Independent researchers should strive to make use of such facilities where they are available.
13. Research organisations, universities and businesses should provide access to suitable infrastructures to enable research data to be made available, where it is lawful and ethically possible to do so, for content mining. Independent researchers should strive to make use of such facilities where they are available.
14. Developments including technical infrastructures, standards, ethical norms and funding requirements should make research results available as open outputs.
15. Open standards such as XML and JSON for data transport, ORCID for author IDs and CC licenses for open licensing needs should be used wherever possible.
16. If material is made available under a CC BY licence, content creators should make the following available for download: the XML or other high quality file format, high resolution images, supporting data behind the images; the unformatted accepted article from the author.

ADVOCACY

17. Bodies such as universities, research organisations, library associations, the medical community, businesses, and members of the content mining community should advocate the benefits of content mining.
18. Research libraries are well placed to take on this advocacy role as part of their activities in research support.
19. Libraries should provide training for researchers on content mining literacy, including legal advice.

DEVELOPMENT AND MONITORING OF THE HAGUE DECLARATION & ROADMAP

20. LIBER (Association of European Research Libraries) has been instrumental in working with stakeholders to develop the Hague Declaration and Roadmap. LIBER will continue to monitor and oversee progress towards obtaining signatures for the Declaration, and will advocate the implementation of the Roadmap.

Learn more & sign the Declaration
www.thehaguedclaration.com