NOTICE OF MEETING

A meeting of the Academic Board will be held at 2:00 pm on Wednesday, 25 March 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
18 March 2015

AGENDA

1. Apologies
   Apologies have been received from: Ms E Arcioni, Professor A Johnston, Ms E May, Professor C Peck, Ms J Smith, Mr J Tong and Professor D Waters.

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 11 February 2015

   Recommendation
   That the Academic Board adopt the minutes of the previous meeting held on 11 February 2015 as a true record.

4. Business arising from Minutes (not dealt with elsewhere in the Agenda)
   4.1 Amendments to Coursework Policy 2014 (Item 12.2.1, Report of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee)

   Recommendation
   That the Academic Board approve the proposed amendments to the Coursework Policy 2014 with effect from 1 July 2015 as set out in the enclosed report.
5. **Overview of the 2016-2020 Strategic Plan**
(Presentations from the Vice-Chancellor, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research))

6. **Report of the Chair**

6.1 **Report on Senate Matters**

6.1.1 **Report of the Senate meeting held on 23 February 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 23 February 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 – Filling of vacancies**

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board approve the nomination of Dr Megan MacKenzie to membership of the Academic Board as a representative of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences for a period of membership expiring 31 December 2015, as set out in the report presented.

6.3.2 **Academic Board Standing Committees: Nominations for Membership**

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board approve:

1. the nomination of Dr Rob Saunders (as the representative of the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning) and Ms Emily Mas (as the undergraduate student member) on the Academic Standards and Policy Committee;
2. the nomination of Mr Sami Isaac (as the undergraduate student member) on the Academic Standards and Planning Committee;
3. the nomination of Mr Jun Tong (as the student member) on the Graduate Studies Committee; and
4. the nomination of Associate Professor Wendy Davis (as the representative of the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning) on the Undergraduate Studies Committee

for a period of membership expiring 31 December 2015, as set out in the report presented.

6.3.3 **Assessment Procedures 2011: Amendment**

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board approve the amendment of the Assessment Procedures 2011 with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

6.3.4 **Change of Residency: Amendment to Coursework Policy 2014**

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board approve the amendment of Part 10 of the Coursework Policy 2014 with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.
6.3.5 Higher Education Policy updates

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the reports from the Higher Education Policy unit on the Defence Trade Controls Amendment Bill, TEQSA, the Higher Education and Research Reform Bill 2014 and the Research Infrastructure Review, as set out in the report presented.

6.3.6 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 23 February 2015

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal on matters considered by Senate at its meeting of 23 February 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 Dentistry: 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 Dentistry 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 Undergraduate Studies Committee.

10.2 Report of the meeting held on 4 March 2015

10.2.1 Changes to the Coursework Policy 2014

10.2.2 Changes to Admissions Criteria

10.2.3 Proceedings of the Committee

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Admissions Committee meeting held on 4 March 2015, as set out in the report presented.
11 Report of the Graduate Studies Committee
(Appropriate Professor Tony Masters)

11.1 Oral report of the Chair

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

11.2 Report of the meeting held on 11 March 2015

11.2.1 Proposals for new and amended postgraduate courses

11.2.1.1 Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning: Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts (Specialisation)

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts to add a 96 credit point Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts (Specialisation);

(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 Architecture, Design and Planning; 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.

11.2.1.2 Faculty of Science: Master of Philosophy

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to introduce the Master of Philosophy;

(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 Science; and

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

11.2.2 Minor course amendment proposals

11.2.2.1 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: Master of Human Rights and Democratisation (Asia-Pacific)

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Human Rights and Democratisation (Asia-Pacific);

(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.
11.2.2 Faculty of Dentistry: Doctor of Dental Medicine

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board approve the English language requirements for the Doctor of Dental Medicine as an overall IELTS score of 7.0 with a minimum of 6.0 in each band as set out in the report presented.

11.2.3 Guidelines for HDR Scholarship Allocations

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board note that the Committee has endorsed the use of the draft guidelines for HDR scholarship allocations at the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee meetings of 11 December 2014 and 9 April 2015 and that a final version of the guidelines would be submitted to the Academic Board meeting of 13 May 2015.

11.2.4 Proceedings of the Committee

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on 11 March 2015, as set out in the report presented.

12.1 Oral report of the Chair

**Recommendation**
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 4 March 2015

12.2.1 Learning and Teaching Policy Framework

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board note the Committee’s report on its discussion of the Learning and Teaching Policy Framework Working Party.

12.2.2 Professional Placement Policy Working Party

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board note the Committee’s report on its discussion of the Professional Placement Policy Working Party.

12.2.3 2015 Guidelines for managing the Opt-Out process for lecture recordings in University-managed lecture theatres

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board note the Committee’s report on its discussion of the 2015 Guidelines for managing the Opt-Out process for lecture recordings in University-managed lecture theatres.

12.2.4 Proceedings of the Committee

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board note the proceeding of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee meeting held on 4 March 2015, as set out in the report presented.
13. General Business
13.1 Academic Promotions Policy and Procedures 2015

Recommendation
That the Academic Board endorse the Academic Promotions Policy and Procedures 2015, as set out in the report presented.
Minutes of the meeting of the Academic Board
held at 2.00pm on Wednesday 11 February 2014 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, Professor J Hanrahan, Associate Professor T Masters and Associate Professor D Traini); Dr T Balle, Mr K Blakeney, Dr R Bourne, Professor B Buckley, Professor T Carlin, Professor M Carroll, Dr B Church, Ms T Clement, Associate Professor J Conomos, Associate Professor W Davis, Dr J Gao, Professor S Garton, Associate Professor J Gliston, Professor M Graeber, Associate Professor T Grewal, Professor N Gurran, Professor T Hambley, Professor S Houston, Ms A Irish, Mr S Isaac, Professor D Ivison, Dr N Jarkey, Professor A Johnstone, Dr P Knight, Professor P Leong, Ms G Luck, Dr J Ma, Ms D Mair, Professor D Mayer, Associate Professor S McGraith-Champ, Dr M Millington, Dr C Owens, Professor P Pattison, Professor C Peck, Professor K Refshauge, Professor C Rhodes, Professor J Riley, Mr T Scriven, Ms J Smith, Associate Professor C Sutton-Brady, Professor G Tolhurst, Mr J Tong, Professor D Waters, Associate Professor G White, Associate Professor T Wilkinson and Dr Y Zhang.

Present as observers: Mr M Charet (University Secretariat), Mr D Pacey (Secretary to Senate), Ms L Rose (Office of the Provost, Ms S Watts (Vice-Principal, Operations).

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

The Chair gave the following acknowledgement at the start of the meeting:

It is my pleasure to welcome you here today. In doing so I wish to acknowledge that the campuses of the University of Sydney are located on the traditional lands of a number of Australia’s First Peoples. It is with deep respect for our indigenous past that I acknowledge the Cadigal, Gundungurra and Duruk peoples and their custodianship of these lands.

1. Apologies
Apologies have been received from: Associate Professor T Ancev, Ms E Arcioni, Associate Professor S Barrie, Dr R Bathgate, Dr T Bell, Dr J Bloomfield, Mr K Brown, Dr S Colmar, Ms S Fahd, Associate Professor T Gerzina, Dr J Gullick, Professor M Hindson, Professor Y-H Jeon, Dr K Kramer, Associate Professor S van der Laan, Dr D Larkin, Professor D Lowe, Dr S Matthew, Ms E May, Professor E Mpofu, Associate Professor L Nicholson, Ms D Ong, Associate Professor N Peres da Costa, Professor I Ramzan, Professor J Redmond, Professor B Robinson, Dr K Rooney, Dr J Saleeba, Associate Professor P Seltisikas, Professor J Shields, Professor J Trehella, Professor C Wade, Associate Professor R Walker, Professor G Whitwell, Dr R Wilson and Professor P Young.

2. Arrangement of agenda
2.1 Starring of items
The following items were starred: 9.2.1, 12.2.1
2.2 Adoption of unstarred items

Resolution AB_1_1/15
That the Academic Board resolved as recommended with respect to all unstarred items.

3. Minutes of previous meeting

Resolution AB_1_2/15
That the Academic Board adopted the minutes of the previous meeting held on 3 December 2014 as a true record.

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

5. Presentations

5.1 Focus Topic: Women’s Career and Leadership Strategy
The Chair welcomed Ms Watts to make a presentation on the new women’s career and leadership strategy. Ms Watts gave a brief background on her position at the University and advised that the women’s career and leadership strategy would be the first step in a broader diversity strategy to be presented to Senate in June. She sought members’ feedback on whether the strategy would be a good fit for the University.

Ms Watts gave members a general overview of the presentation already made to SEG and Senate on the strategy, and highlighted the following points:
- Organisations with diverse workforces achieve better returns;
- The University has self-reviewed and identified itself on the diversity cultural continuum as “moving beyond compliance” (stage 2);
- Selection and recruitment committees are currently required to include a female member, but more can be done about ensuring diversity at the short-listing stage;
- Training and development programs for female leaders are already in place, as are flexible working arrangements;
- Women are under-represented at senior levels in both academic and administrative positions.

The University has a strong foundation to work from, including the existing level of diversity, commitment from key stakeholders and a range of opportunities for change and improvement. Working against this are existing inconsistent understandings of the benefits of diversity, a range of cultural and structural barriers, variations in the inclusiveness of leadership behaviours, and variations in the application of flexible working arrangements.

The next step will be the development of eight strategic pillars: educating University leaders, strengthening leadership and accountability, engaging with staff, implementing more flexible career pathways, implementing a plan to address the pay equity gap, integrating best practice in diversity and inclusion into HR systems and processes, delivering more consistent flexible working conditions for all staff, and leveraging the diversity of thought across the University.

The Chair noted that the ARC has expressed concerns that female researchers are under-represented both as applicants and as grant recipients, and he suggested introducing a target of achieving 50% female participation in the grant application process by a specific year. Professor Graeber added that the University could also lobby to change the criteria for grants, pointing out the research impact score can be biased against female researchers. Members noted that gender bias can be identified in a range of situations, including assessment of CVs and marking.

Professor Refshauge expressed her support for the strategy and asked if it could be highlighted on the University’s website. Associate Professor McGrath-Champ agreed, adding it was important for the University to publicly demonstrate its commitment to this strategy. Mr Blakeney asked how regularly the University will review its progress against the agreed strategy, and Ms Watts advised that, pending finalisation of the strategy, there would be six monthly reports on progress.
The Chair thanked Ms Watts for her presentation.

Resolution AB_1_3/15
That the Academic Board note the presentation from the Vice-Principal (Operations) on the Women’s Career and Leadership Strategy.

6. Report of the Chair
6.1 Report on Senate Matters
6.1.1 Report of the Senate meeting held on 1 December 2014
The Academic Board noted this report. The Chair also advised that Mr Alec Brennan has been elected as Deputy Chancellor.

Resolution AB_1_4/15
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 December 2014.

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_1_5/15
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.

Before proceeding to the general report, the Chair noted that this would be Professor Marie Carroll’s last meeting prior to her retirement. He thanked her for her collaborations with the Academic Board over the past few years, her collegiality and her advice and assistance.

6.3 General Report
6.3.1 Academic Board Standing Committees: Nominations for Membership
Members approved the various nominations for membership of the Academic Board’s standing committees as set out in the recommendation.

Resolution AB_1_6/15
That the Academic Board approve:
(1) the nomination of Associate Professor Wendy Davis (as the representative of the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning) and Dr Peter Gibbens (as the representative of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies) on the Academic Standards and Policy Committee;
(2) the nomination of Associate Professor Paul Jones (as the representative of the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning), Associate Professor David Hamer (as the representative of the Faculty of Law), Dr Janice Gullick (as the representative of the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery) and Mr Justin Trendall (as the representative of the Sydney College of the Arts) on the Graduate Studies Committee;
(3) the nomination of Associate Professor Rae Cooper (as the representative of the Dean of the University of Sydney Business School), Associate Professor Tim Wilkinson (as the representative of the Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies) and Ms Jasmine Chambers (as the representative of the Dean of the Faculty of Science) on the Admissions Committee;

for a period of membership expiring 31 December 2015, as set out in the report presented.

Action: Executive Officer to update the membership lists.
6.3.2 Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy and Procedures: Rescission of related policy
The Chair reminded members that the Academic Board had approved the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy and Procedures in late 2014. The Graduate Studies Office has advised that one of the policies replaced by these new documents has not formally been rescinded. Members approved the rescission of the Higher Degrees Theses Policy as recommended.

Resolution AB_1_7/15
That the Academic Board approve the rescission of the Higher Degrees Theses Policy with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

Action: Executive Officer to rescind the Higher Degrees Theses Policy in the Policy Register.

6.3.3 Authority of the Chair of the Academic Board
Members noted the report, and that no actions were taken during this period.

Resolution AB_1_8/15
That the Academic Board note the report on actions taken by the Chair on its behalf in respect of any urgent matters that arose between the Academic Board meeting on 3 December 2014 and the first Academic Board meeting in 2015, as set out in the report presented.

6.3.4 Coursework Policy 2014: Creation of Standards website
The Chair advised members that a number of the policies replaced by the new Coursework Policy 2014 contained schedules which do not meet the University’s definition of “policy”. After discussion with the Office of General Counsel it was agreed that these would be housed on the Academic Board’s website in a new “Standards and Guidelines” section. Members noted the report.

Resolution AB_1_9/15
That the Academic Board note the creation of a section on the Academic Board website relating to admissions standards.

6.3.5 2015 Overview of Academic Board activities
The Chair drew members’ attention to the detailed report on this item, noting that there are some major initiatives across the University which will involve the Academic Board. Professor Rhodes particularly noted the proposed revisions to special consideration processes as part of the Student Administrative Services Review and asked that the review ensure the University’s Disability Plan is incorporated into the revised processes. The Chair agreed and reminded members that any student registered with Disability Services has the right to apply for special consideration.

The Chair also advised that he has spoken with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) about aligning the Academic Board’s development of the proposed “teaching and learning” policy with the strategic work being undertaken by her portfolio. He is also working with Professor Pattison on the development of a new policy on clinical and professional placements. Other issues to be addressed in 2015 included the review of the Academic Governance Rule, assessing the University’s compliance with the Higher Education standards, the University’s new strategic plan and elections for members and a new Chair of the Academic Board. Members noted the report.

Resolution AB_1_10/15
That the Academic Board note the Chair’s report on the 2015 overview of Academic Board activities.
### 6.3.6 Education Policy Updates
The Chair advised members that the update on education policies, and the related update on research policies (under item 6.3.8) were prepared by Dr Leah Schwartz in the Higher Education Policy unit and were included for the information of members. Members noted the report.

**Resolution AB_1_11/15**
That the Academic Board note the report on education policy updates.

### 6.3.7 Correspondence Register
Members noted the report.

**Resolution AB_1_12/15**
That the Academic Board note the register of correspondence, as set out in the report presented.

### 6.3.8 Research Policy Updates
Members noted the report.

**Resolution AB_1_13/15**
That the Academic Board note the report on research policy updates.

Associate Professor Masters noted the list of honours and distinctions, particularly those for the 2015 Australia Day Honours, and suggested the University could do more to promote equity and diversity via nominations for such awards. The Vice-Chancellor advised that the University does not currently prepare nominations but could be more proactive in putting names forward, and that this could be discussed with Senate.

### 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 December 2014
The Academic Board noted this report.

**Resolution AB_1_14/15**
That the Academic Board note the report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal on matters considered by Senate at its meeting of 1 December 2014.

#### 7.2 General report
The Vice-Chancellor spoke with members regarding the new University strategic plan for 2016-2020. He noted that the current strategic plan has given the University a solid foundation which will be further developed through the next plan. Achievements produced by the current plan include financial sustainability, investment in campus development, improvements in the University’s ERA standings, better reporting and information sources, University-wide projects such as the Wingara Mura Strategy, the CPC, China Studies Centre and SSEAC and significant growth in fund-raising. He noted the following three core questions to be addressed by the new strategic plan:

- **Education** – the University’s current suite of qualifications is neither coherent nor academically justifiable, and the University needs to determine its educational values, particularly for undergraduate degrees; statements on educational outcomes need to be developed, and there are questions regarding the first year experience, and the use of capstone experiences that need addressing;

- **Research** – the Research portfolio has significantly improved the University’s ability to measure research performance and identify areas of research excellence; the University’s aim should be to invest across the disciplines, while targeting areas of excellence and continuing to build its capacity in identified areas of multidisciplinary research; institutional strategies such as internationalisation and industry and community engagement need to be refined to ensure they are effective across the University’s education and research areas, and to improve and better co-ordinate the institution’s communications with external bodies (particularly industry and community partners); and
• Institutional life and culture – the University should be a place where staff and students are confident that what they do well will be recognised and affirmed.

The current plan was developed over a period of 18 months but involved a great deal of work to pin down which areas of the University’s performance would be addressed. This plan should not take as long, and the aim is for the final document to be presented to the December 2015 meeting of Senate for launch in March 2016. Consultations will be more focussed, but he stressed the importance of the Academic Board’s involvement in developing the document.

Resolution AB_1_15/15
That the Academic Board note the report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal.

Professor Refshauge advised that the Faculty of Health Sciences has already commenced work on its faculty strategic plan, but added that this would be aligned with the University plan as much as possible. She also cautioned against too much separation of education and research, and recommended a more holistic approach. The Vice-Chancellor agreed, adding that dealing with education and research in sections had more to do with being able to manage the related workload rather than keeping the areas separate, and he reassured her that these conversations would work in parallel, with issues raised in one area being considered for possible impact on the other.

Professor Johnston noted that the previous process for developing a strategic plan had been quite involved and it took some time for people to understand the shape of the eventual plan. He asked if the process would be more focussed this time, and would the Academic Board’s role in the development of the plan be different as a result. The Vice-Chancellor reiterated that the process for this strategic plan would be focussed from the start on a set of specific questions, but that the Board would still have an important role to play. Some issues may need more detailed conversations across the University community.

Professor Woods asked if there would be an overview or a report on progress against the current strategic plan before work commenced on the new plan. The Vice-Chancellor advised that there would be an acknowledgement of the work achieved under the current plan.

The Vice-Chancellor also mentioned the new sustainable investment strategy. He explained that it is not a simple divestment strategy but involves a measurable reduction in the overall carbon footprint of the University’s endowment of 20% over the next three years. Professor Johnston stressed the need to be mindful that many of the University’s graduates go on to work for fossil fuel companies and the University has existing relationships and research partnerships with such companies. The Vice-Chancellor agreed that the University’s position needs to be carefully communicated, and that the University wants to work with companies committed to making a difference and addressing climate change concerns. He added that he had spent time discussing the University’s strategy at yesterday’s meeting of the Student Consultative Committee. Mr Blakeney agreed the issue was complicated but urged the University to continually monitor its investments. He also thanked the University’s Environment Collective for their research into these issues.

8. Question time
Associate Professor White noted that staff have recently received emails advising that the process for recording lectures has moved from being opt-in to opt-out. He noted that the decision to change the process appears to have been made by SEG, but not discussed by the Academic Board and he suggested it would have been useful for the Academic Board to have had some input. The Chair apologised for not having identified this as an issue that should have been raised with the Board. Professor White noted that the change appears to be a fait accompli, but he sought further information on who approves requests to opt-out and what criteria are used in making such decisions. He added that he felt the change has reduced the level of control he has over his lectures.

Professor Pattison also expressed concern that the need to refer this to the Academic Board hadn’t been properly identified, and the Vice-Chancellor added that his recall was
that SEG had asked for the matter to go to the Academic Board. Professor Pattison advised that requests to opt-out of lecture recording will be approved by deans or heads of schools/departments, and she suggested the revised process be reviewed at the end of Semester 1. She offered to report to the Board on the pilot and to further discuss the process at that time.

Associate Professor Sutton-Brady pointed out that lecture recording is mandatory in the Business School which creates issues with the use of copyrighted material, and with guest lecturers who object to being recorded. She had observed a drop in student attendance at lectures since the introduction of mandatory lecture recording, but tracking data from the Learning Management System indicates that many students who don’t come to lectures are not accessing the online recordings. Mr Scriven asked if lecture recordings could be the subject of a future focus topic, adding that SUPRA frequently receives student complaints that lecture recordings are unavailable. He also acknowledged that some academics did not want lectures recorded for pedagogical reasons, and he suggested it would be good to discuss these issues further. The Chair suggested waiting for Professor Pattison’s review and then identifying issues for discussion, adding that at the moment there were no university-wide policies controlling the issue identified by Associate Professor Sutton-Brady, but that this matter should be considered in the forthcoming review of teaching and learning policies.

Resolution AB_1_16/15
That the Academic Board note the responses to the questions raised.

9. Report of the Admissions Committee

9.1 Oral report of the Chair
Professor Hanrahan advised that she had not attended this meeting, and noted that the Chair had starred item 9.2.1

9.2 Report of the meeting held on 4 February 2015

9.2.1 Diploma of Tertiary Preparation

The Chair advised members that this item outlined a range of issues identified by the Admissions Committee with the recently introduced Diploma of Tertiary Preparation (DTP), and that some committee members are concerned that the Diploma is not being delivered in the manner described in the original proposal. He has discussed these issues with Professor Brewer (Dean, Continuing and Professional Education) and will continue to work with her to resolve these issues.

The issues with the DTP intersect with the broader issue of the use of AQF Level 5 diplomas for admission purposes, and in particular the translation of diploma results (usually a GPA) into an ATAR equivalent by UAC. A relatively small number of students are admitted annually on this basis, but their comparatively poor academic progression has been noted for a number of years. As of 2016 it is proposed that all admission applications on the basis of diploma results will be assessed manually and work is also being done to identify those diplomas that will be preferred for admission purposes.

The Admissions Committee recommends that students completing the DTP who are not mature age students should have attempted the HSC. He indicated that he would work through the details of this recommendation to bring a specific proposal to the Board’s next meeting, but he sought the Board’s support for him to advise the Centre for Continuing Education that this policy change is being proposed so that students commencing a Diploma of Tertiary Preparation in 2015 should be aware that such a qualification could not be used for entry to the University of Sydney in 2016 without an ATAR.

Professor Rhodes asked that any amendment be crafted to ensure that access to admission on equity grounds is not unduly affected, and also suggested that the delivery of the DTP at the Scot’s College be better aligned with what the University wants for admission purposes through a board of studies or advisory committee. The Chair agreed pointing out
that the University of Sydney Foundation Program currently has a Board of Studies with faculty representatives and also that the Diploma of Tertiary Preparation is offered at Scot's but not by the college – it is offered by the University’s Centre for Continuing Education.

The Vice-Chancellor asked what was known about the educational outcomes provided by the DTP. The Chair advised that the first group of students in the pilot program have only recently graduated so little is known as yet beyond what was stated in the original proposal. He pointed out that the DTP was not presented to the Academic Board as an alternative to the HSC. The Vice-Chancellor queried the basis on which some diplomates would be admitted without attempting the HSC, while others would have to attempt the HSC. Professor Carlin suggested the main issue is whether the DTP is intended to be additional preparation (either additional to a previous HSC attempt or life/work experience) or a replacement for the HSC.

The Chair advised that the original proposal had referred to students taking specific units of study at the University for which they could then receive credit. However the pilot group has not taken any units at the University, but is still applying for credit. Professor Hanrahan pointed out that the DTP is a Level 5 AQF diploma and graduates can currently apply and be assessed via UAC. Mr Blakeney urged letting prospective DTP students know now of any proposed change to admission requirements. Mr Scriven expressed interest in developing an alternative to the HSC, and Professor Masters pointed out that the University’s Foundation Program (offered through Taylor’s College) is effectively just that, but pointed out it has a rigorous governance model with external review. The Chair advised members that he would write to the CCE.

**Resolution AB_1_17/15**
That the Academic Board note the discussion regarding the Diploma of Tertiary Preparation and the possible amendment of Section 12 of the Coursework Policy 2014, as outlined in the report presented.

**Action:** Chair, Academic Board to advise the Centre for Continuing Education that the Academic Board will consider amendments to the Coursework Policy 2014 with respect to the Diploma of Tertiary Preparation.

**9.2.2 2016 Dux entry proposal**

**Resolution AB_1_18/15**
That the Academic Board approve in principle the trial in 2016 of a guaranteed merit-based offer scheme to the University of Sydney for school duxes, as outlined in the report presented, subject to confirmation that no changes to policy are required.

**Action:** Director, Admissions to note the Academic Board’s approval in principle of a trial in 2016 of a guaranteed merit-based offer scheme for school duxes.

**9.2.3 Proceedings of the Committee**

**Resolution AB_1_19/15**
That the Academic Board note the proceeding of the Admissions Committee meeting held on 4 February 2014, as set out in the report presented.

**10. Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee**

**10.1 Oral report of the Chair**
Associate Professor Cattle noted that the Committee is recommending the Board approve the two combined degrees and one honours degree. There was a discussion about the optimal length of combined degrees, and he suggested this issue should added to the general strategic discussions occurring across the University. The Vice-Chancellor agreed, adding that one of the issues arising from
discussion of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)'s paper “Towards a distinctive Sydney education” is some unease regarding the University’s combined degrees, particularly their length, aim and the potential for students in such courses to lose the benefits of the “cohort effect”.

Resolution AB_1_20/15
That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Undergraduate Studies Committee.

10.2 Report of the meeting held on 28 January 2015

10.2.1 Proposals for new and amended undergraduate courses

10.2.1.1 Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies and Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: Bachelor of Project Management/Bachelor of Arts

Resolution AB_1_21/15
That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies and the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to introduce a new award course, the Bachelor of Project Management/Bachelor of Arts;

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

(3) approve the introduction of Course Resolutions arising from this proposal; and

(4) clarify the decision making framework to be applied when determining whether a combined degree should be four or five years in duration 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 Engineering and Information Technologies and the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to introduce a new award course, the Bachelor of Project Management/Bachelor of Arts and approve the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies and the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

The Deans and Faculty Managers of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies and the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to introduce a new award course, the Bachelor of Project Management/Bachelor of Arts and amend the resolutions in CMS.

The issue of the framework for combined degrees be referred to the working party reviewing learning and teaching policies.

10.2.1.2 Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies and Sydney Conservatorium of Music: Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Music Studies

Resolution AB_1_22/15
That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies and the Sydney Conservatorium of Music to introduce a new award course, the Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Music Studies;
(2) recommend that Senate endorse the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal and approve the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies and the Sydney Conservatorium of Music; and

(3) approve the amendment of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours combined 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 Engineering and Information Technologies and the Sydney Conservatorium of Music to introduce a new award course, the Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Music Studies and approve the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies and the Sydney Conservatorium of Music.

The Deans and Faculty Managers of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies and the Sydney Conservatorium of Music to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to introduce a new award course, the Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Music Studies and amend the resolutions in CMS.

### 10.2.1.3 Faculty of Health Sciences: Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise Physiology) (Honours)

**Resolution AB_1_23/15**

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to introduce the Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise Physiology) (Honours);

(2) recommend that Senate endorse the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal and approve the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificate in the Faculty of Health Sciences; 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 Health Sciences to introduce the Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise Physiology) (Honours) and approve the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificate in the Faculty of Health Sciences.

The Dean and Faculty Manager of the Faculty of Health Sciences to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to introduce the Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise Physiology) (Honours) and amend the resolutions in CMS.

### 10.2.2 Proceedings of the Committee

**Resolution AB_1_24/15**

That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Undergraduate Studies Committee meeting held on 28 January 2015, as set out in the report presented.

25 March 2015
11. Report of the Graduate Studies Committee

11.1 Oral report of the Chair
Professor Masters advised that he had nothing further to report.

11.2 Report of the meeting held on 28 January 2015

11.2.1 Proceedings of the Committee

Resolution AB_1_25/15
That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on 6 August 2014.

12. Report of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee

12.1 Oral report of the Chair
Associate Professor Traini advised she had nothing further to add to the report, but noted that item 12.2.1 had been starred.

12.2 Report of the meeting held on 4 February 2015

12.2.1 Amendments to Coursework Policy 2014

The Chair noted that this item had been starred by Associate Professor Wilkinson. Professor Wilkinson advised that he has concerns that the amended wording of clause 78(3) will not achieve the clarification necessary. He suggested amending “twice” in clause 78(3)(a) to “two or more times” and “three times” in clause 78(3)(b) to “three or more times”. He also suggested referring to “either the latter of commencement of the course or the most recent period of satisfactory progress” to make it clear from which any such count would start. He suggested that the proposed wording in the supplementary agenda implied that one instance of reversion to good academic progress would prevent any request to show cause for the rest of a student’s course, and this was not what was intended. The Chair suggested this issue be further discussed with the Office of General Counsel and brought back to the March meeting.

[Secretary’s note: Following the meeting the Office of General Counsel requested that the addition of a new clause 92A be circulated urgently to allow the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) to act on a request to award a degree posthumously. Members were asked to vote on the inclusion of the clause by return email and by close of business on Monday, 16th February 2015 sufficient votes in the affirmative were received to declare the amendment approved. No votes against were received on the matter.]

Resolution AB_1_26/15
That the Academic Board approve the inclusion of clause 92A in the Coursework Policy 2014 with immediate effect.

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

12.2.2 University of Sydney (Academic Governance) Rule 2003 (as amended)

Resolution AB_1_27/15
That the Academic Board note the Committee’s report on its discussion of proposed amendments to the University of Sydney (Academic Governance) Rule 2003 (as amended).

12.2.3 Proceedings of the Committee

Resolution AB_1_28/15
That the Academic Board note the proceeding of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee meeting held on 4 February 2015, as set out in the report presented.
13. General Business

13.1 Report on promotion of academic staff to Level E

Resolution AB_1_28/15
That the Academic Board note the report on the promotion of academic staff to Level E in 2014, as set out in the report presented.

13.2 2015 Student Proctorial Panel Membership

Resolution AB_1_29/15
That the Academic Board approve the 2015 Student Proctorial Panel membership, as set out in the report presented.

The meeting finished at 4:09 pm

Signed as a correct record

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

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

6.1.1 Report on the Senate meeting held on 23 February 2015

At its meeting on 23 February 2015, Senate resolved as follows:

(1) **Constitution of the Faculty of Health Sciences**

Senate approved the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate related to the Constitution of the Faculty of Health Sciences with immediate effect.

(2) **Courses**

Endorsed the Academic Board’s approval of proposals from the:

- Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences with effect from 1 January 2016;
- Faculty of Education and Social Work with effect from 1 January 2016;
- Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies with effect from 1 January 2016;
- Faculty of Health Sciences with effect from 1 January 2016;
- Faculty of Law with effect from 1 January 2015;
- Sydney Conservatorium of Music 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 2015 and with effect from 1 January 2016.

(3) **Minor Course Amendments**

Endorsed the Academic Board’s approval of a range of minor amendments to existing courses, with effect from 1 January 2015.

(4) **Other matters**

Senate noted the Chair’s report.

**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 23 February 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:

**Ms Yee Lian CHEW**, Faculty of Science
Awarded the DeLill Nasser Award for Professional Development in Genetics from The Genetics Society of America

**Associate Professor Stuart CORDELL**, Faculty of Science
Named Vice President of the Australian Proteomics Society

**Ms Kathleen HEATH**, Faculty of Law
Named as a 2015 Fulbright Postgraduate Scholar

**Mr Ed JOHNSON**, Faculty of Health Sciences
Elected to the board of the Future Health Leaders Council

**Professor Nalini JOSHI**, Faculty of Science
Awarded the Hardy Fellowship by the London Mathematical Society

**Professor Cameron KEPERT**, Faculty of Science
Awarded the Burrows Award by the Inorganic Division of the Royal Australian Chemical Institute

**Professor Richard PAYNE**, Faculty of Science
Awarded the 2015 Leo Dintenfass Memorial Award for Excellence in Research by The Rebecca L. Cooper Medical Research Foundation; and the 2014 Edgeworth David Medal by the Royal Society of NSW
Professor Penny RUSSELL, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Jointly appointed (with Professor John Gascoigne from the University of New South Wales) to the prestigious Gough Whitlam and Malcolm Fraser Chair in Australian Studies at Harvard University for the 2016-2017 academic year

Professor Jill WHITE, Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery
Named as a 2015 Fulbright Senior Scholar

Sydney Law School Moot Team, Faculty of Law
The team are national champions for 2015, and members also won best equal oralist in the High Court final (Sarah Bradbury), three places in the top ten oralsists for the competition (Alice Zhou, 2nd; Sarah Bradbury, 5th; Angus Nicholas, 6th) and awards for best written submissions. The team will now progress to the international finals of the Jessup International Law Moot Court competition.

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 – Filling of vacancies
Professor Will Christie has advised that he will be stepping down from the Academic Board effective from the end of this month. The Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences has nominated Dr Megan MacKenzie to fill the resulting vacancy.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the nomination of Dr Megan MacKenzie to membership of the Academic Board as a representative of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences for a period of membership expiring 31 December 2015, as set out in the report presented.

6.3.2 Academic Board Standing Committees: Nominations for Membership
Nominations to fill vacancies in membership on the Academic Board’s standing committees have been received as follows:

Academic Standards and Policy Committee
Dr Rob Saunders Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning
Ms Emily May Undergraduate student member

Admissions Committee
Mr Sami Isaac Undergraduate student member

Graduate Studies Committee
Mr Jun Tong Student member

Undergraduate Studies Committee
Associate Professor Wendy Davis Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning

All of the above nominations are to be appointed for a period of membership ending 31 December 2015. Faculties will be encouraged to fill the remaining vacancies on Academic Board and the committees.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve:
(1) the nomination of Dr Rob Saunders (as the representative of the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning) and Ms Emily Mas (as the undergraduate student member) on the Academic Standards and Policy Committee;
(2) the nomination of Mr Sami Isaac (as the undergraduate student member) on the Academic Standards and Planning Committee;
(3) the nomination of Mr Jun Tong (as the student member) on the Graduate Studies Committee; and
(4) the nomination of Associate Professor Wendy Davis (as the representative of the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning) on the Undergraduate Studies Committee for a period of membership expiring 31 December 2015, as set out in the report presented.

6.3.3 Assessment Procedures 2011: Amendment
Following the Academic Board’s meeting of 11 February 2015, members approved an amendment to the Coursework Policy 2014 as follows:

92A Aegrotat and posthumous awards
The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) may, on the recommendation of the relevant Dean, authorise the conferral of an aegrotat or posthumous award in circumstances involving serious illness or the death of a student.

Explanation: this amendment is proposed to align the new Coursework Policy with the University of Sydney (Higher Degrees by Research) Rule 2011 which includes a similar statement regarding aegrotat and posthumous awards.

This alteration to the policy means that a related clause in the Assessment Procedures 2011 will need to be updated as follows:

14 Special consideration due to serious illness, injury or misadventure - Principle 3
(16) Aegrotat and posthumous awards may be made in circumstances involving serious illness or death. In such circumstances the relevant Dean must authorise the Registrar to certify that the conditions for the award of the degree or diploma have been met. 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.

Members are asked to approve the amendment of the Assessment Procedures 2011.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the amendment of the Assessment Procedures 2011 with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

6.3.4 Change of Residency: Amendment to Coursework Policy 2014
Student Centre, the Admissions Unit and the Office of General Counsel have identified an issue with Part 10 of the Coursework Policy 2014 on Change of Residency and the Higher Education Services Act (HESA). This advice is based on HESA and associated documentation such as the AIP (Administrative Information for Providers) and advice to students via the Government’s Study Assist website. It is recommended that Part 10 of the Coursework Policy 2014 be amended to align the nomenclature with that used in HESA and its associated documents, clarify the use of the census date in determining whether or not an international student’s status will change, and clarify the situations in which the University can transfer an international student to a domestic fee-paying or Commonwealth-supported place, as follows:

Part 10 Change of residency
39 International undergraduate applicants and students changing from international to domestic status granted permanent residency
(1) If an international undergraduate applicant is granted permanent residency changes from international to domestic status prior to enrolling in his or her course and:
(a) his or her ATAR or equivalent is equal to or higher than the ATAR required for domestic applicants to be admitted to the same course; and
(b) there are places available in the course; the applicant will be transferred to a Commonwealth supported place.
(2) If an international undergraduate applicant changes from international to domestic status is granted permanent residency prior to enrolling in his or her
course and either or both of the requirements in paragraphs 39(1)(a) and (b) are not met, the applicant’s offer of admission will be cancelled and withdrawn.

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

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

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

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

(7) If an international postgraduate applicant changes from international to domestic status prior to enrolling in his or her course, the applicant will be transferred to a domestic fee-paying place.

(8) If an international postgraduate student changes from international to domestic status before the census date for his or her course, the student will be transferred to a domestic fee-paying place.

(9) If an international postgraduate student changes from international to domestic status after the census date for his or her course, the student will continue as an international fee paying student for that semester and transfer to a domestic fee-paying place in the subsequent semester.

(3) Subject to subclause (4), if an international student is granted permanent residency after enrolling in his or her course, the student will continue as an international fee paying student for that semester and transfer to a domestic fee-paying place in the subsequent semester.

(4) Students enrolled in the Doctor of Medicine will not be transferred to a domestic fee-paying place in accordance with subclause (3).

(5) International students who are transferred to a domestic fee-paying place in accordance with subclause (3) are permitted to compete for any available Commonwealth supported places in subsequent semesters.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the amendment of Part 10 of the Coursework Policy 2014 with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

6.3.5 Higher Education Policy updates

The Higher Education Policy unit has provided the attached updates on:

• the Defence Trade Controls Amendment Bill (pages B6-B21),
• TEQSA (pages B22-B59),
• the Higher Education and Research Reform Bill 2014 (pages B60-B65), and
• the Research Infrastructure Review (pages B66-B75)

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the reports from the Higher Education Policy unit on the Defence Trade Controls Amendment Bill, TEQSA, the Higher Education and Research Reform Bill 2014 and the Research Infrastructure Review, as set out in the report presented.
6.3.6 Correspondence Register

Members are asked to note the following items of correspondence:

- 30/1/15 Correspondence with Ms Agus and Ms Cheng regarding the Coursework Policy 2014
- 11/2/15 Correspondence with Associate Professor White regarding opt-out procedures for lecture recordings
- 17/2/15 Correspondence with Professor Mathas regarding opt-out procedures for lecture recordings
- 19/2/15 Correspondence with the Dean of Professional and Continuing Education regarding the Diploma of Tertiary Preparation
- 25/2/15 Correspondence with student regarding policy on credit
- 9/3/15 Correspondence with Professor Lowe regarding proposed advanced student admissions in Engineering

Recommendation

*That the Academic Board note the register of correspondence, as set out in the report presented.*
6.3.4 Higher Education Policy updates

Defence Trade Controls Amendment Bill

The Higher Education Policy unit has provided the following update in addition to the reports attached:

The Bill was introduced into the house on the 26th of February, debated on the 4th of March in the House and then passed to the Senate. I’ve attached the relevant Hansard pages for your information.

Notably, since our submission on the Bill, the government has agreed to a 12 month delay in the offence provisions. The government has also indicated (Morrison, in the second reading speech) that they will seek to continue the term of the Steering Group through the implementation period. Concerningly, however, they have also adjourned further consideration of the Bill until the 12th of May, which leaves very little time for Royal Assent before the 16th of May, when the offence provisions in the current Act will commence.

We understand there is current consideration being given to extending the Steering Group for two years and asking them to undertake the first review. If that is the case, that means we have also been successful in arguing for an independent review of the operation of the legislation.

We are in regular contact with several MPs, and have prepared the attached simplified brief to support their debates and discussions about the Bill. In addition, Jill has written to Senator Ludlam with Helen’s support advising on the implications of the Bill for research involving encryption technology.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade is now undertaking an inquiry into the Bill under the auspices of its ongoing scrutiny of the Act and we are preparing a short submission to that inquiry that will re-emphasise our remaining issues with the Act, and the need for the Bill to be passed quickly.

The simplified brief has also now been shared with the Senate Committee for their information, and with the Go8 Board. In addition, we have prepared the attached paper for SEG, SEG-Research and the Academic Board.

We will keep you updated on any further developments and time permitting, will give you an opportunity to comment on a draft of the Senate inquiry submission, which is due on the 12th of March.
SUBMISSION TO SEG AND THE ACADEMIC BOARD
02 March 2015 (for SEG Meeting on 19 March 2015)
FOR INFORMATION: UPDATE ON THE DEFENCE TRADE CONTROLS AMENDMENT BILL 2015

DEPUTY VICE-CHANCELLOR (RESEARCH) AND HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY AND PROJECTS
jill.trewhella@sydney.edu.au ph: 8627 8150 or tim.payne@sydney.edu.au ph: 9351 4750

Recommendation

It is recommended that SEG and the Board note this update on recent important developments with the Defence Trade Controls Amendment Bill 2015 (‘the Bill’) and related consultations.

The Defence Trade Controls Amendment Bill 2015 (Cth)

As members of SEG and the Academic Board are aware, the University became quite involved in the debate that led to the enactment of the Defence Trade Controls Act of 2012 (Cth).

The outcomes of that advocacy included the establishment of a two year implementation period during which a Steering Group chaired by the Chief Scientist has overseen pilots, analysis and consultations about the practical operation of the Act with the public and private research sectors. Commencement of the Act’s tough offence penalties was delayed for the duration of this implementation period, which comes to an end in mid-May 2015.

In December 2014 Defence released an exposure draft of the Bill for consultation. I am pleased to report that the new Bill addresses many of the concerns we raised about the legislation in 2012. This is largely a result of the much more constructive approach to consultation taken by Defence during the implementation period, but also the outstanding advice that has been provided to the process by a group of university lawyers, including Kristen Migliorini from our Office of General Counsel.

Major improvements in the Bill include the proposed changes to:

- exempt pre-publication and publication supply of controlled dual use technology;
- exempt most verbal supply of controlled technology;
- allow broad permits to be obtained at the project level, for up to 5 years;
- commit to introducing streamlined permit processing for lower-risk supplies; and
- review the operation of the new Act in 2 years and thereafter every 5 years.

There are some remaining matters that still need to be clarified and we expect the early days of implementation to generate more. The most critical matter, was that the Bill did not change the commencement date for the offence provisions.

Our assessment was that implementing a fully functional system of due diligence and institutional compliance across the University would not be possible in the time between the passage of the Bill and the commencement of the offence provisions. We therefore worked with Universities Australia, Group of Eight and NSWVCC to secure a further 12 month extension on the commencement of the offence provisions.
We also asked the Government to extend the term of the Strengthened Export Controls Steering Group, which along with its expert working groups, has been critical to ensuring that the concerns of university stakeholders are heard and addressed. Given the remaining uncertainties and others that are sure to arise during implementation, this expert oversight is necessary, as is ongoing access to scientific expertise for Government as part of the operation of the Act. Further, the work of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade was critical in ensuring the Act was properly scrutinised, and their continued involvement through this period will also be necessary. Finally, we asked that the scheduled reviews of the Act and its operation be independent of the Department of Defence.

In the meantime, my portfolio is working closely with the Office of General Counsel, which has appointed a Manager for Government Controls with responsibility for implementation of our compliance systems and processes for the Autonomous Sanctions and Defence Trade Controls regimes.

**Canberra briefings and advocacy**

On 11 February I travelled to Canberra with Tim Payne, Director, Higher Education Policy and Projects, to meet with relevant Government, opposition and cross-bench senators and members to discuss the Bill. During our discussions we emphasised the crucial importance of the Bill passing swiftly, prior to the commencement of the offence provisions under the Act, and noted the significant improvements to the legislation contained in the Bill. We also advocated for the changes highlighted above.

All senators, members and their staff were engaged with the issues, and appreciated the briefings. Many have asked for follow-up advice on a range of matters. The Shadow Minister for Defence has asked for a private briefing, and many other officers are keen to stay in touch over the coming weeks as they reacquaint themselves with the issues. We were, unfortunately, unable to secure meetings with the Office of the Minister for Defence and Minister for Education and Training, but will provide briefing material to them separately.

In addition, I attended a meeting of the Chief Scientist’s Steering Group in Canberra on the 17 February, at which the final Bill was discussed and approved for forwarding to the Minister for Defence to be tabled in Parliament. The discussion was constructive and stakeholder views were well received.

**The Bill as introduced**

The Bill was introduced to the House of Representatives on 26 February. We are pleased to note the offence provisions have been delayed a further 12 months. Upon reaching the Senate, the Bill will likely be referred to an inquiry. This inquiry will need to be conducted very quickly, as we understand that the government intends to pass this legislation by the end of March. This short timeframe is necessary to ensure that the current Act’s offense provisions do not commence in May.

Ends/

**Attachment A:** University of Sydney submission on the Defence Trade Controls Amendment Bill 2015
Dear Ms Burrell,

Implementation of the Defence Trade Controls Amendment Bill 2015

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the Defence Trade Controls Amendment Bill 2015 (Cth) (the Bill).

On behalf of the University of Sydney I would like to thank the Chief Scientist; members of the Strengthened Export Control Group and its working groups; and staff in the Departments of Defence and Industry for the considerable effort that has been made over the last two years to improve the Defence Trade Controls Act 2012 (Cth) (the Act).

We are very pleased that many of the concerns raised by the university sector during the development of the legislation in 2012 are addressed by amendments proposed in the Bill, and commend the Defence Export Controls Office (DECO) for the approach taken to consulting with stakeholders in the research community since the Act was passed.

It is clear from the explanatory material released by DECO that it has sought to find practical solutions to minimise the regulatory burden of the control regime, and has tried to ensure Australian industry and research is not disadvantaged compared to international benchmarks. If passed into law, we are confident that the measures proposed in the Bill will significantly reduce the compliance burden for universities and deliver a regulatory framework that is much better targeted at activities that present real risk. The resulting regulatory regime will be of greater overall benefit and more cost-effective for Government, industry and the public sector research community.

In particular, we welcome the following proposed changes as essential:

- the exemption for publication of controlled dual use technology;
- the exemption for most verbal supplies of controlled dual use technology;
- the exemption for some pre-publication supplies of controlled dual use technology;
- the ability to obtain broad permits at the project level, which may apply for up to five years;
- the commitment to introduce streamlined permit processing for lower-risk supplies; and
- the requirement that the operation of the new Act must be reviewed in two years, and then every five years.

The Bill also proposes important amendments to the ‘brokering’ provisions of the Act. While these controls will rarely apply to research undertaken in the university sector, the easing of the requirements should benefit our industry partners.
While we strongly support these improvements to the Act, it will be vital for DECO to work with stakeholders on the detail over the coming months. For example, DECO’s consultation sessions have been useful in highlighting the need for more detail and clarity in areas including the following:

- the application of the control regime to academic teaching activities that are recorded and accessed electronically;
- the activities that will be covered by the proposed pre-publication exemption;
- multi-jurisdictional issues - for example, the requirements where an Australian researcher travels overseas and communicates in relation to DSGL technology;
- the operation of the proposed exemptions for patents and medical devices;
- how the proposed streamlined permit system will work with the Australian General Export Licences (AUSGELs); and
- the detail of the record keeping requirements for researchers and institutions.

We would be happy to discuss or elaborate on each of these issues if that would be of assistance and acknowledge the commitments DECO’s staff have given at recent briefing sessions about the value of continuing dialogue with the research sector. Ongoing cooperation between DECO and the research community will be essential given the complexity involved.

Our key remaining concerns, however, relate to the practicalities of implementation. With the Act’s offence provisions due to take effect from 16 May 2015, instituting a fully functional system of due diligence and institutional compliance across a university of any significant size in the time between the commencement of the amendments and the start of the offence provisions is simply not reasonable or realistic. Moreover, the details of the permit system have not yet been widely shared, and DECO is yet to release two long awaited online tools and other support material that will be essential for compliance and training.

We therefore strongly support Universities Australia’s call for the commencement of the offence provisions to be extended by a further 12 months. Unless such an extension is provided it is highly likely that research institutions will take a risk-averse approach to compliance, resulting in an unmanageable flood of inquiries and permit applications to DECO that could undermine its capacity for effective implementation in the critical early stages of the scheme’s administration. A further 12 month delay in the commencement of the offence provisions would avoid this. It would allow time for DECO to finalise its guidance tools and materials, clarify remaining areas of ambiguity, and establish ongoing governance and consultative structures. The extra time would also enable institutions to establish their compliance frameworks and conduct necessary training with much more certainty about their obligations.

We also strongly support Universities Australia’s calls for the Strengthened Export Control Steering Group (SECSG) to continue its role for at least another two years. The Steering Group, with strong support from its expert working groups, has played a critical role, ensuring that the concerns of stakeholders are heard and addressed. Many important details will need to be finalised during the implementation of the Bill and ongoing independent monitoring and advice will be invaluable.

In addition, proposed amendments to the Bill require the operation of the Act (other than Parts 3 and 4) to be reviewed two years after the commencement of the offence provisions, but do not specify the body or individuals who will conduct the review. It will be critical that the review is independent, and we recommend that the SECSG and its working groups are maintained to monitor implementation and conduct or oversee the first review of the scheme’s operation.
We also consider that the use of external expertise to assist the Minister in determinations under the Act will be necessary in many cases related to the research sector and recommend that a formal mechanism be established whereby such expertise is available to support DECO and the Minister on a permanent basis.

Finally, given the significance of the national security and research issues at stake with this legislation, we believe that the Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Committee should continue to provide Parliamentary oversight of the first two years of the amended Act’s implementation.

Yours sincerely,

Signature removed for electronic distribution

Professor Jill Trewhella
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research)

cc
The Hon. Kevin Andrews MP, Minister for Defence
Senator Chris Back, Chair, Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation
Professor Ian Chubb AC, Chief Scientist of Australia
Professor Mary O’Kane, NSW Chief Scientist and Engineer
Dr Alex Zelinsky, Chief Defence Scientist of Australia
Ms Belinda Robinson, Chief Executive, Universities Australia
Ms Vicki Thomson, Chief Executive, Group of Eight Australia
THE DEFENCE TRADE CONTROLS ACT 2012

The primary purpose of the Act the Defence Trade Controls Amendment Bill 2015 seeks to amend was to give effect to the Australia-United States Defence Trade Cooperation Treaty signed by the Bush and Howard governments in 2007. The main benefit of the treaty was to provide some Australian defence industries with relief from a restrictive export control regime that has hampered Australian-US defence goods and defence industry trade. At the same time, however, the Act established a potentially stifling export control regime for ‘intangible transfers’ (including electronic communication and publication) of ‘dual use’ technology that will impact a broad range of what would ordinarily be open research in Australian universities and other public research organisations; research aimed at improving health and innovation in communications, information technology, robotics, mining, agriculture, manufacturing and trade.

Amendments made to the legislation by the Senate in 2012 established a two year implementation period, during which the Act's offence provisions have not applied, while a Strengthened Export Controls Steering Group (SECSG) chaired by the Chief Scientist has worked with the Department of Defence and public and private sector research organisations to test the necessity of the Act's requirements and identify possible amendments to improve its operation. In December 2014 the Minister for Defence released an exposure draft of the Bill, with the Department of Defence and the SECSG consulting widely on their recommended amendments to the Act. The Bill now before the Parliament includes further amendments made in response to recommendations from the University of Sydney and others.

KEY POSITIVE CHANGES PROPOSED BY THE BILL

- The offence provisions in the Act are to be delayed for a further 12 months from the date of Royal Assent to allow for implementation.
- Oral discussions of Defence Strategic Goods List (DSGL) Technology will no longer require a permit.
- Publication of Part 2 (dual use) DSGL Technology is no longer restricted, unless a Ministerial Notice is issued.
- Some pre-publication activities related to Part 2 DSGL Technology may be undertaken without a permit.
- Permits can extend for up to 5 years and be awarded on a whole-of-project basis. The department has also committed to introducing streamlined permit processing for lower-risk activities.
- The legislation must be reviewed after the first 2 years of operation and every 5 years thereafter.
- The Explanatory Memorandum states that a permanent process for stakeholder input at the time of these reviews will be implemented by the department.

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY POSITION

- The University considers that taken together the above changes make significant improvements to the scope and operation of the Bill. They shift it to a risk-based framework, which will allow available resources to be focused at regulating activities that pose real risk to national security. It is essential that these amendments are passed in the Autumn sitting of Parliament 2015, prior to the commencement of the Act’s offence provisions in May.

- The inclusion of a further 12 month delay in the commencement of the offence provisions is a significant concession achieved since the release of the exposure draft of the Bill. It will provide more time for
affected organisations to prepare compliance frameworks and roll out education material. It will also provide more time for DECO to release its promised online tools.

- The University and sector do have some remaining concerns. We are in the process of seeking more clarity from DECO on issues including the following:
  - the application of the control regime to academic teaching activities that are recorded and accessed electronically;
  - the activities that will be covered by the proposed pre-publication exemption;
  - multi-jurisdictional issues - for example, the requirements where an Australian researcher travels overseas and communicates in relation to DSGL technology;
  - the operation of the proposed exemptions for patents and medical devices;
  - how the proposed streamlined permit system will work with the Australian General Export Licences (AUSGELs); and
  - the detail of the record keeping requirements for researchers and institutions.

- In view of the complexity of the DSGL, and remaining uncertainties such as these, the University and sector considers it reasonable to extend the role of the Strengthened Export Controls Steering Group (SECSG), whose expert oversight and consultation has been essential to the new risk-based approach taken in the Bill. Noting the 2 year review established in the Bill, we suggest that the Steering Committee’s oversight be extended to that review date.

- If the SECSG does not continue, it will be vital that an alternative process for stakeholder consultation (and collaboration between DECO and affected organisations) continues for at least the first three years of implementation.

- The Bill proposes amendments that will require the Minister for Defence to ensure a review of the operation of the Act is undertaken as soon as possible after second anniversary of the commencement of the offence provisions. The University welcomes this commitment, but believes it is critical that the review is independent and draws on expertise from outside the Department of Defence.

- There is also a need for a structure to be put in place to ensure that the Minister and other decision-makers under the Act will have access to timely independent expert scientific advice before issuing a notice to restrict a publication.

- Finally, we consider it essential that the Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Committee continues to scrutinise the Act’s implementation on an annual basis for the next three years. The improvements proposed in the Bill are the direct result of processes established by the Senate in 2012 following advice from the Committee, and of the Committee’s regular review of the Act’s implementation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION
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As part of the second phase of the smaller government agenda, the government decided that the Australian River Co. Limited would be wound-up by 1 July 2015.

The bill allows for the orderly transfer of assets and liabilities to the Commonwealth, and provides for the Commonwealth to be the company's successor-at-law, prior to bringing to a close the operations of the Australian River Co. Limited. The date on which the transfer to the Commonwealth takes effect will be set by proclamation.

I commend the bill to the House.

Debate adjourned.

**Defence Trade Controls Amendment Bill 2015**

**First Reading**

Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Andrews.

Bill read a first time.

**Second Reading**

Mr ANDREWS (Menzies—Minister for Defence) (09:45): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this bill is to amend the Defence Trade Controls Act 2012 to address concerns about its impact on Australian industry and research institutions.

This bill will strengthen national security by enabling Defence to focus its regulatory attention on higher-risk activities with respect to the non-physical supply and transfer of Defence controlled goods while dealing more efficiently with lower-risk activities.

The original act established a two-year transition period during which offence provisions did not apply. This gave stakeholders an opportunity to work with Defence to address concerns with the act through the Strengthened Export Controls Steering Group.

Chaired by Australia's Chief Scientist, Professor Ian Chubb AC, the steering group has tested the legislation and advised government over the last two years on these legislative amendments.

The steering group established a pilot program to test the regulatory impact of the act across different types of organisations, including universities, defence industry, government research agencies, small to medium enterprises, cooperative research centres, and medical research institutes.

The results of the pilot program and wider stakeholder engagement provided a strong evidence base to inform the amendments that are contained in this bill.

These amendments will:

- better target persons who are supplying sensitive technology commensurate with international practice;
- adopt a more balanced approach by only requiring approvals for sensitive military publications and removing controls on dual-use publications (that is, technology with both civilian and potential military applications);
- only require permits for brokering of sensitive military items and remove controls on most dual-use brokering, subject to international obligations and national security interests;
- introduce obligations to regularly review the operation of the legislation to ensure it maintains an appropriate balance between the regulatory impact on stakeholders and the need to protect Australia's national security; and
- delay the commencement of the offence provisions by 12 months to ensure that stakeholders have sufficient time to implement appropriate compliance and licensing measures.

The work of the steering group has been invaluable, and I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to Professor Chubb and the steering group members for their work and leadership. Their reports have provided the government with critical stakeholder perspectives.

I would also like to acknowledge the significant investments from the pilot organisations and the broader stakeholder community that have led to the development of these amendments.

Subject to the passage of this bill, my department will work with stakeholders to help them prepare for the commencement of the offence provisions in 12 months' time. During this period, assistance will be provided by Defence through a number of aids to be developed in collaboration with the steering group and stakeholders.

It is important that this bill is passed before the offence provisions of the act come into force on 16 May 2015. This will enable industry and research organisations to implement sensible, balanced approaches to export controls within a better balanced regulatory system that protects our national security interests.
I commend the bill to the House.

Debate adjourned.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples Recognition (Sunset Extension) Bill 2015

Second Reading

Debate resumed on the motion:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Mr NEUMANN (Blair) (09:49): I say at the beginning of this debate on the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples Recognition (Sunset Extension) Bill 2015 that the Labor Party supports the government, and commends them for bringing this legislation before the chamber today.

This bill amends the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples Recognition Act, a piece of legislation that was passed unanimously in the last parliament and that was initiated, of course, by the then Minister for Indigenous Affairs, the Hon. Jenny Macklin, the member for Jagajaga. It was passed unanimously in the last parliament and the preamble to that particular legislation foreshadowed that there would be a constitutional recognition referendum that would be put to the Australian people, proposing a change to the Constitution. That would build on the work that was done after the 1967 referendum, the moral case that was put for change and the impetus that led to reconciliation in this country.

The preamble to that piece of legislation talked about the fact that there would be further engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and the need to build a national consensus to recognise Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in our Constitution.

There is an incompleteness—if I can put it that way—in the Australian Constitution: a void or a hole in the heart of the Constitution. It fails to recognise and acknowledge the long occupation of the continent by Australia's first peoples. This particular piece of legislation that was passed in 2013 created the idea of a review panel. That was established by this government, and I commend them for it, with three very eminent Australian people: the Hon. John Andersen AO, a former Deputy Prime Minister; Tanya Hosch, campaign director of RECOGNISE; and Mr Richard Eccles, the Deputy Secretary, Indigenous Affairs, Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet.

Their review panel did a very detailed report and recommended that the government continue this particular piece of legislation. Without this legislation being renewed there would be no legislative recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, their prior occupation of this continent and their culture, language and heritage, and we would lose momentum for the campaign for constitutional recognition.

The Joint Select Committee on Constitutional Recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples, chaired by the member for Hasluck, Ken Wyatt, and deputy chair, Senator Nova Peris, recommended in a report on 27 October last year—I am on that committee—that the government do what they are doing today.

This week we celebrated the life of a great champion of the '67 referendum Faith Bandler AC. I was pleased to be there along with member for Lingiari representing the Leader of the Opposition. Her funeral service was a wonderful occasion to celebrate a champion of the '67 referendum. Collectively, as I talked with people outside, we remembered the great work that she along with others did in relation to the 1967 referendum.

The '67 referendum was not only about including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in the Census but also about giving the Commonwealth government the power to pass laws with respect to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. For nearly six decades after Australia was formed as a country and as the Commonwealth of Australia, Aboriginal and Torres Strait island people lost the right to vote. That came back in the early 60s. The '67 referendum built momentum in reconciliation in this country.

The apology led by former Prime Minister Kevin Rudd supported by opposition leader Brendan Nelson and this parliament back in 2008 continued the great work built on that wonderful speech by former Prime Minister Paul Keating, the High Court decision of Mabo and native title legislation. We have been on a national journey in this space. The Prime Minister, I know, is working with the Leader of the Opposition and we wish there to be a bipartisan approach to this. Labor stands ready, willing and able to support constitutional recognition. We believe that we should do nothing without the support of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. This should be real and substantive change. They say that symbolic change is not good enough.

I think with goodwill we can get a referendum through. Only eight referenda have been passed in this country. The changes that are needed are important. I think it goes to an important development in this country. It completes a picture. It would also eradicate a shocking provision in our Constitution, section 25, which foreshadows the fact that laws can be passed at a state level that would prohibit Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people from actually having the right to vote. Most Australians, if they were walking down Pitt Street or Collins Street or Queen Street, would be horrified that that provision remains in the constitution. I know both sides of parliament want to get rid of a provision like that.
Bill read a third time.

**Defence Trade Controls Amendment Bill 2015**

*Second Reading*

That this bill be now read a second time.

Mr FEENEY (Batman) (09:49): I am very pleased to rise to speak on the Defence Trade Controls Amendment Bill 2015. This is of course a bill which seeks to amend the Defence Trade Controls Act 2012, an act that received royal assent on 13 November 2012. It is a bill that was of course crafted by the previous Labor government. As a footnote to history, it is a bill that I took through the Senate in my previous life as a senator. So that received royal assent on 13 November 2012.

The Defence Trade Controls Amendment Bill 2015. This is of course a bill which seeks to amend the Defence Trade Controls Act 2012, an act that was of course crafted by the previous Labor government. As a footnote to history, it is a bill that I took through the Senate in my previous life as a senator. So that received royal assent on 13 November 2012.

I take this opportunity to address the House on a number of key aspects of both the bill and the amendments as they pertain to the substantive act. The act was of course implemented by the previous government so as to meet our international obligations as a nation as set out in the Wassenaar Agreement, the missile technology control regime, the Australia Group and the Nuclear Suppliers Group. Critically, the act also gave effect to the treaty that was made between the government of Australia and the government of the United States concerning defence trade cooperation. One of the remarkable things about this treaty is that it passed the US congress with such swiftness that it was implemented in the United States before it was implemented in this country. For anyone who knows anything about US politics and government, that is a rather remarkable happening.

For Australia, this act brought into place a regime that essentially gave life to our nation's commitment to counter-proliferation activities for weapons of mass destruction. It underlined Australia's commitment to stopping goods and technologies that can be used in conventional, chemical, biological, nuclear and weapons of mass destruction programs and making sure that those technologies do not get into the wrong hands. It is an act that dealt with the fact that Australia had changed obligations pursuant to its treaty with the United States and arising from the Wassenaar Agreement, which brings together the international community in a counter-proliferation regime.

Nonetheless, the act, in seeking to control technologies that can be used in conventional, chemical, biological and nuclear weapons, did mean that we were introducing a regulatory regime in Australia that involved change—for some, quite significant change. The act applies equally to the defence industries, to industry more broadly and to the university and research sectors. The act introduced new export controls on the intangible supply of technology listed in the Defence and Strategic Goods List, the prohibition of publication of Defence and Strategic Goods List technologies and the regulation of brokering activities. These were all significant things.

Brokering activities might mean an Australian entity is involved in the purchasing and sale of materials and that transaction happens entirely outside of Australia. As a consequence, that transaction would not previously have been one that was regularised by Australia, it was not controlled by any Australian agency, but by virtue of our international treaty obligations it became an activity that Australian policymakers now needed to take an interest in—and from that resolve quite a deal flows. Also important for the university and research sectors was the fact that a lot of technologies, including dual-use technologies, were now prohibited from being published—because when published they can no longer be controlled. This was potentially of great significance to our university and research sectors. Dual-use technologies might be entirely legitimate subjects for research, for business transactions and for investment but can also be used in weapons of mass destruction. As a consequence, they suddenly attract a control aspiration from government.

So there were a number of significant challenges in this act, and today's bill seeks to amend the act in certain ways that realise stakeholders' concerns and experience with the act and make sure that this regulatory regime operates all the better.

In particular, in order to strengthen Australia's export controls there are now new provisions that are aimed at stopping goods and technologies that can be used in weapons of mass destruction, as I have just described. We need to remain alert to the fact that these provisions apply equally to the industry, university and research sectors. The Defence Trade Controls Act 2012 restricts the non-physical export of military and dual-use technology through supply by electronic means, publication and brokering. I have already touched upon those briefly.

The transition period that was offered in that act was a two-year implementation period. That two-year implementation period delayed the onset of the offence provisions found within that act. So the transition period...
was of great importance. The provisions of the act came into force at the end of that two-year period and the
offence provisions then became active.

One of the most important things about this bill that is now before the House is that the Defence Trade Controls
Amendment Bill will seek to amend the act and extend the delay to the offence provisions found in the substantive
act. Perhaps unsurprisingly, there is broad stakeholder support for the amendment bill. From the university sector's
perspective it is important that the bill be passed as soon as possible. While this bill does not address all of that
sector's concerns, it greatly improves the situation in relation to publication and verbal supply of controlled
technologies. It also enables organisations to obtain broad permits at the project level, permits that would be valid
for five years, and streamlined permit processing for lower-risk suppliers.

The Senate Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade Committee has played a key role in identifying problems with
the original act and championing ongoing scrutiny. Following its original report in October 2012, it has been
conducting regular six-monthly reviews of the implementation of the act during that 24-month transition period.

As I said, the transition period of the Defence Trade Controls Act 2012 ceases on 16 May 2015. At this time the
offence provisions within that bill would activate unless this amendments bill, with a further 12-month delay to
the offence provisions, is passed. So, this bill will amend the Defence Trade Controls Act 2012. It will continue to
strengthen Australia's export controls. It will continue to make sure that we have a regulatory regime here in
Australia that meets our international obligations. This is a bill that demonstrates that we have sought to establish
a regime that is responsive to stakeholder concerns and continues, in an organic way, to listen to the concerns of
stakeholders.

Due to the stakeholder concerns about the impact of the new export controls the commencement of these
controls were delayed by the transition period. A Strengthened Export Control Steering Group was established
under section 74A of the act, and that export control steering group was to test the legislation and continue to
advise government on legislative amendments during the transition period.

During this transition phase the Department of Defence, in partnership with that Strengthened Export Control
Steering Group and the Department of Industry has conducted extensive consultation on the potential impacts of
the act, and proposed measures to reduce those impacts. And there have been significant conversations and
discussions there about the cost to universities, research and industry of the regulatory impacts of this bill.

The consultation has informed the development of the amendments to this bill and, in broad terms, the
amendments found in this bill provide an additional 12-month implementation period before the offence
provisions that are found in sections 10, 13, 14, 15 and 18, and the record-keeping requirements in subsections
58(1) and 58(2) commence operation.

It provides two new exceptions to the supply offence in section 10—firstly, for the oral supply of defence and
strategic goods listed technology, where the supply is not the provision of access to DSGL technology and is not
for use in a weapons-of-mass destruction program or for a military end use; and, secondly for the supply of dual-
use DSGL technology, where the supply is preparatory to the publication of part 2 DSGL technology. It extends
the exception to the offence of supplying DSGL technology without a permit to or from members of the
Australian Public Service, the Australian Defence Force, the Australian Federal Police, the state and territory
police and to include employees of the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation and the Australian Secret
Intelligence Service.

The bill allows for applicants to apply for supply and brokering permits on behalf of projects and for permits to
be issued to project participants. It narrows the publication offence to publishing military DSGL technology where
no approval has been given or the publication is in contravention of a condition of an approval.

It allows the minister to prohibit publication of military or dual-use technology where that technology would
prejudice the defence, security or international relations of Australia. It allows the Secretary of the Department of
Defence to issue an interim prohibition notice for the publication of military or dual-use technology where the
secretary considers there may be grounds for the minister to introduce a prohibition notice.

Further, the bill amends the brokering definition of 'arranges' to be an exhaustive definition and to include that
the broker must receive money or a non-cash benefit, which includes property or services in any form other than
money.

The bill narrows the scope of the brokering offence in section 15(1) of the act to apply to the brokering of
goods or technology listed in part one of the DSGL and it establishes new offences for brokering dual-use goods
or technology without a permit or in contravention of a condition of a permit where the broker knows, is reckless
or negligent as to whether there goods or technology may be for a weapon of mass destruction program or even a
military end use. The bill extends the exception for the brokering offence to include employees of ASIO and
ASIS.
The bill includes two additional exceptions to the brokering offence found in section 15(1). Firstly, where either the brokered supply is from or the broker conducts their brokering from within a state that is a member of the four main export control regimes—those are the ones I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks—the Wassenaar Arrangement, the Missile Technology Control Regime, the Nuclear Suppliers Group and the Australia Group; and that that state is listed in a legislative instrument or the brokered supplier is in connection with a contract specified in a legislative instrument, and these contracts may include a government business.

The bill also allows the minister to direct a person to seek a permit for the brokering of dual-use goods or technology so that such conduct, where identified, can be regularised. It requires the minister, a delegate of the minister or the secretary of the department to consider criteria prescribed in the regulation and have regard for any other matters the decision maker considers appropriate before making any decision under the act that requires the decision maker to consider whether an activity would prejudice Australia's security, its defence or its international relations.

Perhaps, finally, the bill provides for the continuing review of the operation of the act except for parts 3 and 4. The review will occur initially two years after the commencement of section 10 and then, subsequently, at intervals of not longer than five years. The minister must table a copy of the review report in each house of parliament so that the scrutiny of this legislation remains front and centre for our legislators.

It is fair to say that the original act raised serious concerns for a number of universities in relation to both publication in the formal sense and restrictions on verbal supply of information about potential dual-use technologies. They of course can range from engineering products to information about biological diseases. There was opportunity for those concerns to be considered prior to the passage of the act following a Senate Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade Committee report on the original legislation in October 2012. The Strengthened Export Controls Steering Group was established to work through the issues for universities and other research bodies and that group has been led, and led well, by the Chief Scientist.

This continues to be a legislative regime that is of great importance to Australia. It is our continuing claim to be a nation that supports strengthened international regimes that counter the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and that we are an international citizen that seeks to work in multilateral forums collaboratively with other nation states to make sure that these sorts of technologies are not misused and do not contribute to a heightened threat in our world. In that sense, our work in this space goes to Australia's international reputation and our conduct as a nation.

In this act, we find Australia gave expression to and realised its treaty obligations, and now in this bill we see that our legislative regime is subject to continuing strengthening and refinement as Australia seeks to meet its treaty obligations and demonstrate its credentials as a power committed to opposing proliferation.

Mr MORRISON (Cook—Minister for Social Services) (10:05): In summing up the Defence Trades Control Amendment Bill 2015 on behalf of the minister responsible, I note that the bill will enable Defence to focus its regulatory attention on higher-risk activities with respect to the non-physical supply and transfer of defence control goods while dealing more efficiently with lower-risk activities.

The original act established a two-year transition period during which stakeholders had an opportunity to work with Defence to address concerns and provide feedback through the Strengthened Export Controls Steering Group chaired by Australia's Chief Scientist, Professor Ian Chubb AC.

The steering group has tested the legislation over the past two years and has advised the government on the amendments contained in this bill. The work of the steering group has been critical to the development of these amendments, and the government will seek to extend the steering group's appointments to cover the extended implementation period detailed in this bill.

I thank the opposition for their support of this important legislation and I commend the bill to the House.

Question agreed to.

Third Reading

Mr MORRISON (Cook—Minister for Social Services) (10:06): by leave—I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Question agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

National Vocational Education and Training Regulator Amendment Bill 2015

Second Reading

Debate resumed on the motion:
regulatory overlap for the offshore petroleum sector. This made the National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority the sole environmental regulator for these activities in Commonwealth waters.

Streamlining has significantly increased regulatory efficiency in respect of petroleum activities in Commonwealth waters, as well as delivering clarity and certainty for industry participants.

Recognising these significant gains, the Commonwealth Government is seeking to further streamline regulatory arrangements in respect of all offshore petroleum activities. To this end, the States and the Northern Territory are being encouraged to confer occupational health and safety, structural integrity and environmental management functions and powers upon the National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority under their respective legislation in respect of those waters of the sea within their jurisdictional reach.

A conferral of these powers and functions on the National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority would permit the States and the Northern Territory to benefit from the expertise and experience of an established national regulator, as well as reducing regulatory burden by both providing a consistent regulatory framework across both Commonwealth and State/Territory waters, as well as minimising the number of regulatory agencies with which offshore petroleum industry participants must engage.

In December last year I introduced a Bill which contains amendments to permit conferral across as wide a geographic area as possible. The current Bill further clarifies conditions associated with a conferral including distinguishing between petroleum and greenhouse gas storage regulatory oversight and underpinning effective cost recovery arrangements for the National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority.

Finally, the Bill makes a number of technical amendments to the administrative framework to clarify and improve the operation of the OPGGS Act in relation to suspension of a condition and associated extension of the term of a title, and the consistent treatment of locations leading to the progression through types of title to underpin timely development of Australia's resources.

This collection of measures underscores this Government's ongoing commitment to the maintenance and improvement of a strong and effective regulatory framework, and to a cooperative approach to the regulation of offshore petroleum activities.

OFFSHORE PETROLEUM AND GREENHOUSE GAS STORAGE (REGULATORY LEVIES) AMENDMENT (MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS) BILL 2015

This Bill makes a consequential amendment to the Offshore Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Regulatory Levies) Act 2003 (Levies Act) that is made necessary by amendments contained in the Offshore Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Storage Amendment (Miscellaneous Matters) Bill 2015. That Bill implements new arrangements in the Offshore Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Storage Act 2006 to provide for the automatic grant of an equivalent Commonwealth title over affected blocks to the existing holder(s) of a State or Northern Territory title at the time at which the State or Northern Territory title ceases to be in force as the result of a coastal water boundary change. This automatic grant of title is provided with a specific name when it is an exploration permit to both reflect how it is brought into existence in Commonwealth waters and to distinguish it from other types of existing exploration permits.

The National Offshore Petroleum Titles Administrator (NOPTA) operates on a fully cost-recovered basis through levies payable by the offshore petroleum industry. The Levies Act at present facilitates NOPTA's cost recovery by imposing annual titles administration levies in relation to Commonwealth titles. To this end, the cross-boundary exploration permit title must be added to the definition of Commonwealth title in order to ensure NOPTA is able to cost recover for its oversight of these titles.

Ordered that further consideration of the second reading of these bills be adjourned to 12 May 2015, in accordance with standing order 111.

Australian River Co. Limited Bill 2015

Defence Trade Controls Amendment Bill 2015

First Reading

Bills received from the House of Representatives.

Senator CASH (Western Australia—Assistant Minister for Immigration and Border Protection and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for Women) (17:20): These bills are being introduced together. After debate on the motion for the second reading has been adjourned, I shall move a motion to have the bills listed separately on the Notice Paper. I move:

That these bills may proceed without formalities, may be taken together and be now read a first time.

Question agreed to.

Second Reading

Senator CASH (Western Australia—Assistant Minister for Immigration and Border Protection and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for Women) (17:20): I present the explanatory memoranda and I move:

That these bills be now read a second time.
I seek leave to have the second reading speeches incorporated in Hansard.

Leave granted.

The speeches read as follows—

AUSTRALIAN RIVER CO. LIMITED BILL 2015

This bill provides for the transfer of the assets and any outstanding liabilities of the Australian River Co. Limited to the Commonwealth in preparation for its voluntary deregistration under the Corporations Act 2001.

The Australian River Co. Limited was created in 1997 to hold the residual assets and liabilities of the government owned Australian National Line group following its partial sale in 1998. The Australian River Co. Limited has been in the process of winding up since 2002, selling the last of its vessels in 2012.

Today the company only exists to administer legacy liabilities from former employees relating mainly to workers' compensation, dating back to employment arrangements that typically existed decades ago.

The Government announced as part of the 2014-15 Budget that it would be delivering smaller, more rational Government involving the abolition or merger of Government bodies where possible to reduce the cost of government administration for taxpayers. The reforms are expected to deliver net savings over the forward estimates period.

As part of the second phase of the smaller government agenda, the Government decided that the Australian River Co. Limited would be wound-up by 1 July 2015.

The bill allows for the orderly transfer of assets and liabilities to the Commonwealth, and provides for the Commonwealth to be the company's successor-at-law, prior to bringing to a close the operations of the Australian River Co. Limited. The date on which the transfer to the Commonwealth takes effect will be set by proclamation.

I commend the bill to the Senate.

DEFENCE TRADE CONTROLS AMENDMENT BILL 2015

The purpose of this bill is to amend the Defence Trade Controls Act 2012 to address concerns about its impact on Australian industry and research institutions.

This bill will strengthen national security by enabling Defence to focus its regulatory attention on higher-risk activities with respect to the non-physical supply and transfer of Defence controlled goods while dealing more efficiently with lower-risk activities.

The original act established a two-year transition period during which offence provisions did not apply. This gave stakeholders an opportunity to work with Defence to address concerns with the act through the Strengthened Export Controls Steering Group.

Chaired by Australia's Chief Scientist, Professor Ian Chubb AC, the Steering Group has tested the legislation and advised Government over the last two years on these legislative amendments.

The Steering Group established a pilot program to test the regulatory impact of the act across different types of organisations, including universities, defence industry, government research agencies, small to medium enterprises, cooperative research centres, and medical research institutes.

The results of the pilot program and wider stakeholder engagement provided a strong evidence base to inform the amendments that are contained in this bill.

These amendments will:

- better target persons who are supplying sensitive technology commensurate with international practice;
- adopt a more balanced approach by only requiring approvals for sensitive military publications and removing controls on dual-use publications (that is, technology with both civilian and potential military applications);
- only require permits for brokering of sensitive military items and remove controls on most dual-use brokering, subject to international obligations and national security interests;
- introduce obligations to regularly review the operation of the legislation to ensure it maintains an appropriate balance between the regulatory impact on stakeholders and the need to protect Australia's national security; and
- delay the commencement of the offence provisions by 12 months to ensure that stakeholders have sufficient time to implement appropriate compliance and licensing measures.

The work of the Steering Group has been invaluable, and I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to Professor Chubb and the Steering Group members for their work and leadership. Their reports have provided the Government with critical stakeholder perspectives.

I would also like to acknowledge the significant investments from the pilot organisations and the broader stakeholder community that have led to the development of these amendments.

Subject to the passage of this bill, my Department will work with stakeholders to help them prepare for the commencement of the offence provisions in 12 months' time. During this period, assistance will be provided by Defence through a number of aids to be developed in collaboration with the Steering Group and stakeholders.
It is important that this bill is passed before the offence provisions of the act come into force on 16 May 2015. This will enable industry and research organisations to implement sensible, balanced approaches to export controls within a better balanced regulatory system that protects our national security interests.

Ordered that further consideration of the second reading of these bills be adjourned to 12 May 2015, in accordance with standing order 111.

Ordered that the bills be listed on the Notice Paper as separate orders of the day.

REGULATIONS AND DETERMINATIONS

Competition and Consumer (Industry Code—Port Terminal Access (Bulk Wheat)) Regulation 2014

Disallowance

Senator LEYONHJELM (New South Wales) (17:21): I, and also on behalf of Senator Day, move business of the Senate notice of motion No. 1:

That the provisions of subclauses 5(1), 5(4) and 5(5) of the Competition and Consumer (Industry Code—Port Terminal Access (Bulk Wheat)) Regulation 2014, as contained in Select Legislative Instrument 2014 No. 136 and made under the Competition and Consumer Act 2010, be disallowed.

Acting Deputy President, could I have some guidance as to whether there will be other speakers. Senator Day and I are both ready to speak. I understand there is a right of reply at the end.

The ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senators Cash, Cameron and Siewert have indicated that they will be speaking to the motion.

Senator LEYONHJELM: Thank you. The disallowance motion moved by Senator Day and me will prevent the Minister for Agriculture, Barnaby Joyce, from exempting monopoly grain marketer, CBH, from port access conditions that will apply to other port operators. Passage of this disallowance motion would remove the minister's power to exempt cooperatives from the code. I would make CBH subject to the same conditions as GrainCorp—no more, no less. This would ensure fairness in that the same rules would apply to all who seek access to ports for the export of their grain.

The government might mouth words about free markets and capitalism, but in agriculture the lure of agrarian socialism is never far from the surface. Since the end of the single desk, in 2007, various changes to legislation were made that took the wheat export market towards deregulation. We have moved far beyond the old days of the single desk. I support this progress.

One of the interim measures in the transition was the adoption of mandatory port access codes for the export of grain. Following the expiry of undertakings to the ACCC last October, access to port services is now governed by the code and general competition law. Adoption of the code last year was seen by the government as:

... a significant step towards free and open competition in the wheat export industry, which is a longer-term goal to which we have committed.

However, CBH was exempted from the code.

My disallowance motion does not relate to the entire regulation. I have no concerns about that. It seeks to remove the part that implies CBH, as a grower and cooperative, is somehow more virtuous in its dealings with grain growers than, say, a company limited by shares, and should therefore be given special consideration. Those who claim to welcome competition, when the exporter is a profit-oriented business, especially if it is a foreign multinational, recoil in horror when it is suggested the same competition rules should apply to a farmer-owned cooperative. This is despite the fact that the grower-owned cooperative is just as committed to making money.

The Minister for Agriculture is an agrarian socialist, ready to use rules, regulations and special exemptions to protect his constituency. In Mr Joyce's eyes, all grain exporters are equal, but some are more equal than others. Government authority is being invoked to prevent grain growers from having the freedom to deal with CBH's evil corporate competitors.

Let us take a moment to look at the central player and sole beneficiary of the minister's exemption from regulation. CBH handles 90 to 95 per cent of the grain produced in Western Australia. It is a cooperative, owned by around 4,500 wheat growers. CBH owns and operates the only wheat export facilities in WA, apart from the recently opened Bunge facility. It has 197 receival points and four bulk export terminals. It employs 1,000 permanent staff and has a turnover of close to $2 billion. It is no minnow.

On the east coast, GrainCorp handles about 70 per cent of the grain produced. That proportion is declining. At least GrainCorp operates in a competitive environment. A new terminal at Newcastle has been established, owned...
Recommendation

It is recommended that you:
- note this report on the TEQSA policy document ‘A Risk and Standards Based Approach to Quality Assurance in Australia’s Diverse Higher Education Sector’
- consider the implications for the TEQSA internal compliance framework development project

A Risk and Standards Based Approach to Quality Assurance

This policy document was released by TEQSA in February 2015. The paper sets out TEQSA’s risk based approach to regulation, developed in consultation with the higher education providers’ peak bodies during 2013-14.

TEQSA’s re-registration process, which self-accrediting providers are required to undertake every seven years, is based on a consistent framework for the whole sector, the application of which results in differential treatment for different types of providers. This means that providers with track records of sound financial standing; no history of non-compliance with the standards, a low risk of future non-compliance with the standards and a history of delivery of higher education can expect to be subject to a lower evidentiary requirement when demonstrating compliance with the standards.

While for initial applications for registration TEQSA will continue to assess applications against all of the standards, for re-registration the approach is to be streamlined. Since April 2014 TEQSA has been applying this approach to re-registration through the use of ‘core’ and ‘extended’ assessment. This will be extended to course accreditation in 2015. Determining which institutions are subject to core or extended assessment is based on a number of risk-based criteria. Characteristics which increase TEQSA’s confidence in a provider’s ability to meet the standards include:

- public bodies corporate
- public companies listed on the Australian Stock Exchange
- extensive, successful track records in tertiary education, especially higher education
- outstanding track record of high quality student outcomes
- extensive, effective acquittal of self-accrediting authority
- extensive and secure financial resources
- significant academic breadth and/or depth
- organisations that are significantly engaged in academic networks, nationally and internationally
- extensive corporate and academic governance
- significant research and research training culture and program
- significant professional or industry engagement; and
- significant engagement with and accountability to local communities.
Case studies are provided to demonstrate the intended approach. The most relevant of these is:

**Case 4: An Australian university**

*Provider background:* A large public Australian university. A 50 year record of delivery in higher education in one primary location across all broad fields and all HE course levels.

*TEQSA Risk Assessment:* No significant risks identified.

*Compliance history with TEQSA:* Limited, positive, extensive positive history with former quality assurance bodies.

*Organisational characteristics:* A significant number of organisational characteristics which build confidence, including: public body corporate; extensive, successful track record of HE provision; extensive effective acquittal of self-accrediting authority; extensive and secure financial resources; significant academic breadth; significantly engaged in academic networks, nationally and internationally; extensive collegial academic governance; conducts significant research and research training leading to advanced community of scholarship; and significantly engaged with and accountable to local community.

*Engagement with TEQSA:* Assessment of renewal of registration: Assessed core scope only. Re-registered for full 7 years without condition.

One further example that may be relevant is provided, where all details are the same except for concern over one indicator and a single compliance issue in recent history, notified in a timely manner under the material change process. In this case, the outcome is that the assessment is core scope with extension to examine the risk issue and recent compliance issue, and that the re-registration, while unconditional, includes a reporting request.

Core scope assessment is outlined in the *Process Guide: applying for renewal of registration* published in June 2014 and consists of seven provider registration standards. These are the standards prior to the update recommended by the Higher Education Standards Panel, but consist of: Governance, Planning and Performance Outcomes, Academic Quality Assurance, and Student Experience and Support.

While the core scope assessment provider registration standards have not yet been determined for the new TEQSA standards framework, the University is highly likely to be re-registered against these, given its provider profile. This may suggest a way to prioritise work on the TEQSA compliance framework development project, once the core scope assessment standards are published.
Process guide: applying for renewal of registration

Version 1.0

Effective from 2 June 2014
This guide should be read before you complete the Application Form: Renewal of Registration.

This guide is available on a trial basis until the end of December 2014. It should be used to prepare applications submitted during 2014/2015. Any questions can be discussed with your TEQSA case manager.

We welcome feedback about TEQSA regulatory processes, including any specific comments you may have about this guide, by using the online form available at: www.surveymonkey.com/s/RegulatoryFeedback, or you can provide feedback directly to your case manager.
Section A: Background

Purpose

This guide explains the process and information you need to apply for renewal of registration as a higher education provider in any of the categories listed in the Provider Category Standards at: http://www.comlaw.gov.au/Details/F2012L00003/Download.

TEQSA’s regulatory approach

TEQSA’s regulatory processes assess whether providers comply with the standards set out in the Higher Education Standards Framework. These standards are designed to ensure a quality higher education experience for students. TEQSA recognises the importance of diversity and the need to support innovation in the higher education sector. The standards are generally not prescriptive, but rather they test a provider’s ability to self-assure its higher education operations.

TEQSA applies the principles of reflecting risk, proportionate regulation and regulatory necessity to undertake assessments. These principles are set out in the TEQSA Act and underpin how TEQSA undertakes its regulatory processes.

In practice, this means that a provider’s regulatory history, track record of delivering higher education, and risk assessment are taken into account when TEQSA determines the scope of assessment and the information a provider needs to submit for a renewal of registration process.

If you are applying to renew your registration, TEQSA will need evidence of:

- outputs and outcomes that:
  - demonstrate how effective your operations are in delivering positive student outcomes and experiences, while maintaining academic standards
  - reinforce student and public confidence in your organisation
  - underpin your international credibility, if applicable
- robust, mature and effective systems and processes for your higher education operations including:
  - corporate and academic governance arrangements
  - internal academic quality assurance, including processes for planning, developing, approving, resourcing, monitoring, reviewing and improving your courses of study (including any involving third parties) and how these processes impact your delivery
  - risk management.
For renewal of registration applications, TEQSA bases its assessment on seven Provider Registration Standards. Section 1.2 outlines the minimum evidence we need to assess your application against this core set of standards.

Sometimes, TEQSA may extend the scope of its assessment to other Threshold Standards, as outlined in section 1.3. If this is the case, TEQSA may require more information.

Under the TEQSA Act, registered providers must meet all of the Threshold Standards at all times, and demonstrate compliance by providing TEQSA with evidence when required.

**Regulatory principles**

TEQSA applies the principles of reflecting risk, proportionate regulation and regulatory necessity to undertake assessments. These principles are set out in the TEQSA Act and underpin TEQSA’s regulatory processes. TEQSA has discretion to reduce evidence requirements where the risk of non-compliance with the Threshold Standards is low, streamlining the assessment process and timelines. On the other hand, TEQSA also has discretion to require more evidence where risk of non-compliance is higher.

**Case management model**

TEQSA assigns case managers to work with each provider for all regulatory processes.

Dialogue between providers and case managers is critical to effectively plan application processes and timeframes, for example by taking into account whether concurrent applications such as a renewal of registration and a renewal of accreditation, or a renewal of registration and a renewal of CRICOS registration may be submitted.

Case managers also have an important role in clarifying evidence requirements for each application with you (in relation to both the amount and type of evidence), taking into account TEQSA risk assessments, outcomes of previous regulatory processes, as well as the provider’s context and history of higher education delivery.

Discussions between you and your case manager prior to submission of an application for renewal of registration will focus on ways to tailor evidence requirements, taking into account your choice about the evidence most useful to submit to TEQSA, so that wherever possible existing documentation held by your organisation can be used.

**Timeframes**

TEQSA will usually make a decision about renewing your registration within six months of receiving a complete application. This timeframe may be shorter or longer subject to a range of factors such as:

- your history as a higher education provider
- the strength of the evidence in your application
- the risk of your non-compliance with the Threshold Standards and your ability to mitigate any risks
- the time you take to respond to requests from TEQSA for information
- the level of resourcing available to TEQSA.
Your registration will continue until TEQSA decides whether to renew your registration. The National Register of Higher Education Providers reflects the registration status of providers.

Discontinuing registration

If you do not intend to renew your registration, you must contact your case manager as soon as possible to arrange for withdrawal of your registration. You will need to confirm that you have arrangements in place to ensure that currently enrolled students are not disadvantaged.

Confidentiality of information

TEQSA has statutory obligations about confidentiality. However, we operate within a public accountability framework. If you consider that your information should be treated as confidential, contact your case manager before providing the information. More information about TEQSA’s approach to confidential information can be found at: www.teqsa.gov.au/for-providers/provider-resources.

Further information

Contact your case manager for more information about the renewal of registration application process.

Additional resources

TEQSA has a range of resources that may help you prepare your application. These resources are at: www.teqsa.gov.au/for-providers/provider-resources.

Available resources include:

- guidance notes covering a range of topics within the Threshold Standards, such as ‘academic leadership’ and ‘scholarship’. These notes will be developed progressively during 2014 to help you interpret and apply selected Threshold Standards
- selected good practice resources
- a glossary of terms.
Section B: Renewal of registration process

There are six stages to the renewal of registration process as shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Overview of renewal of registration process and primary responsibility for each stage

| Stage 1 — Clarify application requirements with your case manager | Applicant and TEQSA |
| Stage 2 — Submit your application to TEQSA with assessment fee | Applicant |
| Stage 3 — Assessment of application | TEQSA |
| Stage 4 — Document findings and recommendations | TEQSA |
| Stage 5 — Decision | TEQSA |
| Stage 6 — Public report and updating the National Register | TEQSA |
Stage 1: Clarify application requirements

1.1 Liaise with your case manager

Applications for renewal of registration should be submitted to TEQSA at least 180 calendar days before your current registration period is due to end.

To clarify what evidence will be required, and to discuss choices about the type of documents most useful to submit, you and your case manager will communicate approximately 12 months prior to the current registration end date. TEQSA will then advise you in writing as to the scope of assessment in the forthcoming process - that is whether the scope is the core or if you will be assessed against an extended set of standards, and if so which additional standards (refer to section 1.2 for a more detailed explanation). Usually discussions between you and TEQSA about scope will be concluded at least 12 months before the registration end date to ensure sufficient time for you to prepare your application.

Your case manager will:

- help you plan the timeframe for your application, aligning any other applications, where practical
- clarify the evidence you are required to submit with your application, advising you of the most useful information to submit and help you use existing documentation wherever possible
- clarify if TEQSA already has some of the required information and check if it is still current and relevant
- help you plan future application processes, including timeframes, for example relating to a change of provider category or self-accrediting authority
- explore the feasibility of a jointly managed regulatory process for renewing registration through TEQSA and renewing registration as an NVR Registered Training Organisation through the Australian Skills Quality Authority (ASQA), if you are registered with both ASQA and TEQSA.

If you cannot meet this timeframe you must contact your case manager as early as possible before the 180-day period.

1.2 Core assessment scope and minimum evidence

The core assessment scope for renewal of registration applications will be against seven Provider Registration Standards listed in Table 1. As a minimum, you will be required to submit evidence related to these seven standards. In your application, you are encouraged to use URLs and hyperlinks where possible for information that TEQSA can easily download from your website.

The list of evidence in Table 1 is a reference for the minimum information required. **Discussions with your case manager will help you identify specific evidence needed for your application.**

It is expected that the basis for most of your evidence will be existing documentation, developed and in use for internal purposes, for example your own self-assessments. Using existing documents as evidence is the best way to demonstrate the approaches and processes that are already in place.
Key documents that you have already submitted to TEQSA as part of other regulatory processes that are still relevant will not have to be submitted again.

Policies and procedures that relate to the core assessment scope are supporting evidence of systems and processes. You are expected to provide a URL link for TEQSA to access these, or to discuss with your case manager ways that TEQSA can access your relevant policies and procedures. Examples of policies TEQSA may need to access include: course approval, course review and monitoring, course amendments, course termination/discontinuation, assessment, student admission, academic misconduct, student grievances and complaints, student progress and exclusion, student feedback/student evaluation of teaching, and student support.

Table 1: Core assessment scope and minimum evidence requirements

Note: Evidence requirements are described using generic terms. TEQSA acknowledges that naming conventions may differ between providers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE ASSESSMENT SCOPE</th>
<th>MINIMUM EVIDENCE REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. GOVERNANCE (PRS 3.4 — Risk Management and PRS 3.7 — Corporate and Academic Governance) | 1.1 Constitution (except for universities constituted by Acts of Parliament)  
1.2 Governance chart  
1.3 Delegation instruments  
1.4 Terms of reference and membership of governing body and academic board  
1.5 Minutes of governing body meetings for past 12 months  
1.6 Risk management plan  
1.7 Risk register and status reports on risk and risk management reported to the audit and risk committee  
1.8 Audit and risk committee minutes for the past 12 months.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 2. PLANNING AND PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES (PRS 3.6 — Planning and review processes and PRS 5.6 — Performance of teaching, student learning outcomes, graduate outcomes and, as applicable, research) | 2.1 Most recent report on the progress of the strategic plan, as presented to the governing body  
2.2 Plan relating to research (where relevant) and most recent report on outcomes against the plan  
2.3 Plan relating to teaching and learning and most recent report on outcomes against the plan  
2.4 Summary of benchmarking activity and outcomes (for example in relation to student outcomes, courses, or academic processes such as assessment).                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 3. ACADEMIC QUALITY ASSURANCE (PRS 3.8 — QA and academic development, review and improvement systems, maintenance of academic standards with appropriate mechanisms for external input) | 3.1 Review cycle policy, most recent report to academic board on progress with the review cycle and list of reviews undertaken during the current period of registration  
3.2 Sample recent internal and external review reports on higher education operations and evidence of use for improvement (sample to be discussed with case manager)  
3.3 For self-accrediting providers, evidence demonstrating implementation and effectiveness of self-accrediting processes including course development, course approval, course monitoring and course review. Processes should ensure that courses comply with professional accreditation requirements and the AQF, and more generally the Provider Course Accreditation Standards and the Qualification Standards (for example through documentation such as minutes of academic governance committees; course review reports; and reports to academic governance bodies showing how the quality and...
**4 STUDENT EXPERIENCE AND SUPPORT**  
*(PRS 6.4 – grievance processes; and PRS 6.5 – Transition, academic language and learning support)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE ASSESSMENT SCOPE</th>
<th>MINIMUM EVIDENCE REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| outcomes of undergraduate and, as applicable, postgraduate courses are monitored and acted upon)*  
3.4 Recent student outcome data reports at course, discipline and institutional levels, as submitted to governance bodies, and evidence of consideration by those bodies.  
4.1 Institutional response to student experience and feedback  
4.2 Evidence of student grievance processes, including the number of complaints over the past 12 months and analysis of nature of complaints, and reports on action taken.  

* Assessment of implementation of these processes may be through examining one or more courses (to a maximum of five in total) as case studies.

If TEQSA does not already have information about your organisation’s practices and how you implement those practices that is considered necessary to assess your application against the seven Provider Registration Standards listed in Table 1, your case manager may request additional information.

### 1.3 Extension of assessment scope and additional evidence

In some circumstances the scope of assessment will be extended beyond the seven Provider Registration Standards specified in Table 1. The reasons that TEQSA may extend your scope of assessment include:

- if the most recent TEQSA risk assessment of your organisation concluded a red (high) or orange (moderate) rating for Risk to Students and/or Risk to Financial Position, or in exceptional circumstances, if you have been evaluated as at low risk of non-compliance overall, but TEQSA has identified a significant trend or specific issue that requires consideration
- if a significant issue is raised in your regulatory history in the most recent registration period, for example an application has been rejected, you have had conditions imposed, you have been required to undergo formal monitoring, or other sanctions have been applied
- you have graduated less than three higher education student cohorts in Australia.

In most cases, the extended scope of assessment will be related to a specific standard or cluster of standards. Therefore, discrete and targeted additional evidence will be required. For example:

- In a case where financial viability or sustainability is identified to be a significant risk: (assessed against PRS 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5), requiring additional evidence such as financial forecasts, copies of financial guarantees/support or similar, tuition protection arrangements, financial budgets for the current financial year, and student projections
- In a case where third-party delivery arrangements are identified as a significant risk: (assessed against PRS 4.5), requiring additional evidence such as copies of formal agreements with third parties, student outcomes related to selected courses offered
through third-party arrangements, and evidence of the implementation of quality assurance processes for particular third-party arrangements

- In a case where offshore delivery arrangements are identified to be a significant risk: (assessed against PRS 4.5 and 6.3), requiring additional evidence such as processes to ensure entry standards are upheld for students undertaking a course at an offshore location, quality assurance processes for delivery in a language other than English as applicable, and marketing and advertising arrangements.

If your assessment will extend beyond the core seven Provider Registration Standards, your case manager will advise you in writing at least 12 months before the end of your current registration period. This written advice will include the assessment scope and reasons for the extension, as well as detailing the specific evidence sought by TEQSA in the application.

In exceptional cases, TEQSA may decide to extend the scope of your assessment less than 12 months before your current registration period ends. This may happen if TEQSA identifies a significant risk of non-compliance with the Threshold Standards outside of the seven Provider Registration Standards listed at Table 1 as a result of:

- evidence submitted with your renewal of registration application
- new evidence as the result of a particular event.

In these instances, your case manager will advise you as soon as possible of the extended scope and additional evidence required for further assessment.

1.4 Concurrent renewal of CRICOS registration

If you choose to renew your CRICOS registration process at the same time as submitting a renewal of registration application, discuss a suitable joint process with your case manager. You will need to submit evidence to allow the provisions of the Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 (ESOS Act) and the National Code to be assessed.

If you have self-accrediting authority and have completed a comprehensive external audit of your compliance with the ESOS Act and the National Code, you will be required to submit:

- your most recent external audit report
- a progress report, including management responses on actions to date, as well as future plans for any issues raised by the external audit report
- a declaration of compliance with the Standards for Registered Providers under the National Code of Practice for Registration Authorities and Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2007.

If you do not have self-accrediting authority, Table 2 outlines the evidence you need to submit in addition to the information submitted for your renewal of registration. The list of evidence in Table 2 is a reference for the minimum information required. **Discussions with your case manager will help you identify specific evidence needed for your application.** Any relevant information that you have recently submitted to TEQSA and which remains current does not need to be supplied again.

TEQSA expects that internal self-assessment or self-review forms a part of your quality assurance processes, including those processes relating to CRICOS.

Part C, Section 11 of the National Code requires an inspection of provider premises during the five-year registration period. Your case manager will decide if a provider site visit is necessary.
If a visit is necessary, your case manager will consult with you to confirm the scope, timing, and a program (see section 3 of this guide).

**Table 2: Evidence required for a concurrent CRICOS re-registration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVIDENCE REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. PROVIDER DETAILS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Code Part C, section 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 CRICOS Provider code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Contact Officer details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Code Part D, standards 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 and Section 21 of ESOS Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Policies, procedures, guidelines applicable to international students relating to: credit transfer and exemptions; deferring, cancelling, and suspending enrolment; monitoring course progress; fee refunds; assessing English language proficiency; record keeping; as well as recruitment, induction, performance assessment, and development of staff involved with the recruitment or delivery of education or client services to overseas students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. ENROLMENT AND CONSUMER PROTECTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Code Part D, standards 2 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Evidence of designated account for initial pre-paid fees for non-commenced international students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Information provided to prospective international students prior to enrolment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Information given to international students at time of formalising enrolment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. ARRANGEMENTS WITH OTHER PROVIDERS (if applicable)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Code Part D, standards 1-13 and Section 21 of ESOS Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Updated information not previously submitted to TEQSA regarding roles and responsibilities for upholding ESOS and National Code requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Updated copy of contracts/agreements between the provider and other providers covering provision of services and QA arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. MARKETING INFORMATION AND PRACTICES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Code Part D, standard 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Evidence that the provider markets with professionalism, accuracy and integrity, including evidence of any breaches and the actions taken to rectify these breaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. EDUCATION AGENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Code Part D, standard 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Evidence of compliance with National Code with regard to appointment arrangements for use of agents or offshore representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Evidence of monitoring and quality assurance processes for use of education agents or offshore representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. STUDENT SERVICES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Code Part D, standards 5, 6 and 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Updated information not previously submitted to TEQSA regarding the range of specific services available to international students, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- support for students under the age of 18 (as applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- accommodation services (as applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- visa support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. PREMISES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Code Part D, standard 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Evidence of ownership or tenancy arrangements, including copy of Occupancy Certificate, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. DECLARATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Code Part C, section 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Declaration of compliance with the Standards for Registered Providers under the National Code of Practice for Registration Authorities and Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stage 2: Application submitted to TEQSA

2.1 Submitting your application

Your case manager will provide you with a link to TEQSA’s provider portal with login and password details. The portal makes it easy for you to develop your application. The portal allows you to work progressively on your application online. You will be able to access both TEQSA and CRICOS application forms through the portal, upload documents and links as evidence, and submit one or more applications to TEQSA when you are finished. You can generate a PDF version of your application at any time, so you can see how your application is progressing. You can edit your evidence (including by deleting documents) in any section up until your application is submitted. You can also respond to information requests online and submit any additional evidence that may be requested through the portal.

When your application is complete, submit it to TEQSA via the provider portal. Make sure you check that, as well as your required evidence, you have included a signed declaration and list of evidence, attachment numbers and URL addresses where available.

The portal also acts as a document repository so you can reuse documents already submitted to TEQSA online as part of other applications.

As the final step in submitting your application, you will receive an itemised invoice as final confirmation of your application and for payment. Note that TEQSA does not have an online payment facility.

TEQSA staff have access to the portal so they can help you with any questions or administration, including maintaining the document repository. TEQSA case teams will only start work on assessing your application after it has been submitted and we have received your application fee.

You can find a video help guide and other support material on the ‘For Providers’ menu on TEQSA’s website at www.teqsa.gov.au/for-providers/provider-resources.

TEQSA welcomes feedback on the provider portal and we will work to progressively improve it based on such feedback.

Please ensure that your application includes:

- all required evidence as advised by your case manager
- clearly labelled documents so TEQSA can easily locate and reference them
- references to relevant sections in longer documents.

2.2 Payment of application fee

When your application is submitted you will receive an invoice from TEQSA. To progress your application you must pay the non-refundable application fee.

The application fee does not attract GST. A fee schedule is available at: www.teqsa.gov.au/teqsa-fees.

TEQSA’s ABN is 50 658 250 012.
Stage 3: Assessment

TEQSA will assess your application after we receive your application fee. Your case manager will advise you whether the application including required evidence is complete, usually within 30 calendar days. If throughout the assessment further information or clarification is required, your case manager will contact you.

3.1 Use of experts

TEQSA will often, but not always, get input from external experts to inform the analysis of specific aspects of renewal of registration applications. The input from the external experts forms part of the evidence used in the assessment process and in TEQSA’s decision making.

If TEQSA uses external experts as part of the assessment process, you will be given an opportunity to identify any potential conflicts of interest with the experts, which TEQSA will take into account before the experts are formally engaged.

3.2 Provider site visits

TEQSA may visit one or more of your delivery sites. These visits are another way of collecting evidence, and TEQSA uses observations and discussions held at a site visit in the assessment and in its decision making to supplement or validate your written evidence. At the site visit, TEQSA may also interview various groups including students, staff, and members of corporate and academic boards.

If a provider site visit is required, your case manager will consult with you in advance to confirm the scope, timing, and a program.

Stage 4: Findings and recommendations

At the conclusion of the assessment, a summary of findings is prepared that includes recommendations to the TEQSA Commission about your application.

If the summary of findings recommends to (a) reject your application for renewal of registration; or (b) approve your application with conditions on registration in accordance with Section 53 of the TEQSA Act, TEQSA will send you the Summary of Findings. TEQSA will also send you any relevant evidence you may not have previously seen, such as findings from any external experts used.

You will be given an opportunity to comment on the summary of findings before TEQSA makes a decision.

Stage 5: Decision

5.1 Commission decision

The TEQSA Commission will consider the relevant evidence and make a decision on the application. Where a provider has been given an opportunity to comment on the summary of findings, the Commission will take into account any comments made.
In reaching a decision, TEQSA will take into account the three regulatory principles of reflecting risk, proportionate regulation and regulatory necessity. In particular, TEQSA will ensure that the decision is proportionate to any non-compliance or likelihood of future non-compliance with the Threshold Standards. TEQSA will also consider the nature of any non-compliance and your capacity to effectively deal with non-compliance.

TEQSA may decide to renew your registration, renew registration with conditions, or refuse registration. If conditions on renewal of registration are deemed to be necessary, TEQSA will, to the extent possible, take into account the resources you need to meet imposed conditions and will draft reasonable timeframes with the conditions.

The normal registration period granted is seven years, although TEQSA has discretion to reduce this period.

5.2 Notifying you of the decision
TEQSA will give you feedback on your application and the assessment process. In some cases, TEQSA will also request more information as a way of following through on the application, in accordance with Section 28 of the TEQSA Act, and/or may notify you of areas that may be explored further in future regulatory processes. TEQSA may also make observations about areas for improvement to support quality enhancement.

You will be sent a notice of decision and a draft public report about the decision within 30 calendar days of the TEQSA Commission making a decision to grant or reject your application. More information about public reports is in section 6. You then have up to 28 calendar days to provide feedback on the draft public report before it is published on the National Register.

If your application is approved, TEQSA’s notice of decision will include the period of registration, as well as any conditions on registration.

If your application has been rejected, or if conditions have been imposed on your registration, the notice of decision and draft public report will be accompanied by a statement of reasons. In these cases TEQSA will also be mindful of processes in place to ensure student interests are protected.

5.3 Review of decisions
Processes are in place to review decisions made by the TEQSA Commission. More information about reviews of TEQSA’s decisions is at: www.teqsa.gov.au/for-providers/provider-obligations/review-teqsa-decisions.

Stage 6: Public report and updating the National Register

6.1 Public Report
TEQSA publishes reports on all regulatory decisions about providers and the sector, to provide information to the public and for transparency of TEQSA’s processes, regulatory decisions and reasons for these decisions.
A public report contains TEQSA’s decision and the reasons for the decision. This report is published on the National Register of Higher Education Providers after TEQSA has considered any feedback you may have on the draft version.


6.2 Update of National Register
When your registration is renewed, TEQSA will update your details on the National Register of Higher Education Providers in accordance with the National Register Guidelines.

If your application has been rejected, or if conditions are imposed on your registration, and you have requested a review of the decision (see section 5.3), TEQSA will not include these details on the National Register until after the period for applying for a review has expired, or after the review is completed to ensure the information will not prejudice legal processes.

Updates to the National Register are published at least monthly.
A risk and standards based approach to quality assurance in Australia’s diverse higher education sector
Purpose

This paper explains how TEQSA's risk-based approach to assuring higher education standards is applied in broad terms to a diverse sector. This explanation is consistent with the revised processes developed by TEQSA in close consultation with the sector over 2013-14. The paper has been developed based on a dialogue between TEQSA and registered higher education providers through their peak bodies. It depicts how TEQSA's risk-based approach to assurance of quality standards is applied in practice to the sector and aims to facilitate a shared understanding of how TEQSA takes into account relevant organisational characteristics. TEQSA applies a consistent and fair approach that treats like providers in the same manner, regardless of provider category under the TEQSA Act (the Act).

Overview

This paper is in three parts, together with an appendix:

PART 1: TEQSA'S OVERALL APPROACH
PART 2: AN OVERVIEW OF REGISTERED PROVIDERS IN THE SECTOR
PART 3: ASSURING QUALITY STANDARDS IN PRACTICE
APPENDIX: HYPOTHETICAL CASE STUDIES.

Part 1 outlines TEQSA's overall approach to assuring quality standards, by being satisfied that providers meet and are likely to continue to meet the Threshold Standards. In implementing an approach to arrive at this satisfaction about each registered provider, TEQSA considers three principles which the Act requires it to apply (reflecting risk, proportionality, and necessity). Part 1 explains how these safeguards require TEQSA to differentiate between providers. Where TEQSA has serious doubts about standards being met, it adopts a highly graduated approach to any action it may take in response. It also provides significant information and guidance to the sector to assist understanding of the standards and what is required to meet them.

Before proceeding to an elaboration of how TEQSA differentiates between providers, Part 2 provides descriptive observations about the diverse range and types of registered providers in the sector today. This profile and the business models employed are evolving as providers respond to market dynamics and new entrants emerge. It is useful to review this profile to better understand TEQSA's approach in practice.

Part 3 provides further detail about TEQSA's risk-based approach to assuring that providers are meeting the national standards. This covers TEQSA's assessment approaches, including its risk assessment framework and consideration of providers' demonstrated capacity to monitor and manage identified risks. Certain organisational characteristics are identified as assisting TEQSA in having confidence in a provider, even in the face of identified risk to quality. This part also describes how TEQSA's level of confidence in a provider translates into graduated interventions where warranted.

To aid understanding, the appendix illustrates TEQSA's application of the framework through a series of hypothetical case studies, making reference to different types of providers, risk profiles, regulatory processes and decisions.
PART 1:  
TEQSA’S OVERALL APPROACH

TEQSA’s role is to assure that quality standards are being met by all registered higher education providers. It does this primarily through registration/re-registration processes and through course accreditation/re-accreditation processes for providers without self-accrediting authority. In these processes, which recur up to every seven years, TEQSA considers the provider’s track record and applies a range of assessment methods to reach satisfaction that providers meet and continue to meet the national standards. This satisfaction is required under the Act and, in effect, involves a judgement of confidence in the provider.

In carrying out its role, TEQSA’s approach is underpinned by three principles. These safeguards in effect require that TEQSA’s exercise of power must differentiate between providers that have extensive positive track records and low risk of future non-compliance, and those that have poor or limited track records and a substantial risk of future non-compliance under the standards. TEQSA must not only take a provider’s record and risks of future non-compliance into account, it must also ensure that any exercise of its powers is proportionate to any actual non-compliance and/or risk of future non-compliance. TEQSA places a significant emphasis on promoting and facilitating a culture of effective self-assurance by providers.

How does TEQSA make the differentiation referred to? TEQSA has not adopted an approach which predetermines that particular types of provider are subject to a different treatment. TEQSA has designed its approach and processes to allow it to make nuanced judgements on the scope and depth of monitoring and assessment activities and, based on assessment, the nature of regulatory action that may be taken if any. That is, a consistent framework is applied for the whole sector and it is the application of that framework which results in differential treatment of providers. This has been underpinned by the view that providers in all Provider Categories (defined in the Act) may present substantive risk and conversely that providers in any provider category may be well placed to meet or exceed the standards. It enables a highly tailored approach, regardless of provider category. TEQSA’s case managers play an important role in this tailoring.

In practice, what this means is that any provider that has:

- a strong record of delivery of higher education;
- sound financial standing;
- no history of non-compliance with the standards; and
- a low risk of future non-compliance with the standards,

can expect an engagement with TEQSA that is tailored to reflect that context and therefore involves a lower burden of providing evidence of compliance with the standards.

Conversely, a provider that has:

- a limited or no record of delivery of quality higher education; and/or
- weak financial standing; and/or
- a history of non-compliance; and/or
- a high risk of future non-compliance with the standards,

can expect an engagement with TEQSA that is appropriately amplified to provide a greater level of assurance that the provider continues to meet the standards. For providers that are applying for initial registration, TEQSA will always undertake an assessment against the full range of Threshold Standards.
There is an important time-based dimension to TEQSA’s assurance of standards being met across the sector. Some providers are relatively new to the sector and their trajectory may evolve at a rapid pace, requiring TEQSA to take their staged development into account. Some providers have been in the sector for a very long time but due to dynamics within the industry their position can change rapidly. These developments require TEQSA to develop strong contextual understanding of providers across time and to employ that understanding in its judgements about standards being met. There is also a high degree of innovation in business models occurring, which adds to the time-based dimension.

TEQSA has an increasingly important guidance and information role to play, in helping all parts of the sector, and particularly potential and new entrants to it, to understand the standards and evolving quality practices. Communication, cooperation and providing guidance and support are hallmarks of TEQSA’s approach to all of its functions.

When faced with the need to intervene in order to assure standards, TEQSA uses a graduated scale of actions, starting with the least burdensome option that is likely to facilitate the meeting of standards. At a high level, this scale ranges (escalates) from no action (ie straightforward approval), to communication of concerns in writing, to requesting information and reporting, to imposing conditions under s32 of the TEQSA Act, to approving the registration or accreditation for a period less than the full seven years. Only in exceptional cases, where TEQSA remains unsatisfied about a provider’s capacity to meet the necessary standards, does it resort to rejection of an application. The above scale does not detail every possible action available to TEQSA but notes the main actions that it applies in practice. In applying this scale, TEQSA weighs its assessment of risk and considers the degree of confidence it has in a provider (further explained in Part 3 below) and the demonstrated willingness of a provider to take action in response to issues identified by TEQSA. TEQSA affords providers natural justice by providing them with the opportunity to consider the basis of any proposed regulatory action (eg rejection, conditions, or granting less than seven years) prior to a decision being made.

To go further than these general points of principle in articulating TEQSA’s risk-based approach to assuring quality standards requires greater articulation of the profile of providers that make up the regulated sector.
PART 2: AN OVERVIEW OF REGISTERED PROVIDERS IN THE SECTOR

TEQSA assures a diverse higher education sector that enrolled just under 1.3 million students in 2013. As of mid-2013, there were 173 registered higher education providers, including 37 public Australian universities, three Australian private universities\(^1\), one University of Specialisation, two overseas universities and 130 other higher education providers. Many of these providers, including some universities, are also registered to provide vocational education and training (VET), and are often referred to as dual sector or multi-sector providers. The statistics quoted in this document are based on a TEQSA Statistics Report released in 2014, based on a combination of 2012 and 2013 higher education data\(^2\). TEQSA recognizes and supports diversity in approaches providers take in setting their priorities and missions, organizing their higher education operations and delivering higher education courses of study. It also recognizes that well-designed and well-managed experimentation and innovation by providers can promote healthy competition and enhance access to, and the quality of, higher education.

Overview

The 37 public Australian universities, while 21% of the sector by number, account for 92% of the higher education sector by student enrolments (n=1,171,715 enrolments in 2012), with an average enrolment of more than 30,000 students (ranging from the smallest at just below 10,000 students to the largest at more than 60,000 students).

The 136 other registered providers account for 8% of higher education students nationally (n=107,644 enrolments in 2012) with an average enrolment of just under 800 students (ranging from the smallest at less than 20 students to the largest at just under 10,000 students). There is a high degree of diversity in this group, which is a benefit for the sector, students and employers. This requires TEQSA to understand and adapt to a diversity of approaches and contexts in ensuring compliance with a wide variety of standards. These providers include:

- 6 universities (2 private not-for-profit Australian universities established more than 20 years ago, one private for-profit Australian university in start-up mode, one not-for-profit University of Specialisation and two long-established overseas universities);
- 10 state-owned not-for-profit Technical and Further Education Colleges (TAFEs);
- 25 not-for-profit faith-based colleges;
- 18 for-profit private colleges owned by three global private education corporations, namely Navitas Limited (ASX listed), Kaplan (ultimate owner listed on the New York Stock Exchange) and US-based Laureate Education Inc. (privately held, venture-capital funded);
- 6 not-for-profit professional associations;
- 6 university-affiliated/owned/joint-ventured colleges (pathways); and
- A large number of smaller for-profit colleges, mostly with niche specialisations in business, technology, creative arts or health.

The diversity of the 130 Non-University Higher Education Providers (NUHEPS) can also be seen in terms of

- Their size, with almost half having less than 100 equivalent full-time student load (EFTSL) and none with more than 5,000 EFTSL;

---

\(^{1}\) Public universities in Australia are public bodies corporate established under legislation or expressly recognised by legislation and which have objects of serving their specified Australian community, which are subject to State or Territory government reporting obligations, whose governing bodies are in part appointed by government, and whose accounts are audited by State or Territory auditors-general.

The scope of their course offerings, with some offering a small number of courses in a single field of study and others offering an extensive range of courses in several fields;

- Their history of higher education and/or VET provision, with some having 30+ year histories and some only commencing in the last year or so;
- Their delivery mode, with some being mainly face-to-face, some being entirely online/distance and some being mixed-mode;
- Their sector focus, with some exclusively focussed on higher education, others being predominantly VET providers and others with a focus on a wider range of educational (eg English language) or other industry services (eg professional membership organisations);
- Their market focus, with some being almost entirely focussed on international students either onshore or with significant offshore operations, and others with a predominantly domestic student focus; and
- Their ownership structures, with some being Australian arms of truly global education corporations with overseas ownership, while others have wholly Australian ownership.

### Australian Public Universities

The 37 Australian public universities, as noted above, have 92% of students enrolled in Australian higher education courses. They cover most fields of education, levels of qualification, modes of delivery and geographic reach. They are autonomous public bodies established or recognised under legislation (mostly State or Territory legislation). They have been in existence as self-accrediting universities for a significant period of time, ranging between 15 and 164 years. Many of the more recently established universities have predecessor institutions that were founded earlier in the twentieth century or even nineteenth century. All of the public universities are large institutions that are effectively government-backed, with large portions of revenue from recurrent government sources and have strong balance sheets and relatively low debt. They range in student size from about 10,000 to 60,000 enrolments, in annual turnover from $159m to $1.8b and in net assets from about $200m to $3.9b (2012, Department of Education). They have extensive public reporting, audit and accountability requirements to two levels of government. They require government approval of borrowing limits and have extensive financial, commercial and accounting requirements imposed on them over and above standard ASIC or Accounting Standards requirements. They have been relatively stable organisations with a highly consistent record of legal and regulatory compliance, showing long-term growth, using their significant resources to invest in robust management and education systems, and while there have been some mergers / restructuring, there have been no instances of collapse.

Australian public universities are highly engaged in academic networks, nationally and internationally, and they use these networks to peer-review and benchmark their courses and academic activity to ensure quality. They conduct significant and extensive research training, with more than 60,000 higher degree by research students enrolled (2012). These programs, their graduates, their academic staff and their infrastructure contribute significantly to the sum of new knowledge and to creating a community of scholarship that is engaged in advanced knowledge and inquiry. The depth and breadth of research varies significantly across these institutions, with some being far more research-intensive and research-comprehensive than others. The research environment of these institutions creates an underpinning for research training and more generally a student experience that can be argued to be at the more advanced end of knowledge and inquiry, which can be of benefit to the higher education students universities cater for, especially in creating a culture of scholarship.

### Other universities

There are six other universities currently registered in Australia that are not ‘Australian public universities’.

#### Australian private not-for-profit universities

There are two private not-for-profit universities in the Australian University provider registration category, namely Bond University and The University of Notre Dame, each of which has its own State Act of Parliament. Each has more than 20 years’ successful track record of higher education provision. Although private, they have some of the characteristics of Australian public universities, including legislative recognition, self-
accrediting authority, similar governance structures and quality assurance mechanisms, and wide scope of operations and scale. The extent of public funding varies significantly, with Bond University receiving only a small proportion of its operating revenues from government sources and The University of Notre Dame Australia receiving a significant proportion of its revenue from government sources.

University of Specialisation

Currently, there is only one University of Specialisation, Melbourne College of Divinity, also known as the University of Divinity, which was approved in this provider registration category in 2011. This not-for-profit institution has a successful record of higher education delivery stretching back over more than a century, is self-accrediting in the field of theology at all AQF levels, and conducts significant publicly-funded and recognised research. This institution is established under State legislation and has many of the same governance and quality assurance characteristics of the Australian public universities, although it is focused in a single broad field of education rather than multiple fields and is not a public institution subject to public appointment processes.

Australian private for-profit university

There is one private for-profit university that is registered in the Australian University provider registration category, namely Torrens University Australia (Torrens University) owned by Laureate Group Inc, an international “federation” of universities. Its university status was recognised in 2011 in South Australia. Torrens University transitioned to TEQSA in early 2012, commenced delivering higher education courses in Adelaide in 2014 and had no prior history of delivery in Australia, although its corporate parent owns education businesses around the world. The Torrens University has a board of directors appointed by its parent corporation. Under the TEQSA Act, this university is self-accrediting in all fields up to and including doctoral level.

Overseas universities

There are currently two overseas universities operating in Australia, Carnegie Mellon University, and University College London. Both are reputable and well known internationally. They are subject to robust quality assurance and accountability requirements in their home jurisdictions. These institutions have most of the same characteristics as the Australian public universities, including having self-accrediting authority. Both have operations in Adelaide.

Other higher education providers

There are many other kinds of higher education institutions beyond the Australian public universities and various ways they may be categorised. Many of these providers have some, and in some cases most, of the characteristics associated with the public universities. Many of these, however, also have distinctive characteristics and in this sense bring diversity and choice to the market for students. Niche providers bring an intensity of focus to particular areas of study and serve particular communities. Others have pioneered flexible delivery methods. Many have had a particular focus on producing job-ready graduates in particular sectors with close ties to industry. And many have specialised in providing university pathways to students that might not otherwise gain direct entry to university. Many have long track records of successful higher education delivery. And some are relatively new without track record in higher education, although some may have experience in other areas of education. The maturity of provision across this part of the sector varies and operations and outcomes have not been comprehensively publicly documented due to limited public information covering this part of the sector. In the relatively small number of institutions that have participated in national higher education student surveys, there appears to be positive rating by students exceeding that of university students on at least some dimensions. There has been no robust national data set available publicly on student attainment rates (completion, progression, attrition) nor employment outcomes for graduates from this part of the sector, although some providers have established strong links to particular industries.

---


A number of groupings can usefully be identified and these are described below.

**Technical and Further Education Institutes (TAFEs)**

A significant part of the TAFE sector has developed higher education offerings over the past ten years. There are now ten TAFE Higher Education Providers (TAFE HEPs) currently registered with TEQSA offering collectively over 130 higher education qualifications ranging up to Level 9 Masters degrees. TAFE Institutes are public bodies owned by State or Territory governments, established under legislation and accountable to the Parliament, and operating under public sector accountability and reporting frameworks. They have a long history of high quality delivery of vocational programs for learners, workers and enterprises, with consistent records of legal and regulatory compliance, governance, and accountability. Most have strong records over many years of successfully educating tens of thousands of VET students with high quality educational experiences as demonstrated in student surveys, employment surveys and strong ongoing industry partnerships.

Although no TAFEs currently have self-accrediting authority in higher education, many TAFE Institutes have delegated power to accredit their VET courses under the NVETR Act, developing and accrediting a full range of VET qualifications and consistently demonstrating the capacity to acquit this responsibly and effectively. TAFE HEPs typically offer highly specialised niche and applied higher education qualifications that are developed in close consultation with industry and have a strong focus on the needs of industry and employability outcomes. They develop and deliver degrees in response to identified gaps in the employment market tailored to meet the needs of community stakeholders.

TAFE HEPs are engaged in academic networks, nationally and increasingly internationally. They use these networks to benchmark their courses and academic activity to support quality in delivery and ensure opportunities for students. TAFE Institutes play a strong public role in local communities contributing to social and economic well-being, particularly in remote and regional areas, and in this relationship are accountable to their local communities.

**NUHEPS with self-accrediting authority**

Four other registered providers in the higher education provider category have full or partial self-accrediting authority, namely Australian College of Theology, Moore Theological College, Australian Film, Television and Radio School, and Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education. This means they have authority to accredit some of their own courses without seeking the approval of TEQSA. This authority was granted by TEQSA's predecessors and transitioned to TEQSA. Providers may apply to be granted self-accrediting authority by TEQSA, under criteria requiring successful track record of higher education delivery, mature and highly developed academic governance and quality assurance capabilities. This authority may be granted in one or more fields and at one or more higher education levels in the AQF.

**Faith-based colleges**

There are more than 25 registered higher education providers that can be described as faith-based colleges. Although private organisations, these providers are typically not-for-profit and operated by Australian religious organisations. These providers specialise in theology and religious studies, but also often branch out to related fields, such as cultural studies, education and social work. Many of these have long, successful records in the provision of education and more recently higher education. Many, although not all, of them also operate with a low student-to-staff ratio, offering small class sizes with high levels of pastoral care. A number of these colleges are characterised by scholarly communities with formal research activity, mainly in the theology field. A significant subset are accredited to deliver AQF level 10 doctoral qualifications, which is rare outside of universities.

**Global private education corporations**

There are currently three global education corporations, with 18 subsidiaries registered with TEQSA, operating in the Australian higher education market:
US-based Kaplan Inc, with approximately 1,000,000 students worldwide, in 400 locations in 30 countries, listed on the New York Stock Exchange (Graham Holdings);

US-based Laureate Education Inc, with approximately 675,000 students worldwide in 60+ institutions in 29 countries (venture capital funded); and

Australian-based Navitas Limited, with approximately 80,000 students worldwide, in 110 locations in more than 27 countries (ASX listed)

In Australia, the business models of the subsidiaries of these global corporations vary, ranging across highly-embedded university pathway colleges to stand-alone colleges in specialist areas. Each of these corporations has significant scale in Australia, developed through a combination of acquisition and organic growth. Each have large balance sheets, with parent capital structures of $2b or more. That said, these organisations spread their capital and debt funding across global operations. Each is focussed on major growth opportunities, both here and overseas. Like many in the NUHEP part of the sector, these organisations have particular strengths in developing and delivering programs with a strong industry and/or pathway focus and with embedded learning and language support for students.

Professional associations
There are at least six professional associations which have registered as higher education providers. They currently include professional associations operating in the law, accounting, nursing and corporate governance sectors. These organisations typically have long successful histories, although not necessarily in higher education, they are not for profit, they serve public interests, and they have a strong interest in the development of professional competence and knowledge in their domains. They are well connected to / embedded in the academic fraternity in their fields and draw heavily on these networks for academic development, delivery and review of their programs.

Other providers without self-accrediting authority
In the remaining group of 60 registered providers there is great diversity, paralleling that which has already been described above. Most of this group focus on a single field such as creative arts, business, design, computing or health, and in these fields serve a specific community sector. This group ranges across private for-profit colleges, private not-for-profit colleges and some public institutions. The colleges in this group range in size from less than 50 students up to a number that have more than 1,000 students. Many of them have records of successfully delivering higher education over ten or more years, while some are still in start-up mode. Many provide successful pathways into universities, serving another important function in a market where not all prospective students are readily equipped to enter and succeed at university. There are also a number of registered providers owned by ASX-listed corporations, such as Vocation Limited, which now owns three registered higher education providers.
PART 3: ASSURING QUALITY IN PRACTICE

Having stated the general approach and outlined the diverse profiles of registered providers within the sector today, how then does TEQSA assure standards are met in practice?

Summarising the application of the overall framework

Figure 1 below illustrates TEQSA’s approach in an integrated way. It shows the use of risk assessments in combination with registration/accreditation assessments to arrive at its regulatory decisions. In doing so, it explicitly builds in a provider’s higher education history, its regulatory compliance history and a risk assessment against specific risk indicators from TEQSA’s Risk Assessment Framework (RAF). This part of the paper goes on to explain ways in which TEQSA tailors its assessments to reduce regulatory burden while maintaining a robust judgement about compliance with the standards. It also discusses the role of ‘confidence’ in TEQSA’s decision-making processes and in this regard identifies a number of organisational characteristics which build TEQSA’s confidence about a provider’s capacity to maintain standards and manage risks to quality.

Figure 1: An integrated view of TEQSA’s risk-based approach to assuring quality

Registration and accreditation assessments: In its main functions of registration and course accreditation, TEQSA has developed a highly robust set of processes for assessing provider compliance against the relevant standards. These involve a combination of professional case managers, evidence-based application processes and the use of external experts where appropriate. Case teams prepare assessment reports and recommendations for consideration by a decision-maker, either the full TEQSA Commission or an individual acting under delegation. This approach is applied for all applications received by TEQSA.
Doing this across the breadth of the standards and in all instances, however, is a very resource-intensive and time-consuming exercise, for both TEQSA and the provider. The three principles in the TEQSA Act explicitly contemplate that TEQSA, in arriving at a judgement about compliance with the standards, will adopt approaches which minimise the burden on the provider while maintaining efficacy.

**Reducing the burden:** For initial applications for registration, TEQSA makes its assessment against all of the Threshold Standards. For all other applications, however, TEQSA has developed a number of approaches which allow it to significantly streamline its processes wherever appropriate. Specifically, TEQSA:

- undertakes risk assessments and considers provider history as a means to scope and scale its engagement with individual providers;
- relies on material change notifications from providers and has clarified to the sector the specific areas in which it expects such notification;
- has developed approaches to the assessment of re-registration and course accreditation and re-accreditation which allow it to substantially tailor the scope and depth of the assessment process, based on its view of risk and the provider’s context and history. This approach, which has been described as “core” and “extended” assessment, has been applied to re-registration since April 2014. TEQSA plans to introduce a similar approach for course accreditations and re-accreditations in 2015, following consultation;
- has facilitated concurrent applications, across registration and accreditation, across multiple course accreditations and across TEQSA, ASQA and CRICOS registration;
- has developed approaches to sector-wide monitoring which assist in scaling and directing its broader effort; and
- considers applications for self-accrediting authority, which if approved, leave the processes associated with course accreditation to the provider, within the scope of authority granted.

These approaches have been articulated in some detail quite recently by TEQSA following consultation with the sector and will not therefore be re-rehearsed here. These include:

- Material change see [http://teqsa.gov.au/for-providers/provider-obligations/material-changes](http://teqsa.gov.au/for-providers/provider-obligations/material-changes);

**Characteristics which build TEQSA’s confidence**

Arriving at a point or degree of confidence in a provider is an important consideration for TEQSA. Confidence about a provider’s capacity and demonstrated willingness to meet the standards and to deal with quality issues as and when they arise is one of the ultimate goals of the Higher Education Standards Framework. TEQSA’s confidence in these matters supports its decisions to grant registration, accredit courses and renew these decisions on an ongoing basis. In turn, such decisions underpin student, sector and international confidence in Australian higher education.

TEQSA’s confidence also supports its assessment of risk, in that the greater its confidence in a provider the more likely it is that the provider can mitigate and manage identified risks as they arise. And in the event that TEQSA is contemplating regulatory action, it is particularly interested in the reliance it can place on a provider to deal with quality issues, for example the provider taking corrective action under an imposed condition. In this sense, TEQSA’s confidence is an overarching consideration and is depicted in this manner in Figure 1 above.

In TEQSA’s experience, there are a number of organisational characteristics which tend to increase TEQSA’s confidence in a provider’s capacity to meet the standards and to effectively deal with risks to quality. Importantly, high quality providers do not have to have all of these characteristics. The characteristics described in this section below have been identified by TEQSA from its experience in assuring quality across the sector. They are characteristics which often run deep in an organisation and therefore have a certain stability and resilience to market pressures and changes of personnel. The characteristics described are not
intended to be exhaustive but are the most obvious ones in TEQSA’s experience.

- **Public bodies corporate**: Organisations established or recognised under legislation which significantly regulates the purposes, powers, structure, governance, audit and public reporting requirements of the entity. These kinds of organisations have governing body members appointed by government and extensive public reporting, audit and accountability requirements, often to two levels of government. They typically require government approval of borrowings limits and have extensive financial, commercial and accounting requirements imposed on them over and above Australian accounting standards. They are also subject to government probity processes (such as Crime & Misconduct Commissions), to administrative review processes and to the purview of ombudsmen for review of complaints.

- **Public companies listed on the Australian Stock Exchange**: Such companies are subject to significant compliance obligations under the ASX Listing Rules and monitoring by regulators, investors, analysts and the media. The Listing Rules are contractually binding on listed entities as well as enforceable under the Corporations Law on the company and its associates. The rules impose minimum standards of quality, size and operations. They also have significant continuous disclosure requirements of information which may have a material effect on the price or value of an entity’s securities. Such companies are required to disclose significant information about their governance processes, their directors are expected to maintain high standards of integrity and accountability, and they have elevated requirements for shareholder approval of certain transactions. Companies that are within the ASX 300 must comply with a number of additional governance requirements recommended by the ASX Corporate Governance Council. These characteristics are particularly relevant to TEQSA’s view of the corporate governance and financial sustainability of such companies.

- **Extensive, successful track records in tertiary education, especially higher education**: Organisations that have been successfully delivering education, especially higher education, over extended time periods, including having successfully graduated large numbers of students and having established strong reputations nationally and internationally for the quality of their academic programs. Such organisations typically have strong compliance, regulatory and financial records, and have shown resilience throughout economic, policy and technology cycles.

- **Outstanding track record of high quality student outcomes**: Organisations that can demonstrate an established, outstanding record typically make significant investments in monitoring, measuring and analysing their student performance (eg progression, retention, completion), learning outcomes, student feedback and graduate destinations and on at least these dimensions can show without difficulty the exemplary nature of outcomes for their students across time and for different cohort sub-groups.

- **Extensive, effective acquittal of self-accrediting authority**: Institutions which have been self-accrediting and which have consistently demonstrated over time mature processes to acquit this responsibility effectively.

- **Extensive and secure financial resources**: Organisations which have a large financial scale and capacity, backed by strong balance sheets, ready access to long-term capital, demonstrated earnings capacity and stable or diverse sources of revenue. Organisations that build public confidence in this position by disclosing their audited accounts regularly to the public, as well as disclosing their related-party interests.

- **Significant academic breadth and/or depth**: Organisations that are comprehensive academic institutions that cover multiple broad fields of higher education and most qualification levels of higher education typically have a depth and breadth of expertise across the higher education enterprise. These multi-disciplinary organisations have a strength and capacity to develop a wide range of courses in evolving disciplinary and multi-disciplinary contexts. On a more focussed basis, organisations that have successfully established a specialisation in a narrow higher education field have successfully operated in that field over an extended period of time, and have a strong capability within their respective field and in their engagement with the community/industry they serve.

- **Organisations that are significantly engaged in academic networks, nationally and internationally**: Such organisations typically use these networks to peer-review and benchmark their courses, assessment methods, moderate individual assessments, review student outcomes and more generally share improvements. Such organisations tend to have a strong quality assurance focus.
Extensive corporate and academic governance: Organisations that are well governed, with independent directors (or equivalent) and strong oversight of risk, and which are governed in a way that reflects their higher education purpose and academic character, ensures significant checks and balances exist, ensures a strong commitment to academic quality and academic freedom, and promotes collegial oversight.

Significant research and research training culture and program: The quality of such research and scholarship is extensively tested in external peer review and competitive processes, as well as external assessment of research training. This culture and program usually translates into a deep community of scholarship and, in turn, advanced higher education courses for students, particularly at postgraduate level. TEQSA notes that scholarship can be successfully developed by means other than a research and research training culture and program.

Significant professional or industry engagement: Higher education providers with extensive and deeply embedded engagement with their industry or professional counterparts typically have an especially strong focus on the quality and skill of graduates, with specific standards often developed to achieve strong alignment between graduate outcomes and industry expectations, and with the industry co-investing in the development and monitoring of higher education courses. Industry also often provides unique infrastructure and training in the form of placements, practicums, internships or more generally, work-integrated learning.

Significant engagement with and accountability to local communities: Organisations which play a strong public role in local communities contributing to social and economic well-being, particularly in remote and regional areas, and in this relationship are accountable to their local communities. This usually translates into a deeper understanding of the needs of students and other stakeholders in those communities and a greater capacity to meet those needs.

These characteristics are not absolute. Verifying their presence may involve judgement. TEQSA looks broadly at these things and is flexible in considering ways in which a provider may have such characteristics by equivalence.

Some registered providers have many of these characteristics. Some have a subset of them, and some providers have very few if any. A provider that has many of these characteristics will generally be regarded by TEQSA as having broad capacity and significant general controls in place to manage risks to quality. A provider that has some of these characteristics may also increase confidence in relation to capacity and controls, depending on the risks in question. Such a provider may also have a strong case about its specific risk management and quality assurance controls. A provider that has none of these characteristics would typically need to more fully demonstrate to TEQSA its capacity to manage risk where significant risks are identified.

Importantly, TEQSA’s confidence and therefore handling of any emergent issues will also be founded on a provider’s specific regulatory history. An extensive and positive history will count for a lot in this regard. On the other hand, a negative regulatory record (i.e., one involving rejections, conditions or granting less than seven years) will feed directly into the identification of risk in the Risk Assessment and be taken into account in making decisions about the nature of intervention required. TEQSA will generally not be in a position to make such positive inferences or arrive at confidence where a provider is relatively new to higher education and has a limited regulatory record with TEQSA. In such cases, TEQSA normally expects to undertake comprehensive assessments for the purposes of course accreditation and potentially re-registration.

It is also the case that for providers with some or even most of these characteristics, should the nature of identified risks be so serious (in terms of likelihood or consequences) and/or should the regulatory history of such a provider be cause for concern, TEQSA would be likely to conclude that an elevated mode of engagement with that provider is necessary. In this sense, the identified characteristics are not a guarantee to exemption from external monitoring by TEQSA, rather they have been identified by TEQSA as one of the means by which it may usefully calibrate its assessments and inform the nature of decision-making.
Examples of applying the framework to hypothetical cases

Set out in the Appendix are some examples which are designed to illustrate the application of the above framework. The examples are hypothetical providers with hypothetical risks designed to illustrate how TEQSA would handle the situation. These examples should not be interpreted in any way to imply that providers of the types described typically carry certain types of risks and therefore have a typical mode of engagement with TEQSA. Nor are the examples based on particular registered providers. The examples are intended to illustrate the interplay between risk assessment, organisational characteristics that build TEQSA’s confidence, TEQSA registration and accreditation processes, and TEQSA decision-making.

CONCLUSION

In each engagement with a provider, regardless of type, TEQSA is principally concerned to ensure that every student studying at an Australian registered provider gets a quality higher education and thus, the standing of the sector is upheld. Its examination of this question and any potential response is conditioned by the principles of reflecting risk, proportionality and necessity.

In order to go further than a highly generic statement of TEQSA’s approach, this paper traces the profile of the Australian higher education sector today and articulates TEQSA’s application of a risk-based framework to the sector.

The paper demonstrates and acknowledges the challenge of describing in a balanced, non-comparative way for quality assurance purposes the different parts of the sector. TEQSA is committed to consistency and fairness in its approaches to assuring quality standards in the sector. By this is meant that any provider can expect a similar engagement with TEQSA for similar facts and contexts. In gathering and judging the facts, TEQSA is faced with an imbalance of information, where large, old, publicly-funded institutions have by their nature established on the public record a history of provision. By contrast, new, small, private institutions have not done so, and this is entirely understandable. This paper seeks to explain that TEQSA, for reasons of administrative efficiency and reduced compliance burden, applies a risk assessment approach and gives consideration to organisational characteristics which build its confidence in a provider’s quality and quality assurance. TEQSA draws on the provider’s record in this regard. To be fair, TEQSA makes no presumption about an entity where that record is not readily available. Under the TEQSA Act, however, such a provider will need to establish to TEQSA directly in its applications the evidence which demonstrates its compliance on all relevant matters.

As the sector and Government contemplates revised standards drafted by the Higher Education Standards Panel, TEQSA welcomes feedback about this paper and its approach to assuring quality standards in Australian higher education.
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APPENDIX:
EXAMPLES OF APPLYING THE FRAMEWORK OUTLINED ABOVE TO HYPOTHETICAL CASES

Set out below are some examples which are designed to illustrate the application of the above framework. The examples are hypothetical providers with hypothetical risks designed to illustrate how TEQSA would handle the situation. These examples should not be interpreted in any way to imply that providers of the types described typically carry certain types of risks and therefore have a typical mode of engagement with TEQSA. Nor are the examples based on particular registered providers. The examples are intended to illustrate the interplay between risk assessment, organisational characteristics that build TEQSA’s confidence, TEQSA registration and accreditation processes, and TEQSA decision-making.

Case 1: A TAFE institute

- Provider background: A large TAFE focussed on higher education and vocational education and training. A 35 year record of delivery in VET and 15 years in higher education in 3 locations in three broad fields and up to Masters coursework level.
- TEQSA Risk Assessment: No significant risks identified, although academic staffing indicator raised.
- Compliance history with TEQSA: Extensive, almost all positive, academic staffing raised in two course accreditations.
- Organisational characteristics: A significant number of organisational characteristics which build confidence, including: public body corporate; successful track record in HE; extensive and secure financial resources; significant academic breadth; significantly engaged in national academic networks; significant accountability to local communities.
- Engagement with TEQSA:
  » Renewal of registration: Assessed for core scope\(^5\) only. Re-registered for full 7 years without conditions.
  » New course accreditation in field completely new to this provider: extensively examined, accredited for seven years without condition but with one reporting request.
  » Re-accreditation of existing courses: granted for full 7 years after narrowly scoped assessment with staffing profile examined carefully in scope.

Case 2: An ASX 300 company

- Provider background: A large provider focussed on higher education and vocational education and training. A 15 year record of delivery in higher education in multiple locations in three broad fields and up to Masters coursework level.
- TEQSA Risk Assessment: Identified moderate risk to students based on attrition, graduate outcomes and rapid growth.
- Compliance history with TEQSA: Extensive, mostly positive but conditions imposed on some courses.
- Organisational characteristics: A significant number of organisational characteristics which build confidence, including: ASX-related accountability and corporate governance requirements; history of HE provision; and financial strength.

\(^5\) Core scope refers to TEQSA’s revised assessment process for re-registration introduced in 2014 after sector consultation. In this process, TEQSA only examines a core subset of seven Threshold Standards for low risk providers, and extends beyond this only where there are identified concerns. Refer to TEQSA’s streamlined process guide listed on p10 above.
Engagement with TEQSA:
» Assessment of renewal of registration: Assessed core scope only. Re-registered for full 7 years without condition.
» New course in field new to this provider: extensively examined, accredited for seven years without condition.
» Re-accreditation of existing courses: granted for full 7 years after scoped assessment which re-examined issues the subject of previous conditions.

Case 3: A niche college

Provider background: A small provider focussed on a single higher education field. A 20 year record of delivery in higher education in one location up to Masters coursework level.

TEQSA Risk Assessment: No significant risks identified.

Compliance history with TEQSA: Limited but positive.

Organisational characteristics: A significant number of organisational characteristics which build confidence within niche area, including: extended, successful track record in higher education; outstanding track record of student outcomes; significant academic depth in niche discipline; extensive collegial governance; and significant accountability to local community.

Engagement with TEQSA:
» Assessment of renewal of registration: Assessed core scope only. Re-registered for full 7 years without condition.
» New course at new course level, PhD, in its niche field: scoped assessment to specifically assess research and research training environment, accredited for seven years with one reporting request.
» Re-accreditation of existing courses: granted for full 7 years after narrowly scoped assessment, no conditions.

Case 4: An Australian university

Provider background: A large public Australian university. A 50 year record of delivery in higher education in one primary location across all broad fields and all HE course levels.

TEQSA Risk Assessment: No significant risks identified.

Compliance history with TEQSA: Limited, positive, extensive positive history with former quality assurance bodies.

Organisational characteristics: A significant number of organisational characteristics which build confidence, including: public body corporate; extensive, successful track record of HE provision; extensive, effective acquittal of self-accrediting authority; extensive and secure financial resources; significant academic breadth; significantly engaged in academic networks, nationally and internationally; extensive collegial academic governance; conducts significant research and research training leading to advanced community of scholarship; and significantly engaged with and accountable to local community.

Engagement with TEQSA:
» Assessment of renewal of registration: Assessed core scope only. Re-registered for full 7 years without condition.
Case 5: Another Australian university

- **Provider background:** A large public Australian university. A 30 year record of delivery in higher education in one primary location across all broad fields and all HE course levels.
- **TEQSA Risk Assessment:** No significant risk identified but attrition indicator raised.
- **Compliance history with TEQSA:** Limited, one significant compliance issue in last 12 months with university notifying TEQSA in a timely manner of the issue under material change process.
- **Organisational characteristics:** A significant number of organisational characteristics which build confidence, including: public body corporate; extensive, successful track record of HE provision; extensive, effective acquittal of self-accrediting authority; extensive and secure financial resources; significant academic breadth; significantly engaged in academic networks, nationally and internationally; extensive collegial academic governance; and conducts significant research and research training leading to advanced community of scholarship.
- **Engagement with TEQSA:**
  - Assessment of renewal of registration: Assessed core scope plus extension to examine the risk issue and the recent compliance issue. Re-registered for full 7 years without condition but with one reporting request.

Case 6: A five-year old niche provider

- **Provider background:** A small provider delivering across higher education, vocational education and training and English language programs. A 5 year record of delivery in higher education in two broad fields up to bachelor level, with one cohort complete.
- **TEQSA Risk Assessment:** Moderate risk to student quality and moderate risk to financial position.
- **Compliance history with TEQSA:** Extensive, significant compliance issues identified, conditions imposed and less than full seven years for course accreditations.
- **Organisational characteristics:** No organisational characteristics that help build TEQSA’s confidence.
- **Engagement with TEQSA:**
  - Assessment of renewal of registration: Assessed against full scope of standards. Re-registered for 4 years with four conditions imposed.
  - New course in field new to this provider; extensively examined, accredited for four years with conditions.

Case 7: An established VET provider transitioning into HE

- **Provider background:** A medium-sized VET provider extending into higher education. A 20 year VET record and a 2 year higher education record in one broad field at advanced diploma level.
- **TEQSA Risk Assessment:** Moderate risk to student quality and low risk to financial position.
- **Compliance history with TEQSA:** Significant, positive assessment at time of initial registration, with a number of dimensions for ongoing reporting commensurate with stage of maturity of higher education operations.
- **Organisational characteristics:** A number of organisational characteristics which build confidence, including: strong and publicly disclosed financial position; outstanding track-record of high quality student outcomes; significant professional and industry engagement; and strong corporate governance.
- **Engagement with TEQSA:**
  - Assessment of initial registration: Assessed against full scope of standards, registered for full seven years, with annual reporting requirements until two successful cohorts graduated.
Assessment of initial course accreditation: assessed against full scope of standards, accredited for full seven years, with a number of staffing and course design issues required to be addressed prior to marketing of course.

New course recently accredited in same field at same level as first course: assessment scoped primarily around internal course design and approval, and emerging evidence of student outcomes and delivery in the first course.

Case 8: An overseas university

- **Provider background:** A large northern-hemisphere private university. A 90 year record of delivery in higher education across all broad fields and all HE course levels. Operating in Australia offering courses in two broad fields.
- **TEQSA Risk Assessment:** No significant risks identified.
- **Compliance history with TEQSA:** Limited, positive history.
- **Organisational characteristics:** Extensive, successful track record of HE provision; extensive, effective acquittal of self-accrediting authority; extensive and secure financial resources; significant academic breadth; significantly engaged in academic networks, nationally and internationally; extensive collegial academic governance; conducts significant research and research training.
- **Engagement with TEQSA:**
  - Assessment of renewal of registration: Assessed core scope only, including how its local operations are managed and governed, and how its local courses are performing. Registered for full 7 years without condition.
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Recommendation

It is recommended that SEG and the Board note this update on the new Higher Education and Research Reform Bill 2014; and the two Senate inquiries on the Bill.

The Higher Education and Research Reform Bill 2014

As members of SEG and the Board are aware, a new Higher Education and Research Reform Bill 2014 (the “Bill”), was introduced to parliament in December 2014, following the defeat of the Higher Education and Research Reform Amendment Bill 2014 by the Senate. The new Bill retains most features of that first Bill with some critical changes.

Following the introduction of the Bill, two Senate inquiries were initiated. One of these was initiated by the Government, and is being undertaken by the Senate Standing Committee on Education and Employment, Legislation (the “Legislation Committee”), chaired by the National party Senator, Bridget McKenzie. The other was initiated by Labor, Greens and the cross-bench senators, and is being undertaken by the Senate Standing Committee on Education and Employment, References, (the “References Committee”) chaired by the Labor party Senator, Sue Lines.

The Legislation Committee’s inquiry invited submissions on the provisions of the Bill and any other related matters by 20 February.

The References Committee was tasked by the Senate in enquiring into the principles of the Higher Education and Research Reform Bill 2014, and related matters, including:

1. The principles of the Higher Education and Research Reform Bill 2014
2. Alternatives to deregulation in order to maintain a sustainable higher education system
3. The latest data and projections on student enrolments, targets, dropout rates and the Higher Education Loans Program
4. Structural adjustment pressures, and the adequacy of proposed measures to sustain high quality delivery of higher education in Australia’s regions
5. The appropriateness and accuracy of government advertising in support of higher education measures, including those previously rejected by the Senate
6. Research infrastructure
7. Any other related matters

Submissions to the References Committee’s inquiry addressing these terms of reference were due by 27 February.
The University of Sydney made brief submissions to both inquiries (Attachment A, Attachment B), and provided input to the development of Universities Australia and Go8 submissions. All submissions to the inquiries are available through the Committee’s website. Both Inquiries are expected to report on 17 March.

Media commentary indicates that the Government is still unlikely to have the numbers in the Senate to pass the Bill. There has been increasing talk of alternative models, including a progressive levy model designed by Bruce Chapman. This model would impose a tax on higher education providers who charged fees above a certain threshold, with the percentage of the tax increasing as higher fees are charged.

**Attachment A**: The University of Sydney’s submission to the inquiry by the Senate Standing Committee on Education and Employment, Legislation

**Attachment B**: The University of Sydney’s submission to the inquiry by the Senate Standing Committee on Education and Employment, References
Dr Michael Spence
Vice-Chancellor and Principal

20 February 2015

Senator Bridget McKenzie
Senator for Victoria
Chair, Senate Standing Committee on Education and Employment, Legislation
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

By email: eec.sen@aph.gov.au

Dear Senator McKenzie

**Higher Education and Research Reform Bill 2014 (Cth)**

The University of Sydney welcomes the opportunity to comment on the provisions of the *Higher Education Research and Reform Bill 2014* (“the Reform Bill”) and related matters. Our submission is intended to complement and support the submission made by Universities Australia and the Group of Eight Universities.

Our submissions on the previous *Higher Education and Research Reform Amendment Bill 2014* argued that the Bill should be passed with amendments to: reduce the severity of the proposed cuts; continue to index HECS-HELP loans at the Consumer Price Index (CPI); and set aside for review the proposed introduction of tuition contributions for domestic higher degree by research students.

We are very pleased the Reform Bill addresses one of our major concerns with the previous Bill by retaining the CPI indexation of HECS-HELP. This will significantly reduce the future debt burden for students, while the proposed interest freeze for primary carers of young children also makes the Reform Bill fairer.

The proposed establishment of a cap on course fees for domestic students linked to the fees paid by international students, combined with the ACCC’s role in monitoring trends in prices, should keep a check on the fees charged by providers. The additional scholarship and structural adjustment packages for regional universities address concerns about potential impacts from the reforms on providers operating in thin markets, and on students from low socioeconomic backgrounds from these areas.

We continue to believe, however, that the Reform Bill would benefit from amendments to reduce or phase in the proposed 20 percent cut to public funding per student, and that the proposed introduction of tuition contributions for domestic higher degree by research students should be set aside for detailed review.

Passing the Reform Bill will benefit students. Students will continue to face no upfront tuition fees. The real value of their debts will not increase over time. There will be increased competition between existing and new providers, which will drive diversification, innovation and offer students more choice. Providers will be able to increase the quality of their educational offerings and significantly improve facilities and support services, while at the same time ensuring wider access to higher education.

As we noted in our comments on the previous Bill, the main factor deterring low socioeconomic background and regional students from higher education is not tuition fees, payment of which can be deferred under HECS, but the cost of living while studying.
Under the proposed reforms, providers would be able to offer more support to these students. During the debate on the previous Bill, we committed to providing financial assistance to up to a third of our students, if the reforms were passed. We are deeply committed to ensuring that the brightest students, regardless of their social or cultural background, should have access to a world class education.

Without the proposed reforms, further deterioration in funding for higher education is likely to leave in place the barriers that currently prevent access to higher education for lower socioeconomic background and regional students. In addition, the quality of the student experience will continue to decline, as may the international rankings and competitiveness of our universities, with flow-on impacts for the international education export market.

It is also likely that without these reforms, the cost to the taxpayer of supporting the large numbers of students expected to undertake higher education in the next few decades will increase significantly under a demand-driven system that encourages growth rather than a focus on quality and excellence. Some providers may also be forced to decrease the number of course offerings, dropping those that are costly to run, but of great significance to the economy and society.

The opportunity for significant structural reform in higher education does not come often. This Bill represents a once in a decade opportunity to improve the way the system is funded and operates. The debate on these reforms so far has demonstrated that views about higher education funding are strongly held across the community and political spectrum. However, it is crucial that Members of Parliament consider the evidence carefully when deciding the best possible outcome for students and the nation.

There is no need for further reviews at this time, beyond the two the Senate currently has underway. The evidence in support of the need for reform is contained in the reports of successive reviews dating back to the Bradley Review of 2008, the Crossroads Review of 2002 and many before it. The Base Funding Review of 2011 quoted the following extract from our submission at the time:

“The current cluster funding framework (based as it is on the Relative Funding Model – RFM – established over twenty years ago) has passed its use by date. We do not believe that further tweaking or short term fixes to the current arrangements will be sufficient to underpin in the long-term a high quality Australian higher education system.” Base Funding Review Report, 2011 p.38.

That review made a number of recommendations that would have addressed many of the sector’s challenges, but these were never actioned. Our position on the need for substantial funding reform has not changed since 2011. Recent reforms and large cuts to offset the cost of the demand-driven system only increase the need for reform and policy certainty.

We urge the Senate to pass the Reform Bill with amendments to:

1. remove or reduce the impact of the proposed cuts to Commonwealth funding;
2. set aside the proposed introduction of fees for higher degree by research students for separate consideration;
3. establish workable regulatory safeguards to ensure:
   a. equity of access to all providers by students from low socioeconomic and other disadvantaged backgrounds;
   b. any fee increases are reasonable and aligned transparently to each institution’s actual costs of service provision;
4. establish an independent expert body to report on the implementation of the reforms annually for at least the first three years from 1 January 2016.

Yours sincerely,

signature removed for electronic distribution

Dr Michael Spence
Vice- Chancellor and Principal
Dr Michael Spence  
Vice-Chancellor and Principal

27 February 2015

Senator Sue Lines  
Senator for Western Australia  
Chair, Senate Standing Committee on Education and Employment, References  
PO Box 6100  
Parliament House  
Canberra ACT 2600

By email: ecc.sen@aph.gov.au

Dear Senator Lines

*Higher Education and Research Reform Bill 2014 (Cth)*

The University of Sydney welcomes the opportunity to comment on the principles of the *Higher Education Research and Reform Bill 2014* ("the New Bill") and related matters. Our submission is intended to complement and support the submission made by Universities Australia and the Group of Eight Universities.

The University of Sydney supports the principles of the New Bill, and is encouraged to see that some of our major concerns with the previous Bill have now been addressed. We set out our position on New Bill in our 19 February 2015 submission to the Legislation Committee's review.

In particular, the New Bill continues to ensure that domestic undergraduate students pay no upfront tuition fees and that the real value of their debt capital will not increase over time.

The New Bill also introduces a market-based cap on the fees that providers may charge, with the ACCC to monitor charging practices. These changes should give comfort to those in the community who are concerned about the potential for unfettered price increases. We firmly believe that the system created by the Bill will drive competition between providers, increasing diversification and innovation, ultimately offering students better quality and more choice.

In addition, providers will be in a better position to provide financial assistance to those students for whom the prohibitive barrier to study is not fees, which can be deferred under HECS, but the cost of living while studying. This has the potential to greatly increase equity of access to higher education. In our case, we predict that under the proposed reforms we would be able to provide tailored financial aid packages to up to a third of our undergraduate students.

The case for reform has been made many times: in our previous submissions on these reform proposals; in those from Universities Australia and the Group of Eight; and in the many recent reviews of the higher education sector.

Uncapping undergraduate places in all courses except Medicine, has widened participation rates, and increased access to higher education for many students who would not have otherwise had the chance to study at this level. During a period when the Federal Budget has been under under considerable pressure, however, the demand-driven funding reforms have dramatically increased the cost of the Commonwealth Grant Scheme and student income support programs. This has resulted in a tendency to impose offsetting savings in scholarships and through blunt measures like efficiency dividends and a return to indexation rates that fall well short of actual increases in costs over time.
There has been no clear process for allocating commonwealth supported places for postgraduate coursework programs since demand-driven funding commenced in 2012. In that year, the University of Sydney provided a submission to the then Government's review of Commonwealth Support Places Allocation (available here) in which we argued that a hybrid model between 'fixed envelope' and demand-driven funding would strike the right balance between flexibility and stability for both providers and Government.

Unfortunately, neither the former or current government has been able to solve this important policy question, which continues to affect the day-to-day operations of providers. As a result, providers cannot plan their mix of courses with any certainty. If the proposed reforms are not passed in some form, and the current funding arrangements are to continue indefinitely, the process for making postgraduate CSP allocations will need to be resolved as a priority.

Other unforeseen consequences of the demand driven system include the impact the growth in enrolments across the sector in teacher education programs, the health disciplines and other professional fields where students must complete supervised work-based placements in order to graduate and meet registration standards. The growth in students in these disciplines (20-30 percent nationally) has resulted in significantly increased pressure on the availability, quality and cost of compulsory work-based placements. The University completed a scoping study on these issues in the health disciplines in 2013 to better understand the dimensions of the problem (available here). Such pressure is resulting in an increasing expectation that universities will provide financial support to health and education systems placing students, further increasing the demands on available funding for higher education.

As the cost of supporting domestic students through the Commonwealth Grants Scheme and HECS has risen, successive governments have also sought to offset such costs with cuts to research and infrastructure programs. Indeed, the survival of some of the funding programs (Future Fellowships and the National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy or NCRIS) critical to the national research and innovation system has been tied to the fate of the Bill currently before Parliament. This risks our research capacity, our international rankings, and potentially the future sustainability of the multi-billion dollar higher educational export market.

The reduction in support for research and research infrastructure is also adding to the financial burden on research-intensive universities, the majority of which are dealing with ageing infrastructure and significant backlog maintenance liabilities.

In short, the funding challenges the higher education sector faces can only be addressed by: increasing the burden to the taxpayer; asking students to increase the contribution they make towards their education through HECS; further cutting public funding per student; or reducing the numbers of Commonwealth supported students in the system. Doing nothing is not an acceptable alternative. The New Bill before the Parliament represents a once in a decade opportunity to improve the funding framework under which higher education providers operate.

Without action, a flawed demand-driven system in which funding bears no relation to actual costs, combined with impending demographic and industrial changes, will see the cost of the system to the government grow uncontrollably over the next 15 years. Under a continuation of the current system, the quality and international competitiveness of our higher education institutions is likely to continue a slow but inexorable decline.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Michael Spence
Recommendation

It is recommended that SEG and the Board note this update on the Research Infrastructure Review.

The Research Infrastructure Review

As SEG noted at the 5 February 2015 meeting, two reviews of infrastructure funding are currently underway. Commissioned by the Minister for Education, both reviews are chaired by Mr Philip Clark AM.

The Research Infrastructure Review panel held a consultation session on 18 February 2015, attended by myself and Greg Robinson, Director Campus Infrastructure and Services. The session was also attended by the Deputy Vice Chancellors (Research) of the University of New South Wales and the University of Technology Sydney. Prior to the meeting the review panel circulated the following discussion questions:

1. What do you see as the key challenges for research infrastructure in Australia? Are there significant and important opportunities that we should be capitalising on?
2. What research infrastructure – or infrastructure for research – does Australia need? What are the factors that should guide decisions on research infrastructure?
3. Is Australia’s national interest best served by the infrastructure presently available? If not, what is missing?
4. How can Australia plan and prioritise for the research infrastructure it needs going forward? Can your organisation respond to these needs? Are there technology, science and social drivers that should inform priorities?
5. In what circumstances could Australia become involved in international research infrastructure projects? How should these be prioritised?
6. If a principles based approach was to be used to prioritise support and creation of research infrastructure, what elements would you like to see covered in the principles?
7. Acknowledging that a regular process to identify long-term research infrastructure need is required, how should the process work and how often should such a process be undertaken?
8. There are currently different models for research infrastructure support. Do you have a view on any of the models currently in play?
9. Given the constrained fiscal environment, in what circumstances should the Commonwealth support research infrastructure?
10. What defines the infrastructure that should be provided on an open access basis? Do you have a view on user charging or cost recovery for research infrastructure?
11. Are there any other issues or matters that you believe should be considered by the Review?

While no written submissions were requested, the panel were happy to receive documents tabled on the day. Attachment A is the meeting brief we tabled with the panel.

The Review already appears well advanced. The panel advised that they reported to the Minister on 16 February on urgent matters, specifically the need to urgently release NCRIS funding for this year and
next, and for the Commonwealth to take over management of the Synchrotron facility. They expect to report next to the Minister at the end of May, a report that is likely to influence the 16/17 Budget process.

The discussion at the meeting focussed on the review’s draft recommendations, with the panel keen to garner stakeholder’s views as to the effective implementation of the recommendations. These recommendations have not yet been tested with the Minister and are ambitious, aimed at significantly improving research infrastructure funding and ensuring its ongoing provision.

The Chair of the panel also briefly discussed the University Infrastructure Review, which is expected to look at 'local level' research infrastructure. The University has now received a list of questions from the panel focused on this matter. We understand that the Group of Eight is organising a consultation session for this review, likely to be held on 2 April.

**Attachment A:** University of Sydney meeting brief for the Research Infrastructure Review (tabled for panel's use)

**Attachment B:** Letter from the reviewers for the University Infrastructure Review
RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE REVIEW: MEETING WITH REVIEWERS
18 February 2014

KEY POINTS

- The biggest outstanding need is to properly resource the ongoing operational costs of research infrastructure. The current environment of funding instability is making the retention and development of high-quality technical staff, for already established research infrastructure, increasingly challenging. Not only does this cohort of expert technical staff operate the equipment, but they refine and innovate the capability of the hardware and software, and provide critical advice to researchers and users through the full experimental cycle, from design to analysis. This is in addition to other costs of operation, and apart from any further capital investment that is necessary to upgrade or expand the facilities.

- The current funding model, whereby the renewal of infrastructure investment is made ad hoc, on a yearly basis, is causing the instability and loss of capacity identified above but also adds to the financial burden on the research-intensive universities, the majority of which are dealing with ageing infrastructure and significant backlog maintenance as a result of the need to find additional resources to support research projects funded through national competitive grant programs.

- The use of a set of agreed national strategic Science and Research Priorities is a reasonable way to prioritise the research infrastructure needed for Australia. The 2011 Strategic Roadmap for Australian Research Infrastructure provides a good example of this approach and this could be used to determine a longer-term, say 10 year plan to apportion funding to a number of large infrastructure projects. Within each project there could be some agility to respond to emerging needs during that time, but funding renewal on the infrastructure facility scale should only need to be sought approaching the end of that period.

- The NCRIS and Education Investment Fund (EIF) are both excellent long term strategic and sustainable models, but both have come under enormous pressure since the GFC, and particularly as the cost of the demand-driven funding system for university coursework teaching has blown out. We understand that while substantial EIF funds exist on paper, in reality the fund no longer exists, as the Department of Finance insists that any spending from it must be offset by other cuts from university programs.

- Resolution of the higher education funding reforms currently before the parliament is also critical to questions of sustaining investment in research infrastructure, given how reliant universities are on teaching revenues to cross-subsidise loss-making research activities – including research enablers.

- The University of Sydney has recently developed a new research infrastructure strategy and such that it can be a leader in this field, with several programs that provide good examples of the principles outlined above. These include our Core Facilities program, our Decadal Plan for Research Infrastructure and the SPARC approach exemplified in the Charles Perkins Centre, the Brain and Mind Research Institute and the Australian Institute for Nanoscale Science and Technology, all of which bring together interdisciplinary faculty from across the University and beyond, including partners in the health system, wider higher education sector and industry. These Centres address wicked problems relevant to the wider Australian community, serving both the needs of researchers and clinicians or industry at the same time. We believe such approaches could be translated to a national scale.
DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. What do you see as the key challenges for research infrastructure in Australia? Are there significant and important opportunities that we should be capitalising on?

   • The key challenge is maintaining operational funding for our research infrastructure facilities, particularly stable funding for personnel. Technical staff are often PhD level trained personnel and it is their expertise that mediates the capability of the facility. These are highly skilled people, to whom we must be able to offer stable career paths in order to retain them in Australia. The precarious nature of the operational funding for the major research facilities has already seen a loss of capacity, if this continues and we lose more of these staff, we may see a complete collapse of the current infrastructure facilities and a loss of our existing investment.

   • Addressing this problem was part of the motivation for the University of Sydney moving to a Core Facility model for our major research infrastructure. These facilities are centralised, allowing university-wide researcher access and providing a stable, ongoing funding platform to retain the technical expertise necessary to run the facilities. This allowed technical staff to be moved to continuing positions rather than being reliant on a particular faculty or research groups’ competitive grant funding results. In supporting these key facilities centrally, the University recognises their value to a broad, interdisciplinary, spectrum of researchers and encourages interdisciplinary collaboration.

2. What research infrastructure – or infrastructure for research – does Australia need? What are the factors that should guide decisions on research infrastructure?

   • Research infrastructure needs are best assessed via reference to a set of national, strategic Science and Research Priorities, such as that under consideration by the Commonwealth Science Council. Previous reviews of the NCRIS program, such as the 2011 Strategic Roadmap for Australian Research Infrastructure, assessed infrastructure facilities against strategic research priorities, a robust methodology that has much to recommend it.

   • The University of Sydney has found value both in the Core Facilities program and also in establishing a small number of pan-University Strategic Priority Areas for Research Collaboration (SPARCs). Examples of these include the Charles Perkins Centre, the Brain and Mind Research Institute and the Australian Institute for Nanoscale Science and Technology.

     o These are interdisciplinary, university-wide programs to address strategic thematic problems, supported in each case by an investment in a research and education hub to headquarter the program for its lifetime.

     o Faculty from across the University and beyond (including the wider health system and higher education sector and industry) can come together in these hubs to share research ideas and infrastructure to address these real-life problems, and then return to their host faculty, freeing up the facility for the next project.

     o This is an example of a way to establish infrastructure that can flexibly respond to the pressing issues of the day, encouraging collaboration while also ensuring relevancy to the wider Australian community.

3. Is Australia’s national interest best served by the infrastructure presently available? If not, what is missing?

   • There has been sustained underinvestment in research infrastructure in Australia. While some facilities are very good, across the board the ageing of our infrastructure means it is often substandard compared to international benchmarks.

   • This is linked to ongoing sustained underinvestment in university infrastructure, particularly in the research-intensive universities, the majority of which are dealing with ageing infrastructure and significant backlog maintenance as a result of the need to find additional resources to support research projects funded through national competitive grant programs.
• To identify what is missing, a good place to start would be with the NCRIS hubs themselves. The existing governance structure and requirements for all hubs require the boards to prepare outlooks, including detailed business cases for what the next steps for their infrastructure facility could be. These often have substantial quality intelligence and planning behind them, and are an active, ongoing, process.

4. **How can Australia plan and prioritise for the research infrastructure it needs going forward?**

   Can your organisation respond to these needs? Are there technology, science and social drivers that should inform priorities?

   • Lessons learned from the early days of the NCRIS program include the importance of a transparent, consultative process that involves key experts from across Australia. In addition, understanding the key problems of importance to the broader Australian community helps to focus and prioritise investment on behalf of both business and academia.

   • The University of Sydney’s SPARCs are excellent examples of this: in the Charles Perkins Centre (CPC), the Brain and Mind Research Institute (BMRI) and the Australian Institute for Nanoscale Science and Technology (AINST) there is a focus on solving bigger societal ‘wicked’ problems alongside community partners.

      - The external-facing nature of the SPARCs means the investment made in them is meeting a combination of research needs but is also able to translate outwards. In the case of the BMRI and the CPC they also provide clinical facilities and support services, while the AIN clean room will be useful to Australian industry.

      - The University’s development process for SPARCs ensures that business cases consider societal need as a major driver, and this has been successful in ensuring that community benefits result from research infrastructure investment.

   • One option the review may wish to consider is establishing a statutory body to oversee research infrastructure investment. Such a body would be independent of the Department of Education, which is appropriate given that research infrastructure is a cross portfolio area of interest, with Health, Industry and Science all key areas. The current approach where research infrastructure funding is administered by the Department of Education leads to it being considered a university funding source, rather than a resource for all of Australia. This results in various perverse outcomes: for example, we understand that while substantial EIF funds exist on paper, in reality the fund no longer exists as the Department of Finance insists that any spending from it must be offset by other cuts from university programs.

5. **In what circumstances could Australia become involved in international research infrastructure projects? How should these be prioritised?**

   • Cases where international collaboration makes sense are those in which: the research problem is such that a great number of researchers are required to solve it; the level of infrastructure investment necessary is very high; or the research problem being addressed is a truly global one.

   • Strategic prioritisation at the highest level of Australia’s involvement in major international research infrastructure is currently lacking. The ARC Linkage Infrastructure, Equipment and Facilities (LEIF) program goes some way to addressing this, though funding is limited at the few million dollar level per project. This makes it a limited means of seeing the bigger strategic picture.

   • It is certainly worthwhile being involved in international projects. There are many cases where there are researchers who will need to use cutting edge facilities that we may not have the ability to build here, or may not wish to, as such a facility would service only a small number of our researchers or local industry. Our involvement in such projects is also important in raising the international profile of Australian research.
6. If a principles based approached was to be used to prioritise support and creation of research infrastructure, what elements would you like to see covered in the principles?
   • Using a set of nationally agreed strategic Science and Research Priorities is a good basis to prioritise support for research infrastructure.
   • In addition, such principles should also address the question of stability, particularly for ongoing operational costs such as technical staff, while preserving the ability to respond to emerging research priorities with agility.

7. Acknowledging that a regular process to identify long-term research infrastructure need is required, how should the process work and how often should such a process be undertaken?
   • Noting the answer to 6, above, a useful approach may be to agree a 10-year plan for major research infrastructure facilities, and to allow some agility within those facilities to respond to emerging research priorities. This would provide a compromise between stability and agility, with a major review process built in at the end of the 10 year period to identify those facilities that are ready to conclude their operation, those that may need to expand, those that should continue and any new facilities that should be established. Annual reviews within facilities would allow flexibility within those centres to respond to emerging needs.
   • The University of Sydney is in the process of developing a Decadal Plan for Major Research Infrastructure that demonstrates some of these principles. The 10 year strategic roadmap will be reviewed annually to assess emerging needs, but will also provide stability of investment in centralised infrastructure, managed under the Core Facilities program.

8. There are currently different models for research infrastructure support. Do you have a view on any of the models currently in play?
   • The NCRIS and EIF are both excellent long term strategic and sustainable models but both have come under enormous pressure as a result of the GFC and particularly as the costs of the demand-driven funding system for university coursework teaching has blown out.
   • In general, funding research infrastructure through competitive grant funds attached to individual projects and research groups tends to result in duplication of purchasing, and can be responsible for ageing infrastructure and equipment. A much better approach is to centralise infrastructure funding so that such facilities can be provided in a Core Facilities style program, and used by multiple research groups. This reduces duplication, increases efficiency and encourages collaboration.
   • Where funding is cyclical in nature, tied to financial years and must be spent on penalty of a reduction in funding in the next year, this can drive bad behavior, encouraging spending that may not be strategic and best value for money. Introducing the flexibility to roll over funding would allow more dynamic, strategic decisions to be made.
   • The University of Sydney’s experience in moving to the Core Facilities program is that ad hoc funding on an emergency basis makes it difficult to demonstrate value. Since we centralised the facilities, we are now able to have transparent view of how funding to the facilities is divided between staff, equipment, and consumables and to map that against research impact generated by researchers who use the facilities.

9. Given the constrained fiscal environment, in what circumstances should the Commonwealth support research infrastructure?
   • We note the recently released report from Pricewaterhouse Coopers which predicts that Australia will no longer be among the world’s top 20 largest economies by 2050. To address this, they call for increased investment in science and research, and in STEM training.
   • The focus from government on increasing STEM education in our schools is admirable, but must also be accompanied by investment in the infrastructure to ensure that such students receive the very best research training, which allows them to go on to work in innovative industries that also utilise our research infrastructure.
Investment in research infrastructure is an investment in growing our economy and must be sustained even in constrained fiscal environments. This has been recognised by our competitors: in the US and the UK, even during the worst of the GFC, research investment was not only protected, but increased.

10. What defines the infrastructure that should be provided on an open access basis? Do you have a view on user charging or cost recovery for research infrastructure?

- Cost effective infrastructure operation will require a balance between access for various kinds of users. Co-investment with industry is often possible, but industry access is usually on a cost-recovery basis.
- For researchers, access tends to be subsidised but some user charges usually do need to be applied. Some balance is required here as costs may act as a disincentive.
- Allowing researchers to use competitive grant funding to access research infrastructure drives competitive behavior between research facilities, and allows researchers freedom of choice in determining the best facilities for their needs.
- Given the diversity of the research infrastructure supported by programs such as NCRIS, it would be appropriate for the mix of charges to be considered at the facility level, as part of the ongoing business plan for each hub.
Dear Dr Spence

HIGHER EDUCATION INFRASTRUCTURE WORKING GROUP CONSULTATIONS

Further to our letter of 15 December 2015, we are writing to provide you with some of our preliminary findings and the key issues in order to facilitate discussion when we meet with you shortly.

You will recall from our previous correspondence that the Working Group commissioned PhillipsKPA to undertake a review of universities’ finances and asset management practices based on data provided by universities for the period 2011 to 2013. Professor Bradley outlined some key findings at the 19 November 2014 meeting of the Australian University Senior Finance Officers Group (AUSFOG). A brief summary of the PhillipsKPA report findings is at Attachment A, with the full report at Attachment B for your information.

The Working Group also held discussions with capital markets experts during October-November 2014 and with philanthropy experts in December 2014.

The capital markets discussions pointed to a high level of interest by financial institutions in the potential for investment in the university sector. This is driven predominantly by the current high level of international and domestic capital seeking sustainable returns on investment, a perception that there is high growth and ongoing demand in the university sector, and a number of recent high profile bond issues by the larger universities.

In relation to philanthropy, the Working Group has been advised that only about 14 per cent of giving to Australian universities is for capital investment, a figure which is mirrored in other countries. Major donors are often motivated by a wish to achieve particular worthwhile social objectives and see the purpose of their donation, such as scholarships for talented or disadvantaged students, as a means to that end.

The PhillipsKPA report and our consultations to date provide an assessment of the scale and state of infrastructure, the level of investment in infrastructure and how the sector and individual universities are positioned to finance infrastructure into the future, as well as some external views on capital funding and financing.

In order to increase our understanding of the issues surrounding infrastructure funding and financing from universities’ perspective, we would like to discuss the following when we meet with you:
1. Do you have any observations on the PhillipsKPA findings?

2. Financial analysis points to a wide range of borrowing behaviour by institutions. Is there any evidence that institutional size and location matter for investment or are other factors in play?

3. The PhillipsKPA study has highlighted low rates of borrowing across the sector, as exemplified by the small number of institutions with gearing ratios above a conservative benchmark of 10 per cent. What are the principal reasons underlying low borrowing levels?

4. It appears that, in a period of very low interest rates and high liquidity, universities have been paying down debt. What are the reasons for this strategic choice?

5. Will it be more difficult in a more deregulated environment to justify internally the provision of funds for capital infrastructure to support research? If so, why? What can be done to improve this situation?

6. Are universities able to accommodate anticipated growth in student numbers within their existing space footprints by increasing space use efficiency? What will be the most important drivers of future capital investment?

7. It appears that universities are becoming increasingly free to make their own financial and commercial management decisions. For example, in New South Wales, universities no longer need to seek the approval of the Governor to borrow. Are universities in other states generally free to operate in a commercial manner or do some restrictions remain in place?

8. Are there impediments to taking a more strategic approach to the management of infrastructure by universities? What policy settings need to be in place to enable universities to fund their infrastructure into the future?

The Working Group considers that the consultation process is very important and we look forward to hearing your views. However, if you are unable to participate or would like to provide additional comments, please write to us at HEIWG@education.gov.au.

If you have any questions about the consultation process, please contact Ms Ditta Zizi, Branch Manager, Research and Higher Education Infrastructure Branch, Department of Education and Training on 02 6240 8432 or ditta.zizi@education.gov.au.

Kind regards,

Emeritus Professor Denise Bradley AC  Mr Philip Marcus Clark AM

19 February 2015
Summary of PhillipsKPA’s findings

- The total book value of property, plant and equipment (PPE), as recorded in university annual financial statements was $40.8 billion in 2013. Most of these assets were categorised as buildings and infrastructure ($26.9 billion) and land ($6.6 billion). Their asset replacement value in 2013, as reported to TEFMA, was $45.5 billion.

- The condition and functionality of buildings and infrastructure, as reported by institutions to TEFMA, varies across the sector. There is no obvious correlation between the overall condition or functionality of buildings and any particular university characteristic, such as the age of the institution.

- Space use efficiency across the sector, as measured by UFA/EFTSL, improved from 9.8 m² in 2010 to 8.7 m² in 2013. However, there is wide variation between universities, with space ranging from approximately 5 m² UFA/EFTSL to 20 m² UFA/EFTSL at an institutional level.

- Universities invested strongly in infrastructure over the period 2010-2013. They spent $10.6 billion on property, plant and equipment, with the book value of building and infrastructure increasing 23 per cent, to $27 billion. That investment was largely funded through surpluses generated from operations.

- Overall, universities remain highly liquid with significant cash reserves. Total financial assets increased from $9.9 billion in 2011 to $12.1 billion at the end of 2013. Net financial assets, after financial liabilities, increased from $6.8 billion to $8.1 billion.

- Significant borrowings over the triennium have been limited to a small number of institutions. Borrowing over the triennium was largely from banks, with central treasury corporations, state governments and Catholic development funds playing a minor role. Only two universities issued bonds during the triennium.

- Universities have adopted a number of other approaches to infrastructure development financing, particularly for student accommodation. These include Build-Own-Operate-Transfer (BOOT) arrangements and Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) arrangements in the form of service concession agreements and finance leases.
Report on Senate Matters

7.1 Report of the Senate meeting held on 23 February 2015

At its meeting held on 23 February 2015, I presented to Senate on the 2015 strategic priorities including the development of the University’s 2016 – 2020 Strategic Plan. My 2015 Year in Preview is attached for information.

(1) Senate decisions

Senate resolved to approve:

- in relation to items from the Vice-Chancellor’s report to admit the retired member of academic staff, Associate Professor Ross Drynan BAgrSc UQ PhD UNE to the degree of Master of Agriculture and Environment ad eundem gradum;
- the amendments to the Pro-Chancellor policy;
- the reappointment of Mr Robert Leece AO RFD as Pro-Chancellor and appointed Mrs Dorothy Hoddinott AO, Mr Peter FitzSimons AM and Mr Kevin McCann AM as Pro-Chancellor;
- the disestablishment of the Audit (sub) Committee of the Senate Finance and Audit Committee;
- the amendments to the Terms of Reference of the Senate Finance and Audit Committee;
- the amendments to the Constitution of the Human Resources Committee;
- the appointment of Professor Robert van Krieken to the Student Disciplinary Appeals Committee;
- the appointment of Ms Jordi Austin, as the reserve Fellow to the Student Disciplinary Appeals Committee;
- the appointment of Ms Catherine Lassen to the NSW Architects Registration Board;
- the appointment of Mr Simon Hill, to membership of the Buildings and Estates Committee;
- the appointment of Mr Dalton Fogarty, to membership of the Safety and Risk Management Committee;
- the appointment of Ms Ilana Atlas, to membership of the Finance and Audit Committee and the Human Resources Committee;
- the rescission of a first class Bachelor of Science (Advanced) (Honours) degree and University medal conferred on a student and awarded a Bachelor of Science (Advanced) Pass degree; and
- the appointment of Jill Baker, Baker & Baptist Consultants to assist the University in undertaking its 2015 Senate Evaluation.

[Members wishing to review any of the above reports to Senate should contact the Executive Officer to Senate via email mark.j.smith@sydney.edu.au]

(2) Other matters

Senate also noted at its February meeting the following items:

- at its next meeting on 13 April, the Vice-Chancellor will advise whether the student who received the rescission of a degree should face further re-enrolment sanctions and that the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) will supply information on the University’s student discipline policy and processes;
- the information provided regarding re-appointments to the Law Extension Committee; and
- the timetable for the Senate Staff Fellows elections.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal on matters considered by Senate at its meeting of 23 February 2015.
2015 YEAR IN PREVIEW

2015 is a year that has three main foci: to continue the implementation of the Strategic Plan 2011-2015; to report on progress and celebrate the significant achievements against the 17 strategic objectives of the Strategic Plan 2011-2015; and to develop the next five year Strategic Plan 2016-2020. In this process, we must both celebrate the achievements of the last five years and reflect on the hurdles that have affected the implementation of the current strategy. The first section of this Preview and Attachment A outline the major projects that we will be working on to advance the current Strategic Plan. The second section of this Preview and Attachment B outline the process that we will follow for the development of the 2016 – 2020 Strategic Plan.

SECTION ONE: THE ONGOING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CURRENT STRATEGIC PLAN

1. EDUCATION INITIATIVES

- An educational vision for the University of Sydney
- Simplifying our degree profile
- Implementation of the recommendations of the Working Group on eLearning and MOOCs
- A new model for professional learning and support for teaching and learning
- Cultural competence

Our work in 2015 will be guided by four key imperatives. The first is to settle on our conceptualisation of the distinctive character of a Sydney graduate and the curriculum framework necessary to deliver it. This is a necessary first step in transforming our educational offer: we need a coherent narrative of educational values and purpose, aligned with the University’s mission that can be communicated readily and embedded across all of our degrees.

The second key task is to develop a plan to simplify our educational offerings in a way that retains their outstanding intellectual breadth across fields of study, while also rendering coherent, attractive and navigable study pathways.

A third key task is to implement the recommendations of the 2014 Working Group on eLearning and MOOCs chaired by Professor Annamarie Jagose. This includes implementing MOOCs during 2015. Once implemented, these recommendations will deliver an integrated strategy for eLearning and learning and teaching more broadly, improved organisational arrangements for support of eLearning, and enhanced functionality of our supporting virtual infrastructure.

The fourth task is to implement a new model for the broader support of professional learning and innovation in teaching and learning. The purpose of the model is to promote educational excellence and innovation through more targeted, timely and effective support for academic staff.

A further key priority will be working across portfolios - in particular Education and Indigenous Strategy and Services - to embed cultural competence in the education offering. This will involve the development of a curriculum map for cultural competence in academic literacy and academic learning; the development of a resources portal; the enrichment of teaching resources; the implementation of agreed measures of evaluation; best practice modelling in key areas; leadership development for cultural competence innovators; and corporate memory work.
2. RESEARCH INITIATIVES

- Australian Institute of Nanoscale Science and Technology (AINST)
- Research and Rankings Strategy Implementation
- Sydney Health and Medical Research (HMR) Strategic Review
- ERA 2015

In research, we will focus on a number of flagship initiatives to ensure that we maximise our opportunities.

The Australian Institute for Nanoscale Science and Technology (AINST) will capitalise on the University’s broad capabilities in nanoscale science and technology. AINST will provide unique research and education facilities upon practical completion (on schedule for June 2015) and will then be known as the Sydney Nanoscience Hub (SNH). A $1 million AINST Accelerator Scheme is supporting 11 projects (selected from 41 submissions) from collaborative teams across Science, Engineering and IT, Medicine and Pharmacy. An initiating AINST leadership team is being appointed to continue the necessary community building work to fully establish AINST over the next two years, monitor progress on the AINST Accelerator projects and ensure that the SNH research laboratory capabilities are developed and utilised to maximum benefit. The AINST Business Case, AINST Vision & Structure, and the Sydney University Nanoscale Science and Technology Research Review Report are foundational documents that will guide the development of AINST.

The forthcoming launch of the University’s expanded Brain and Mind Research Institute (BMRI) is another significant milestone for 2015. As the second SEG approved Strategic Priority Area for Collaboration (SPARC) recommended by the 2013 Sydney Health and Medical Research Strategic Review (HMR Review), it will capitalise on our strengths in neuroscience and mental health issues. The new BMRI vision involves 44 academics across nine faculties who have actively collaborated to envision and define a shared strategic framework. Fellows will be advised of the date of the launch, likely to be in the first half of this year.

The allocation of almost $2 million in research funding across all four priority areas for collaboration identified in the HMR Review (obesity, diabetes and cardiovascular disease; cancer; mental health and neuroscience; and infectious diseases) will enhance our key research strengths in these priority research areas. In developing each of these strategic priority areas, the focus will be on supporting new research collaborations across the University and with our key strategic partners in hospitals and independent medical research institutes.

The launch of the BMRI as a SPARC and the $2 million investment in the HMR Review program represent the completion of key projects of the HMR Implementation Steering Committee (chaired by Professor Mick Reid) and supported by the HMR+ program management team in the DVC (Research) office. They are major steps toward the HMR vision for a highly integrated health and medical research program that spans from the laboratory to the clinic and community, with a focus on maximising the translation of the results of research into improved health care for individuals and communities. It is a key step towards realising the HMR Review’s vision for game-changing collaborative cross-disciplinary research that solves society’s significant health challenges. The investment of research funds into the SPARC areas has been especially well received by NSW Health, which has provided information on our initiatives into the consultation process of the Commonwealth Medical Research Institute Review.

3. LEADERSHIP AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

- Leadership training
- Initiatives for a safer, more inclusive, diverse community
- Program for the development of Women Leaders
- Workplace health and safety

As highlighted in our 2014 priorities, leadership and cultural development are strategically important and a continuing focus for 2015. It is recognised that this will require a significant investment and a long term approach. With the appointment of the Director Equity and Diversity Strategy in mid-2014, the University’s progress in this area will be accelerated during 2015. The size of the University’s leadership team indicates a need for highly skilled leaders with strong influencing skills. A leadership development strategy and capability framework has been developed and is under discussion; a women’s leadership strategy has been developed and is being implemented; and, an integrated
diversity and inclusion strategy will be implemented to determine the delivery of the Wingara Mura strategy, the Disability Action Plan, and the Women’s Career Acceleration and Leadership Strategy. We also have a program of work in the LGBTIQ area that will be begin with the launch of the ALLY network at the University on 3 March.

4. SPECIAL PROJECTS

GROWING WEST - A MULTIDISCIPLINARY CAMPUS IN WESTERN SYDNEY

The University will continue its leadership in health education, research and services with continuing and enhanced partnerships with the Sydney Local Health District (LHD), Northern Sydney LHD and other key parts of the public, private and rural health system, consistent with key recommendations of the HMR Review. A key focus will be to build on our work during 2014 with the Western Sydney LHD and Sydney Children’s Hospitals Network based at Westmead. The work will continue to develop the proposed Westmead Precinct Strategic Partnership and its objectives to integrate translational research and teaching into outcomes-focused health solutions through innovative health service design.

When Western Sydney boomed in the late 1960s, the University made the case to establish and lead health research and learning at the landmark new Westmead Hospital in the growing heart of Sydney. Projecting into the future, over the next 15 years, Sydney will grow by 1.6 million people including 900,000 more in Western Sydney. Demands for health services, tertiary education and research will grow, along with high consumer expectations, a thriving multicultural demography and the challenges of urban growth including chronic disease. While the University already attracts large numbers of students from Western Sydney, we can only deliver on our founding mandate if we lead new growth and strategic partnerships in this powerful economic, innovation and cultural engine-room.

In exploring the development of a Westmead University of Sydney Campus, there are clear opportunities to create a unique precinct where science and humanities collaborate in practical translational education and research with Western Sydney business, community, and international connections. Professor Chris Peck is leading this project and discussions with government and stakeholders, and will engage closely with University faculties in 2015 to maximize the alignment of faculty strategies with this globally unique Westmead campus model. In 2015, the University will invest in and pilot an Open Innovation Laboratory and develop a Master of Nursing to be delivered at Westmead from first semester 2016. The broader question of the development of a Westmead campus will become a focus area for discussions on strategic priorities for the next strategic plan.

PHYSICAL PRESENCE IN CHINA – SUZHOU

Establishing a physical presence in China is a logical and necessary next step if the University is to deepen its engagement with the Chinese higher education sector, strengthen its research partnerships with China’s leading universities, build trusted relationships with China’s business, government and community sectors, and enhance relations with Chinese alumni. A physical presence is key to relationship-building and engagement with China. It signals the University’s commitment to a substantial, firm and lasting presence in China and positions the University as a leader in intellectual exchange between our two countries.

Over the past eighteen months, the University has closely explored the option of establishing a multi-function centre (MFC). The multi-function centre is an emerging model in transnational higher education that is characterised by a strong academic mission to increase intellectual exchange and collaboration by facilitating staff and student exchange and mobility. This activity is supported on the ground by business activities designed to build institutional brand recognition and reputation and establish closer relationships with key communities and stakeholder groups.

In 2014, SEG agreed in-principle to accept the multi-function centre model as the basis for launching our activities more formally in China, and that Suzhou, on the perimeter of Shanghai, should to be the base for the Centre. It was agreed that the working party overseeing the development of the business case should pursue further conversations with Suzhou over 2014 to secure the terms of the arrangement. In early 2015, the working party, chaired by the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor, will present its final business case to the SEG for approval. The establishment phase of the project will be undertaken over a 12 month period. It is therefore, envisaged that the University will launch the Centre in Suzhou in China in 2016.
5. SYDNEY STUDENT AND THE REORGANISATION OF STUDENT ADMINISTRATION

- Services Delivery and reform
- Administrative Services Reform
- Student Recruitment & Admissions Implementation

With the appointment of Sara Watts, Vice-Principal (Operations) in 2014, we are working both to improve the effectiveness of the professional services units, and better to coordinate their activities. Each of the PSUs has unique circumstances, history and embedded capabilities. In regard to major project works, CIS has clearly aligned objectives, accountabilities, deliverables and processes in place to track and measure progress. The 2015 aim is to increase capability in the three other PSUs from a purely transactional approach to quality service delivery. The goal is to have a clearer focus on the implementation of current and future University strategic plans and to be in a position to support research and education initiatives. This involves, among other things, a significant reconsideration of operational governance to bring the services closer to the needs of the Faculties and other client groups.

The creation of a Project Management Office to support the delivery of major transformational projects will provide the University community with both the expertise and project governance framework for key projects. This will build institutional capacity and confidence in implementing large and complex projects. It will also ensure the intellectual property developed by the University is maintained in house.

In 2015, the University will move into the next phase of the student administrative services reform program, Sydney Student. The program team has managed the enrolments of all students for the first semester 2015 academic year, with issues triaged as they emerged. The work on bedding down and refining the user experience of the system will continue during 2015 under a competency centre, now known as Services Transformation (Sydney Student), effective 1 February 2015. While this work continues, the next phase of the project involves the design and implementation of an institution-wide student contact and enquiry handling centre that will build on the improvements implemented during 2014. It will also include the centralised provision of a number of key student administrative services. These include a whole-of-institution special considerations system, a whole-of-institution academic and administrative appeals system and a range of other initiatives relating to curriculum timetabling, examinations, scholarships, prizes and academic credit. In addition, a new whole-of-institution higher degree by research (HDR) student administrative services team will be created, delivering consistent service to all HDR candidates across all faculties of the University.

It is also important to continue the work on Student Recruitment and Admissions. During 2013, a change proposal calling for the creation of a single, whole-of-institution student recruitment and admissions group was approved by SEG. During 2014, the work was progressed and the Student Recruitment and Admissions Group completed its first full operational cycle. During 2015, the work of maturing the operating model for the Student Recruitment and Admissions Group will continue. In particular, a concierge service will be implemented to grow direct (non-agent) recruitment volumes from China, a new data analytics and reporting capability will be developed, and further admissions and recruitment business process reform will be implemented to improve conversion rates and support the strategy of recruiting the highest quality cohorts from a diversity of backgrounds to a greater diversity of the University’s programs and faculties.
SECTION TWO: DEVELOPMENT OF THE 2016 – 2020 STRATEGIC PLAN

Senate has the important role of endorsing the University’s 2016-2020 strategy. Senate will review a number of key strategic issues at each Senate meeting. In addition, Senate will consider the development of our next strategy at a special half-day session in May and again at our August retreat. The May meeting will test the emerging direction of the strategy and present preliminary findings from a University community survey. At the August retreat, Fellows will participate in discussions of the key planks of the strategy at a more fully developed stage. Senate will be asked to endorse the strategy in December so that preparation can begin for the launch of the strategy in March 2016.

As with the development of our current strategic plan, the process of setting the strategy will involve widespread consultation. However, this strategy will build upon the existing Strategic Plan, so issues for consultation will be able to be more focused, with the University community being given the opportunity to consider a number of specific proposals. One issue that will make the early stages of the development of the Plan more complex than it might otherwise be is the ongoing uncertainty of our government funding context.

A roadmap of the stages of the strategic planning process in 2015 is contained in Attachment B.
ATTACHMENT A: 2015 PREVIEW, Individual Projects

A. EDUCATION

1. An educational vision for the University of Sydney
This work will complete the first part of the project initiated with release of *Towards a distinctive Sydney education: a discussion paper* in October 2014, by settling on our conceptualisation of the distinctive character of a Sydney graduate and the curriculum framework necessary to deliver it. This is a necessary first step in transforming our educational offer; we need a coherent narrative of educational values and purpose that can be communicated readily and embedded across all of our degrees. Feedback from the University community suggests that there is broad agreement about the necessity of such a characterisation and an emerging consensus on many of its features.

2. Simplifying our degree profile
There is recognized value in simplifying our educational offerings in a way that retains their outstanding intellectual breadth across a rich constellation of fields of study, while also rendering coherent, attractive and navigable study pathways. The purpose of this project is to undertake the necessary planning work and secure agreement on preferred options.

3. Implementation of the recommendations of the Working Group on eLearning and MOOCs
The focus will be on implementing the working group recommendations which are intended to yield an integrated strategy for eLearning and learning and teaching more broadly; improved organisational arrangements for support of eLearning; and enhanced functionality of our supporting virtual infrastructure. A number of introductory MOOCs will be implemented in 2015.

4. A new model for professional learning and support for teaching and learning
The implementation of a new structure for the Education Portfolio is a response to the recommendations of two 2014 SEG Working Groups and will entail significant changes for the portfolio in 2015. It is proposed to re-organise the portfolio so that it can support an integrated and technologically-sophisticated range of services for professional development in teaching and learning and for support of quality and innovation in teaching and learning. The proposed operating model will involve working more closely with faculties to provide more tailored, coordinated, *in situ* and timely support of learning and teaching initiatives. Work to be completed in 2015 includes: the development of a coherent overarching framework for professional development for learning and teaching, including eLearning; the development of a suite of professional development resources for teaching and learning in support of best-practice technology-enabled pedagogical models; and the development of a blended model for ongoing delivery of professional development for teaching and learning.

5. Increasing capacity for experiential learning
The purpose of this work is to identify resource requirements and options for a major experiential learning initiative proposed as a cornerstone of the University's educational vision. There are two aspects to this work. The first is to develop a clear understanding of costs and associated staffing requirements for various experiential learning models. Experiential learning is a feature of high-quality education, having been demonstrated to have high impact on learning, but it does not necessarily scale well; our aim will be to understand the implications of models with demonstrated potential. The second aspect of the work will be to develop legal, policy, administrative and coordination resources to minimize the costs and maximise the effectiveness of faculty efforts to build greater scale.

6. Implementation of a new evaluation framework for teaching and learning
The new framework seeks to improve the effectiveness of our evaluation framework for learning and teaching by ensuring an appropriate suite of surveys and timely reporting; fostering a culture of responsiveness to feedback and utilization of available analytics; increasing capacity for national and international benchmarking; implementing new KPIs and targets for learning and teaching across the University; and completing the necessary policy work for smooth adoption of Blackboard Analytics later in 2015. Implementation of the framework involves: online delivery of a new smaller, revised Unit of Study Survey (USS) for every offer of a unit of study from Semester 1, 2015 and inclusion of the data in the AP&D process (completing implementation of the recommendation of the 2014 Working Group on Student Feedback chaired by Prof Joellen Riley); increased opportunities for national and international benchmarking; and rollout of Blackboard Analytics.
7. Academic enrichment for Higher Degrees by Research
In 2015, we will support the development of central resources for common needs identified through the Research Training Needs Analysis and seed new cohort-building activities including student-led cross-faculty research seminars.

8. In collaboration with ICT, establishment of the Educational Technology Incubator
We will build on the initial investment made in 2014 in educational innovation by collaborating with ICT to create an incubation capacity for innovative technology-enabled education projects. The Educational Technology Incubator (ETI) is intended to provide concentrated expertise and an efficient model for supporting, appraising and disseminating emerging innovations in teaching and learning. This capacity will provide initial support for software pilots and the development of high quality online resources, including for online units of study, blended learning models and MOOCs. It will also support and help to foster a culture of quality improvement and innovation and ensure that, where possible, the benefits of innovation can be realised across the University.

B. RESEARCH

1. Australian Institute of Nanoscale Science and Technology (AINST)
The AIN Building project will be completed by June 2015, with all educational spaces ready for use. A core set of laboratories, including specialized clean room facilities for nanofabrication and characterisation will also be complete. Space has been planned for recruitment of key personnel and the recruitment process is underway. The Australian Institute for Nanoscale Science and Technology (AINST), which will capitalize on these facilities, is supported with a vision document that articulates guiding principles and an organisational structure consistent with the University’s goals and strategies. A comprehensive business case for investing in and establishing AINST has been completed. A review of the University’s nanoscience capabilities also has been completed, and a special nanoscience accelerator program established with ~$1 million committed to 2015 ‘accelerator’ projects involving researchers from Science (Physics and Chemistry), Engineering and IT, and Medicine.

2015 will be a critical period during which we must recruit a number of key people, including the initiating AINST leadership team (the AINST Director, Director Sydney Nanoscience Hub and Research and Prototype Foundry (SNH & RPF), Director AINST Community Relations and the Hooke Chair of Nanoscience). Progress needs to be monitored for the accelerator projects, and the AINST strategy fully developed and implementation begun.

2. Research and Rankings Strategy Implementation
Work is continuing on the implementation of the key strategies and initiatives in The Sydney Research Strategy and International Rankings: an integrated, data-informed approach to enhance the University’s research performance and its position in key global university rankings. This includes supporting faculty-based discipline-oriented strategies through the DVC (Research) Compact process; continuing to invest in quality research facilities and infrastructure; enhancing arrangements to attract, retain and develop quality researchers; and growing and diversifying research income.

Core activities to underpin these investments are the work on data cleansing and verification to maximise the impact of our current and past research performance data in rankings outcomes, and establishing processes for using the discipline/subject area ‘benchmarks’ to identify top ranking researchers for recruitment and retention. In 2015 we plan to work with Thomson-Reuters to clean-up researcher affiliations and publications (in the same way as has been done with the Scopus database (Elsevier) in 2014) with the aim of seeing benefit particularly in the 2015 ARWU and potentially some additional benefit to the Times Higher Education (THE) rankings. Discipline-specific benchmarking against international benchmarks is now available and has been used to identify a number of researchers the University would like to recruit. We are aiming for between three and six strategic recruits for 2015.

In addition the Research Portfolio is working with Human Resources to provide data on individual research performance for all shortlisted Level E candidates. This enables selection committees to assess candidates in context with national and international researchers working in the same field. The data is also provided to the Academic Appointment Committee of Senate for their consideration in making appointments.
3. Sydney Health and Medical Research (HMR) Strategic Review
Implementation of the HMR Strategic Review will continue in 2015, focusing on bedding down the Brain and Mind Research Institute (BMRI) as the Strategic Priority ARea for Collaboration (SPARC) for mental health and neuroscience. Key activities for 2015 will be the appointment of the new executive roles and further development of the strategic plan and community building. In addition we are progressing the planning and development of cancer and infectious diseases as strategic priority areas. Work will also continue on deepening external engagement to foster SPARC development and outreach and to make Sydney’s growing strength in the SPARCs highly visible to health care providers (especially through Sydney Health Partners and at Westmead), industry and the community.

The appointments of the Vice-Principal (Operations) and Pro Vice-Chancellor (Strategic Collaborations and Partnerships), will enable more focused attention to be given to progressing development of the tools needed to manage the SPARCs, including harmonising leadership and governance arrangements as well as developing and implementing integrated university wide ‘end-to-end’ business processes and systems to support the SPARCs. A key deliverable for 2015 will be the tools for ‘horizontal reporting’ to enable monitoring and review at a ‘whole of university’ level of program outcomes and returns on investment against the SPARCs’ mission and business cases.

4. ERA 2015
The University’s ERA 2015 submission is due in April 2015 and we expect to be assessed in approximately 98 of the 157 ‘field of research’ (FoR) codes.

To ensure the ERA result for Sydney is optimised, substantial work is continuing on validating the discipline codings for research income and outputs. Under the leadership of the two ERA Stewards, Professors Geraint Lewis and Will Christie, all faculties are participating actively in the review of the University’s 46,000 research outputs, in reviewing and updating the staff lists of eligible researchers and in drafting explanatory statements. It is proposed that there would be value in establishing the ERA Stewards (one each for the citation and non-citation focused FoR codes) as continuing positions as these roles can provide valuable input into research outcome metrics and evaluation that is relevant to various policy frameworks (Commonwealth and internal), the research and rankings strategy and research data management.

Thirteen University academics have been nominated for Research Evaluation Committee (REC) panels.

We anticipate the ARC will announce the results of the assessment in late 2015.

5. Research Strategy Development
Work has commenced on a strategic analysis of the University’s capabilities and market opportunities in the areas of Food and nutrition security, Big data/data analytics and Materials Science and Engineering. The outcome of this analysis, due by 30 June 2015, will feed into the development of key research initiatives in the University’s next Strategic Plan. There are a number of indicators that suggest the University needs to be proactive in the data analytics space with a particular focus on health, geology, and astrophysics.

C. PROVOST’S PORTFOLIO
Three projects from 2014 – the Vet Hospital, our China presence and plant and animal sciences – will continue to be progressed during 2015. Some of the new priorities for 2015, however, include:

1. Operational Governance and the Reform of SEG
In light of the review of key services, I have asked the Provost and Vice-Principal (Operations) to oversee the implementation of the principles for service governance, which involves the creation of major service operational committees. This will have implications for some SEG committees and will lead to the review of the SEG governance arrangements, building a good platform for the new strategic plan.

2. Faculty Services Model
An integral part of the administrative services program in 2015 will be the development of an appropriate faculty services model. The Provost is the designated sponsor of this element of the program and as part of the ongoing services reform process, refinement of a faculty services model will be essential. An integral element of this process will be clearer definition of the core administrative
responsibilities of faculties, aiming to create greater consistency across faculties. This in turn should give us a greater understanding on the appropriate professional staffing levels for faculties and will assist in the development of more consistent business processes in faculties, supporting the alignment with the University's central enterprise services.

3. Faculty Management structure
The second layer of Faculty administrative personnel - Heads of School, Associates and Pro-Deans - are a critical and underutilised senior management resource. We have begun a Heads of School development program but will be reviewing the faculty management structures as there is a significant variety of faculty arrangements. Greater consistency (again mindful of the particular needs of some faculties, especially in the context of meeting accreditation and other professional requirements) will be essential for laying a platform for further work on academic governance, management, reform and sustainability.

4. Viability of Faculties
Some faculties, despite five years of effort under the current Strategic Plan, remain in significant deficit. During the year we will need to drive the sustainability process a lot harder for these outlying faculties to reassure SEG and Senate that at the end of 2015 they are in a position to make informed decisions about which faculties deserve ongoing cross-subsidy and at what level. This will require much closer focus on, for example, levels of administrative staff, staff-student ratios, and untapped revenue generation options. Detailed analysis of four or five faculties will underpin these discussions and will also require analysis of load trends, teaching performance, research performance and market and demand trends.

D. INDIGENOUS STRATEGY AND SERVICES

1. Increase Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander participation
During 2015, the focus will be on increasing Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander staff to 75 Academic and 97 Professional positions by 31 December 2015; increasing the number of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students by 100% by 31 December 2015; and promoting the alternative entry pathways such as the Cadigal, Pemulwuy and Breadwinners programs.

2. Research and Cultural Competency
A key initiative for 2015 was the recent appointment of a Director for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research including Academic and Operational staff and a Director for the National Centre for Cultural Competency. During 2015, we aim to negotiate new international partnerships to explore Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and knowledge and invite Visiting Thinkers to build staff cultural capability. Research, learning and teaching Aboriginal knowledge opportunities for key faculty members through personalised engagements is to be targeted and research translation and mobilisation through service learning opportunities to be expanded. By doing so, we will build greater positional value for the University through key external community, business and government level partnerships.

3. Curriculum Audit
A key focus will be to undertake a curriculum audit to implement Cultural Competence as a learning outcome and graduate attribute and enhance reporting and monitoring mechanisms of the Wingara Mura - Bunga Barrabugu Strategy. We also aim to improve the marketing and communication of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander history and activities at the University of Sydney.

E. VICE-PRINCIPAL (OPERATIONS) PORTFOLIO
The competency centre was established on 1 Feb 2015 to oversee the program now known as Services Transformation (Sydney Student) and Sarah Morgan has accepted a secondment into the role as Director, Services Transformation (Sydney Student). The SAS/ASP project will finalise scope on the 31 March 2015 and a tender is underway for the delivery of the next implementation phase.

In 2015, the portfolios will continue to partner with other Portfolios to implement and support the new governance and financial models that enable the success of these initiatives, such as:

• horizontal reporting capability;
• continuing to deliver improved levels of financial and business decision support to research institute and/or unit leaders:

• focusing on skilling our academic and research staff in work health and safety responsibilities, covering both physical and psychological health and safety;

• continuing to partner with DVC (Indigenous Strategy and Services) to create entry points and pathways for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander undergraduates, postgraduates and early career academics, through the development of Human Resources programs, ICT and financial incentives to faculties to encourage participation;

• completing the development and implementation of the staff development and capability plan, engaging with the DVC (Education) to develop the academic career path resources for academics;

• continuing to partner with, and listen to, key internal clients will deliver further key programs such as the delivery of student accommodation and new buildings (Abercrombie and AINST); and

• the continuation of improvements in events management processes, the Human Resources Service Centre and other support structures.

Specific projects in each of the four Professional Service Units (PSUs) include:

**Human Resources (HR)**

i. **HR Process and Technology Transformation**

This initiative combines step-change process and technology transformation to achieve operational effectiveness of the HR Service Centre. Improved efficiency and service levels will be achieved through:

• greater automation of HR processes;
• reducing the number of hard copy forms;
• simplified forms;
• increased online workflow management;
• increased capacity for employee and manager self-service;
• improved information management and storage;
• better data integrity; and
• improved reporting and analytics capability.

ii. **Deployment of new system to support Academic Planning & Development**

The design, build and testing of the new system to support the Academic Planning and Development (AP&D) process was a strategic focus in 2014 and the new system will be ready for deployment from January 2015. The deployment of the new system involves moving each faculty, on an agreed timetable, onto the new system to run the AP&D process and builds on the record level of completions this year.

iii. **Employee relations strategy and preparation for next round of enterprise bargaining**

Our approach to employee relations will focus on increasing levels of trust with our employees, improved consultation and engagement with staff and union representatives, and designing the strategy for negotiating the next enterprise agreement. A key desired outcome is a less fraught enterprise bargaining process in 2017.

iv. **Staff Engagement Survey**

The 2015 staff engagement survey is an important follow up to the 2013 survey. An effectively-managed communication of results and planned actions will ensure University-wide and organisational understanding of the outcomes. In addition, organisational units will be required to accept responsibility for their results and commit to addressing them.

v. **Safety, Health and Wellbeing**

A University safety, health and wellbeing culture championed by visible leadership will help shift the current safety culture from reactive to proactive. Key actions include; safety forums held with each
faculty leadership team, SEG safety leadership training, and the delivery of the University’s wellbeing framework.

**Information and Communication Technology**

**i. Digital Strategy Refresh**

In 2014, the implementation of our Digital Strategy began. This was to ensure we navigate the changes new technologies are bringing to the learning and research environment. This work will be reframed and redesigned during 2015. Technologies, including increasing access to high performance computing, electronic lab notebooks and collaboration tools will simplify data capture, processing and analysis, enhance the research effort and foster collaboration. Expanding formal and information learning spaces and remote lab capabilities will create more personalised and flexible learning environments. Base infrastructure will be improved through continued roll-out of the multiyear network upgrade and a Digital Strategy team will be created to connect academics to future technologies. In 2015, within this strategy, specific focus will be on:

- **Technology to Support Research**
  Deliver technology supporting research through addressing recommendations of the Health and Medical Research Strategic Review; complete the implementation of shared university high performance computing service and further expand research data store capacity.

- **Learning and Teaching Technologies**
  Support education through enhancements and improvements to learning management systems and refurbishment of formal and informal learning spaces.

- **Information and Administration Processing Systems**
  Upgrade, replace and develop information and administration processing systems including Financial system upgrade, HR systems roadmap, web improvement program technologies, Sydney Student Program, Alumni, Events & Philanthropy Administration and gift registry improvements and business process improvements.

- **Network and Wireless Upgrade**
  Continue the networks and wireless upgrade programs.

**Campus Infrastructure Services**

**i. Construction**

Construction of the Abercrombie Business School and student accommodation, the Queen Mary Building student accommodation and the AINST are due for completion for Semester 2, 2015.

**ii. Lodge DAs**

In line with the approved Campus Infrastructure Plan, lodge DAs for Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences, Faculty of Engineering & Information Technology (Stage1), and the Clinical School at Westmead.

**iii. Blackburn Precinct**

In line with the approved Campus Infrastructure Plan, develop a masterplan and business case to move the Faculties of Health Science and Nursing and Midwifery to join Medicine in the Blackburn precinct.

**Finance**

**i. Procurement transformation**

As a large part of Finance, the review of Procurement will continue to enhance and build capability to ensure streamlining, increased purchasing power and better management of contractors and suppliers.

**ii. Revisit University Economic Model (UEM) methodology**

The UEM was established under the current strategic plan. In designing and developing a strategic plan 2016 – 2020 the UEM will be reviewed in light of key operational learnings and developing strategies.

**iii. Redesign budget process**

The process is currently being reviewed with an intention to streamlining the 2015 process.
F. GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT

1. Regional initiatives program
Strengthen our engagement with key areas of the world by implementing the initiatives drawn up by the Regional Advisory Groups, in coordination with recruitment, alumni and development and international media activities.

2. Priority partnerships
Continue to develop the priority partnerships strategy initiated in 2014; provide support for those partnerships already established and ensure their quality assurance; undertake a review of institutional international agreements to enable a more informed approach to future partnership building.

3. Student mobility
Build on our institutional partnerships and networks to provide new international mobility opportunities for students, with a focus on identified priority regions.

4. Global networks
Ensure that our networks – WUN and APRU – deliver a sound return on investment.

5. Resource development
Identify new sources of support and funding for international collaborations.

G. INSPIRED – THE CAMPAIGN TO SUPPORT THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

In 2015 the INSPIRED Campaign is set to pass the $500 million mark in funds raised to support teaching and research across the University. The total number of donors to the Campaign will pass 40,000 by the end of February, making it the most widely supported, as well as the largest, fundraising campaign in Australian Higher Education history. Key initiatives this year will include an increase in the number of major giving proposals across the University, an expanded Giving Day (Pave the Way), refreshed Alumni Council and Alumni Awards programs, and an expanded volunteering program. Major giving activity will have an increasing emphasis on the opportunities created by the HMR+ program. The Development program, through the INSPIRED Campaign, will also be increasing efforts to engage academic leadership more closely in the fundraising process. 2015 marks the beginning of a new phase for the Sydney Alumni and Development program, in which the University will respond to the growing need to keep ambitions high, in order to retain its status as a national leader for fundraising campaign success.

H. MARKETING AND COMMUNICATIONS

In addition to supporting the strategic goals of the University, University-wide centres and portfolios, and each of the faculties, Marketing and Communications has five major projects for completion in 2015:

1. Rebuild and re-launch the University’s home page and major sections of the corporate website
This includes the new “About us” information and information for prospective and current students. The project has been based on current best-practice approaches to web design, and is underpinned by extensive research with users and consultation with stakeholders. The work, which will deliver a website more in keeping with the University’s leading position, will focus on meeting the information needs of external audiences, and has been enabled by the implementation of a new content management system that will provide an improved user experience and improved metrics.

2. Deliver an international marketing campaign
This will support the University’s student recruitment and reputation-enhancement goals. The campaign - the first coordinated whole-of-University international investment in marketing - will also support the DVC (Research)’s rankings strategy.

3. Run “Raising the Bar”
A series of public engagement events designed to bring academic expertise to the Sydney community will include “Raising the Bar”, a worldwide initiative aimed at making education a part of popular
culture through the creation of knowledge-driven events in venues across a city. The University of Sydney will present the first Australian Raising the Bar event in September 2015, following events in San Francisco and New York. The program complements our successful Sydney Ideas public program, and will further enhance and differentiate the reputation of the University for thought leadership, in particular with younger alumni and prospective postgraduate students.

4. **Launch a revised and improved Sydney Alumni Magazine (SAM)**
   This will provide better engagement with our alumni audience. The aim is to increase the magazine’s production quality, including photography, editorial content, layout and paper stock. SAM will be published twice a year, complemented by a monthly digital newsletter. A bespoke edition targeted towards older graduates will be introduced in the middle of the year.

The new SAM will:

- showcase the impact of the University on the wider world through the achievements and contributions of its alumni;
- reflect the life of the University through a personal, rather than an institutional lens; and
- deliver more popular and contemporary content with a richer visual presentation.

5. **Transition the University’s marketing collateral**
   To better support the “leadership for good” brand position and the associated new visual identity.
## ATTACHMENT B - STAGES of the STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1: SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS</th>
<th>Stage 2: LAUNCH STRATEGIC CONVERSATION</th>
<th>Stage 3: STRATEGY FORMULATION AND DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>Stage 4: TRANSLATE THE STRATEGY / ACCEPTANCE TESTING</th>
<th>Stage 5: LAUNCH THE STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### PURPOSE

**Stage 1:** Define the questions, hypothesis and methodology

**Stage 2:** Consultation, stakeholder input, data collection and analysis

**Stage 3:** Summarise findings through the strategic plan drafting process

**Stage 4:** Release the draft strategic plan and test community acceptance

**Stage 5:** Publish the results, communicate strategic direction and goals

### ACTIVITY

**Stage 1:**
1. Reflect on the strategic framework – vision, statement of purpose, values and strategic priorities
2. Articulate the leadership vision for the next five years and set the context for strategy setting in the University community
3. Establish process of stakeholder engagement
4. Develop the investigative questions
5. Commence situational analysis
6. Examine external and internal issues
7. Engage SEG and Senate on the strategy development approach
8. Establish with SEG a set of agreed core themes and options for consultation

**Stage 2:**
1. Commence the strategic conversation (strategy campaign) with the University community
2. Determine modes of data gathering, consultation approach and communications (multiple new technologies)
3. Engage academic advisory group for strategic intelligence
4. Engage ‘strategy secondees’ from across the professional portfolios (capability building)
5. Discuss strategic directions and preliminary results of survey at SEG and Senate strategy sessions
6. Establish process to continue the dialogue and layout the incremental development of the plan
7. Begin the process to align the strategy setting process with the budget / resource allocation process

**Stage 3:**
1. Present emerging themes of the strategy supported by empirical evidence
2. Develop and detail the sub-initiatives
3. Agree on Key Performance Indicators
4. Identify and assess resources
5. Solicit feedback on draft strategy and report back to stakeholders via various forums

**Stage 4:**
1. Discuss, refine and adjust (if required) after feedback from stakeholders
2. Clarify accountability and responsibilities
3. Establish the approach to implementation, monitoring and review

**Stage 5:**
1. Develop communication plan for the launch of the Strategy
2. Communicate the approach to strategy implementation, monitoring and review
3. Begin the process to develop and/or realign existing Faculty/Unit plans
9.1 Faculty of Dentistry: Amendment to Faculty Constitution

The Faculty of Dentistry has pointed out that the ex officio position of the President of the Sydney University Dental Undergraduates' Association is missing from its constitution.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board recommend that Senate approve the amendments to the Senate Resolutions relating to the Constitution of the Faculty of Dentistry with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.
9.2.1 Amendment to Faculty Constitutions: Faculty of Dentistry

Faculty of Dentistry

1. The Faculty of Dentistry shall comprise the following persons:

1.1 the Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry;
1.2 the Professors, Associate Professors, Senior Lecturers, Lecturers, and Associate Lecturers being full-time members of the teaching staff in the Faculty of Dentistry;
1.3 the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine;
1.4 the Professors, Associate Professors, Senior Lecturers, Lecturers and Associate Lecturers being fractional members of the teaching staff of half-time (0.5) or greater;
1.5 two members of the part-time academic staff at 0.4 and below, elected by and from the part-time academic staff of the Faculty appointed at 0.4 and below;
1.6 full-time members of the research staff of the disciplines of the Faculty of Dentistry and of the Institute of Dental Research who hold appointments of research fellow and above;
1.7 persons upon whom the title of Clinical Professor, Adjunct Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Clinical Senior Lecturer, Clinical Lecturer or Adjunct Lecturer has been conferred in accordance with the resolutions of the Academic Board;
1.8 not more than five students elected in the manner prescribed by resolution of the Senate;
1.9 The President of the Sydney University Dental Undergraduates’ Association, provided the President is enrolled as a candidate for a degree or diploma in the Faculty of Dentistry;
1.10 the President of the Oral Health Foundation within the University of Sydney;
1.11 the Area Clinical Director, Westmead Centre for Oral Health, the General Manager, Westmead Centre for Oral Health;
1.12 the Area Clinical Director, Oral Health (Eastern Zone), Sydney South Western Area Health Service and the Clinical Manager, Sydney Dental Hospital;
1.13 the Director of the Institute of Dental Research;
1.14 the Chief Dental Officer of New South Wales;
1.15 one nominee of each of the Royal Australasian College of Dental Surgeons and the Australian Dental Association (New South Wales Branch);
1.16 such other persons as may be appointed by the Faculty on the nomination of the Dean, for such period as determined by the Faculty;
1.17 such other persons as may be appointed by the Faculty as Honorary Members of Faculty on the nomination of the Dean, for such period as determined by the Faculty, in accordance with resolutions adopted by the Faculty at its meeting on 10 November 1995;
1.18 the President of the Dental Therapy Association and Dental Hygienists Association (New South Wales Branch);
1.19 the President of the Dental Alumni Society of the University of Sydney;
1.20 the Chairperson, Committee for Continuing Education in Dentistry;
1.21 former members of the Faculty upon whom the University has conferred the title of Emeritus Professor; and
1.22 Fellows of the University who were prior members of the Faculty of Dentistry.

2. The election of members pursuant to section 1.5 shall be held at the last meeting of the Faculty in each alternate year and the members so elected shall hold office from 1 January of the year following their election until the next election but conterminously with their membership of the part-time teaching staff.

3. Election of Honorary members of faculty (section 1.16)

3.1 Honorary members will be elected to the Faculty on the basis of conspicuous involvement in one or more of the following:

3.1.1 support of the interested and welfare of the Faculty or of a particular part of the Faculty's activities;
3.1.2 promotion of the academic purposes of the Faculty or facilitating these purposes in any particular activity of the Faculty;
3.1.3 fostering the links between the Faculty and other institutions within and outside Australia;
3.1.4 representation of the Faculty's needs for resources for its growth and diversification and supply of such resources;
3.1.5 any other activity deemed appropriate by the Faculty.

4. Nominations for consideration by the Faculty's Advisory Committee on Selection of Candidates for Honorary Members of the Faculty are invited annually. Nominations may be made by any member of the Faculty and must include a clear statement on the nominee's attainment, position and relationship to the Faculty with particular reference to the criteria outlines above.

5. The number of persons who may be elected each year shall be no more than four.
AGENDA ITEM 11
Report of the Graduate Studies Committee

11.2 Report of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on 11 March 2015
The Committee met on 11 March 2015 when there were present: The Chair (Associate Professor T Masters) presiding; Professor R Coleman, Mr S French, Associate Professor G Frost, Dr J Gullick, Associate Professor D Hamer, Dr A Harmer, Associate Professor D Hirsh, Associate Professor P Jones, Dr J Kavanagh, Associate Professor P McCallum, Dr M Melatos, Associate Professor K Nelson, Professor G Pearson, Mr T Scriven, Associate Professor T Stephens and Mr J Trendall. Mr S Brown, Associate Professor W Davis, Ms M Kemmis, Mr M McAneney, Ms L Rose and Mr J Tong 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

11.2.1 Proposals for new and amended postgraduate courses

11.2.1.1 Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning: Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts (Specialisation) E3-E6
The Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning is proposing to amend the Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts to introduce a 96 credit point version, the Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts (Specialisation), with specialisations in Audio and Acoustics, and Illumination Design.

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts to add a 96 credit point Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts (Specialisation);
(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 Architecture, Design and Planning; 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.

11.2.1.2 Faculty of Science: Master of Philosophy E7-E10
The Faculty of Science is proposing to introduce the Master of Philosophy, which will replace the existing Master of Science (Research) (a deletion proposal for the MSc will be submitted at a later stage). The Master of Philosophy will provide the Faculty of Science with a path to the PhD complementing the existing pathway from its honours programs.

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to introduce the Master of Philosophy;
(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 Science; and
(3) approve the introduction of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

11.2.2 Minor course amendment proposals

11.2.2.1 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: Master of Human Rights and Democratisation (Asia-Pacific) E11
The Faculty of Art and Social Sciences is proposing to amend the Master of Human Rights and Democratisation (Asia-Pacific) to generalise the section on collaborating institutions and amend the requirements for award of the degree.
Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Human Rights and Democratisation (Asia-Pacific);
(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.

11.2.2 Faculty of Dentistry: Doctor of Dental Medicine
The Faculty of Dentistry and Student Recruitment and Admissions have advised that the English language requirements for the Doctor of Dental Medicine should be listed as an overall IELTS score of 7.0 with a minimum of 6.0 in each band. The original proposal for the course did include this information but also advised that the English language requirements would be the same as the University standard (i.e. an IELTS score of 6.5).

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the English language requirements for the Doctor of Dental Medicine as an overall IELTS score of 7.0 with a minimum of 6.0 in each band as set out in the report presented.

11.2.3 Guidelines for HDR Scholarship Allocations
The Chair of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee advised members that the sub-committee has developed revised guidelines for HDR scholarship allocations based on the principles approved by the Academic Board at its meeting of 3 December 2014. The draft guidelines have already been used in one scholarship allocation round and will be used again at the sub-committee’s meeting of 9 April 2015, however further work will be done to the guidelines before they are referred back to the committee and the Academic Board for approval.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note that the Committee has endorsed the use of the draft guidelines for HDR scholarship allocations at the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee meetings of 11 December 2014 and 9 April 2015 and that a final version of the guidelines would be submitted to the Academic Board meeting of 13 May 2015.

11.2.4 Proceedings of the Committee
The Committee also:
• noted a discussion on proposed changes to HDR Student Administration;
• noted and confirmed the action of the Chair in admitting to candidature and appointing examiners for one candidate in the Doctor of Veterinary Science in the Faculty of Veterinary Science;
• noted the reports of the PhD Award Sub-committee meeting held on 3 February and 24 February 2015;
• noted the report of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-committee meeting held on 11 December 2014; and
• noted the report of the Academic Board meeting of 11 February 2015.
11.2.1.1 Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning: Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts (Specialisation)

Resolutions of the Senate

1. Degrees, diplomas and certificates of the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning.

(1) With the exception of the Doctor of Science in Architecture 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 Architecture, Design and Planning. The Doctor of Science in Architecture and the Doctor of Philosophy are provided and conferred according to the rules specified by Senate and the Academic Board.

(2) This list is amended with effect from 1 January, 2016. 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>CA002</td>
<td>Doctor of Science in Architecture</td>
<td>DScArch</td>
<td>Published Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB000</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC082</td>
<td>Master of Philosophy (Architecture)</td>
<td>MPhil(Arch)</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC050</td>
<td>Master of Architectural Science</td>
<td>MArchSci</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC150</td>
<td>Master of Architectural Science</td>
<td>MArchSci</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC165</td>
<td>Master of Architecture</td>
<td>MArch</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC033</td>
<td>Master of Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>MHeritCons</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC055</td>
<td>Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts</td>
<td>MIDEA</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC151</td>
<td>Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts (Specialisation)</td>
<td>MIDEA</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC034</td>
<td>Master of Urban and Regional Planning</td>
<td>MURP</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC035</td>
<td>Master of Urban Design</td>
<td>MUrbanDes</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC137</td>
<td>Master of Urbanism</td>
<td>MUrbanism</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH020</td>
<td>Bachelor of Design in Architecture*</td>
<td>BDesArch</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH024</td>
<td>Bachelor of Architecture &amp; Environments*</td>
<td>BArchEnv</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH009</td>
<td>Bachelor of Design Computing*</td>
<td>BDesComp</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*may be awarded with honours following a further year of study
^may be awarded with honours in an integrated program

3. 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>CH023</td>
<td>Bachelor of Design in Architecture* / Bachelor of Laws*</td>
<td>BDesArch/LLB</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH046</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering^/ Bachelor of Design in Architecture*</td>
<td>BE(Civil)/BDesArch</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Graduate diplomas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title &amp; stream</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CF050</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Architectural Science</td>
<td>GradDipArchSci</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF033</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>GradDipHeritCons</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF0565</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Interaction Design and Electronic Arts</td>
<td>GradDipIDEA</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF034</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Urban and Regional Planning</td>
<td>GradDipURP</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF035</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Urban Design</td>
<td>GradDipUrbDes</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF037</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Urbanism</td>
<td>GradDipUrb</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5. Graduate certificates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title &amp; stream</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CG050</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Architectural Science</td>
<td>GradCertArchSci</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG003</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>GradCertHeritCons</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG0565</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Interaction Design and Electronic Arts</td>
<td>GradCertIDEA</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG004</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Urban and Regional Planning</td>
<td>GradCertURP</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG005</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Urban Design</td>
<td>GradCertUrbDes</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Graduate Certificate in Interaction Design and Electronic Arts
Graduate Diploma in Interaction Design and Electronic Arts
Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts

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 2010 (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 and stream title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CG055</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Interaction Design and Electronic Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF055</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Interaction Design and Electronic Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC055</td>
<td>Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC155</td>
<td>Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts (Specialisation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Attendance pattern
The attendance pattern for this course is full-time or part-time according to the student choice.

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

4. Embedded courses in this sequence
The embedded courses in this sequence are:
- the Graduate Certificate in Interaction Design and Electronic Arts
- the Graduate Diploma in Interaction Design and Electronic Arts
- the Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts
- the Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts (Specialisation)

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
(1) Available places will be offered to qualified applicants based on merit, according to the following admissions criteria.
(2) Admission to the Graduate Certificate in Interaction Design and Electronic Arts requires a bachelor’s degree from the University of Sydney or an equivalent qualification.
(3) Admission to the Graduate Diploma of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts requires:
   (a) a bachelor’s degree from the University of Sydney or an equivalent qualification; or
   (b) completion of the requirements of the embedded graduate certificate with a WAM of at least 70.
(4) Admission to the Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts or Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts (Specialisation) requires:
   (a) a bachelor’s degree from the University of Sydney or an equivalent qualification with a credit average mark across all units; or
   (b) completion of the requirements of the embedded graduate diploma; or
   (c) completion of the requirements of the embedded graduate certificate with a weighted average mark of at least 70.

6. Requirements for award
(1) The units of study that may be taken for the courses are set out in table G.
(2) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Certificate in Interaction and Electronic Arts, a candidate must complete 24 credit points, including:
   (a) minimum 18 credit points of core foundational units of study; and
   (b) maximum 6 credit points of elective units of study.
(3) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Diploma in Interaction Design in Interaction Design and Electronic Arts, a candidate must complete 48 credit points, including:
   (a) minimum 18 credit points of core foundational units of study;
   (b) minimum 18 credit points of core advanced units of study; and
   (c) maximum 12 credit points of elective units of study.
(4) To qualify for the award of the Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts, a candidate must complete 72 credit points, including:
   (a) minimum 18 credit points of core foundational units of study; and
   (b) minimum 18 credit points of core advanced units of study;
   (c) minimum 12 credit point capstone unit of study; and
   (d) maximum 24 credit points of elective units of study.
(5) To qualify for the award of Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts (Specialisation), a candidate must complete 96 credit points, including:
(a) minimum 18 credit points of core foundational units of study; and
(b) minimum 18 credit points of core advanced units of study;
(c) minimum 12 credit point capstone unit of study; and
(d) minimum 24 credit points of core specialisation units; and
(d) maximum 24 credit points of elective units of study.

7. Specialisations
(1) Completion of one specialisation is a requirement of Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts (Specialisation) course. A specialisation requires the completion of at least 24 credit points chosen from units of study listed in the table for that specialisation. The specialisations available are:
(a) Audio and Acoustics
(b) Illumination Design

8. Course transfer
A candidate for the master’s degree or graduate diploma may elect to discontinue study and graduate with a shorter award from this embedded sequence, with the approval of the Dean, and provided the requirements of the shorter award have been met.

9. Transitional provisions
These resolutions apply to students who commence their candidature after 1 January, 2016.
11.2.1.2 Faculty of Science: Master of Philosophy

Resolutions of the Senate

1. Degrees, diplomas and certificates of the Faculty of Science

(1) With the exception of the Doctor Science 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 Science. The Doctor of Science and the Doctor of Philosophy are provided and conferred according to the rules specified by Senate and the Academic Board.

(2) This list is amended with effect from 1 January, [YEAR]. 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>RHSCIENC-01</td>
<td>Doctor of Science</td>
<td>DSc</td>
<td>Published Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPPHDSCI-01</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASIENC-01</td>
<td>Master of Science*</td>
<td>MSc</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Master of Philosophy</td>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASCPSOCO-01</td>
<td>Master of Science in Coaching Psychology</td>
<td>MSc(CoachPsyc)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMASCMG-02</td>
<td>Master of Marine Science and Management</td>
<td>MMarSciMgt</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAENVSCI-01</td>
<td>Master of Environmental Science</td>
<td>MEnviSci</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAENSCLA-02</td>
<td>Master of Environmental Science and Law</td>
<td>MEnviSciLaw</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMEDPHY-01</td>
<td>Master of Medical Physics</td>
<td>MMedPhys</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANUTDIE-01</td>
<td>Master of Nutrition and Dietetics</td>
<td>MNutrDiet</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASUSTAI-01</td>
<td>Master of Sustainability</td>
<td>MSust</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAACLIPSY-01</td>
<td>Master of Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>MCP</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLPIARSC-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Liberal Arts and Science**</td>
<td>BLAS</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPMEDSCI-02</td>
<td>Bachelor of Medical Science**</td>
<td>BMedSc</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPBPSYCHO-02</td>
<td>Bachelor of Psychology**</td>
<td>BPsych</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPSCIENC-02</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science**</td>
<td>BSc</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced**</td>
<td></td>
<td>BSc(Advanced)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Mathematics**</td>
<td></td>
<td>BSc(Advanced Mathematics)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No new admissions

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

3. 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>BPBCOMSCI-02</td>
<td>Bachelor of Commerce* and Bachelor of Science*</td>
<td>BCom/BSc</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPBESMSCI-02</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education (Secondary: Mathematics)^ and Bachelor of Science*</td>
<td>BEd(Sec:Maths)/BSc</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPBESISCI-02</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education (Secondary: Science)^ and Bachelor of Science*</td>
<td>BEd(Sec:Science)/BSc</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPBENGMSC-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering^ and Bachelor of Medical Science*</td>
<td>BE/BMedSc</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPBENGSCI-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering^ and Bachelor of Science*</td>
<td>BE/BSc</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPBSCIART-02</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science* and Bachelor of Arts*</td>
<td>BSc/BA</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPBSCILAW-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science* and Bachelor of Laws^</td>
<td>BSc/LLB</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. 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>MACLPPHD-01 / RPHDSCI-04</td>
<td>Master of Clinical Psychology and Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>MCP/PhD</td>
<td>96/Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPSCAMED-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science (Advanced)* and Doctor of Medicine</td>
<td>BSc(Adv)/MD</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPMSCMED-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Medical Science* and Doctor of Medicine</td>
<td>BMedSc/MD</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPSCINUD-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science* and Master of Nutrition and Dietetics</td>
<td>BSc/MND</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### 5. Graduate diplomas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title &amp; stream</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNPSYCOA-01</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Coaching Psychology</td>
<td>GradDip(CoachPsyc)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNMAASCAMG-02</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Marine Science and Management</td>
<td>GradDipMarSciMgt</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNENVSCI-02</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Environmental Science</td>
<td>GradDipEnviSci</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNMEDPHY-01</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Medical Physics</td>
<td>GradDipMedPhys</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNPSYCHO-02</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Psychology</td>
<td>GradDipPsych</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNSCIENC-01</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Science</td>
<td>GradDipSc</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNSUSTAI-01</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Sustainability</td>
<td>GradDipSust</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Graduate certificates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title &amp; stream</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCPSYCOA-01</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Coaching Psychology</td>
<td>GradCert(CoachPsyc)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCMASCMG-01</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Marine Science and Management</td>
<td>GradCertMarSciMgt</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCENVSCI-01</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Environmental Science</td>
<td>GradCertEnviSci</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSCHEIPS-01</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Science (History and Philosophy of Science)</td>
<td>GradCertSc(HPS)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSSUSTAI-01</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Sustainability</td>
<td>GradCertSust</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Master of Philosophy
These resolutions must be read in conjunction with applicable University By-laws, Rules and policies including (but not limited to) the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (the ‘HDR Rule’), the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended), and the Academic Board policies and procedures for Higher Degrees by Research including, but not limited to, Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013, Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Policy 2015 and Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Procedures 2015

Course resolutions
Part 1: Preliminary
1 Course codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course and stream title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CODE</td>
<td>Master of Philosophy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2: Admission requirements
2 Eligibility for admission to candidature

(1) Subject to sub-clause (2) and (3), to be eligible for admission by a Dean or Associate Dean to candidature for the Master of Philosophy, an applicant must hold or have completed all the academic requirements, in a subject area related to the proposed course of advanced study and research, for a University of Sydney:
(a) Master’s degree; or
(b) Bachelor’s degree with honours; or
(c) Bachelor’s degree with a result of at least a Credit grade in the senior level unit(s) of study relevant to the proposed area of research.

(2) A Dean or Associate Dean may admit to candidature an applicant who does not meet the requirements of sub-clause (1), provided that the applicant holds a qualification or qualifications that, in the opinion of the Faculty Postgraduate Research Committee are equivalent to those prescribed in sub-clause (1).

(3) The Dean or Associate Dean may impose on a student admitted to candidature pursuant to sub-clause (2) such conditions as the Dean or Associate Dean considers appropriate.

3 Application for admission to candidature

(1) An applicant for admission to candidature for a Master’s degree must submit to the Faculty:
(a) a proposed course of advanced study and research approved by the Head of Department, in which the work is to be undertaken;
(b) satisfactory evidence of the applicant’s eligibility for admission; and
(c) a statement certifying the applicant’s understanding that, subject to the HDR Rule and Academic Board policies and procedures for Higher Degrees by Research, 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 Control of candidature

The HDR Rule specifies the conditions for the control of candidature by the University.

6 Appointment of supervisor

The Head of Department will appoint supervisors for each candidate in accordance with the HDR Rule and Academic Board policies and procedures for Higher Degrees by Research.

7 Other studies during candidature

(1) Each student will complete a Training Needs Analysis no later than the end of the first research period of their enrolment.

(2) The Head of Department may from time to time require a student to attend, undertake or complete assessment for lectures, seminars, courses or practical work during the course of the candidature, in accordance with the HDR Rule. This may include enrolment in units of study. These requirements will be informed by the Training Needs Analysis

8 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: Enrolment and progression

9 Probation
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.

10 Time limits, earliest and latest submission dates
(1) A full time student may not submit a thesis for examination earlier than the end of three semesters (HDR Rule) of enrolled candidature and a student who has undertaken all of his or her candidature on a part-time basis must not submit his or her thesis for examination earlier than the end of the third year of enrolled candidature.
(2) Where a student has undertaken his or her candidature as a mixture of part-time candidature and full-time candidature, a part-time semester will be counted as the equivalent of one half of a full-time semester, and the student must not submit his or her thesis for examination earlier than the end of one and a half equivalent full-time years of enrolled candidature.
(3) The HDR Rule specifies the latest completion times and submission dates for full- and part-time candidates in this course. The latest date for submission of thesis is normally the end of the fourth full-time semester of enrolment (or equivalent).

11 Mode of attendance
The attendance pattern for this course is full-time or part-time as approved by the Dean.

12 Discontinuation of candidature
A candidate may discontinue enrolment in the degree subject to the conditions specified by the HDR Rule.

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

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

15 Progress
A candidate is required to maintain and demonstrate satisfactory progress towards the timely completion of the degree. Progress will be reviewed at intervals no longer than one year according to the provisions of the HDR Rule and Academic Board policies and procedures for Higher Degrees by Research.

Part 5: Requirements

16 Degree requirements
(1) To satisfy the requirements of the degree candidates must:
(a) Satisfactorily complete any specified requirements of admission or probation;
(b) Satisfactorily complete any prescribed units of study, or other studies, as required by the Head of Department. Completion is defined as demonstrating a level of knowledge or competency of skills appropriate and essential for satisfactory progress of the research project;
(c) conduct research on an approved topic; and
(d) submit a document embodying the results of the research as a thesis that passes the examination.

17 The thesis
(1) A candidate shall produce a thesis that meets the requirements specified in the HDR Rule and Academic Board policies and procedures for examination of Higher Degrees by Research.
(2) The required length of the thesis is a total upper limit of 50,000 words, as described in the Academic Board policies and procedures for examination of Higher Degrees by Research.

Part 6: Examination

18 Examination of the thesis
(1) Examination of the thesis will be conducted in accordance with the HDR Rule and Academic Board policies and procedures for Higher Degrees by Research.

19 Award of the degree
The degree is awarded at the Pass level only.
11.2.2.1 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: Master of Human Rights and Democratisation (Asia-Pacific)

MINOR COURSE AMENDMENT PROPOSAL
FACULTY/BOARD OF STUDIES: FACULTY OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
Contact Person: Danielle Celermajer
Date: 9 February 2015

1. Name of award course
Master of Human Rights and Democratisation (Asia-Pacific)

2. Purpose of proposal
To amend the 2015 Degree Resolutions for the Master of Human Rights and Democratisation (Asia-Pacific) by errata

3. Details of amendment
Section 4, titled 'Collaborating Institutions', as follows:

4 Collaborating Institutions
(1) This course is offered in collaboration with the following other academic institutions (subject to change) in the Asia-Pacific with whom inter-institutional agreements have been established:
(a) Gadjah Mada University (Indonesia)
(b) Kathmandu School of Law, Purbanchal University (Nepal)
(c) University of Colombo (Sri Lanka)
(d) Ateneo de Manila University

Section 6(2), titled 'Requirements for award', as follows:
(2) Candidates for the Master of Human Rights and Democratisation (Asia Pacific Regional Program) are required to complete 60 credit points, including:
(a) a minimum of 24 credit points of core units of study to be completed at the University of Sydney;
(b) 6 credit points of core units of study to be delivered in intensive mode by any one or combination of the institutions participating in teaching the degree (i.e., the University of Sydney and collaborating institutions) a minimum of 24 credit points of units of study to be undertaken at (a) collaborating institution/s including 18 credit points of elective units of study as a research component comprising either a dissertation or an internship;
(c) a minimum of 12 credit points of core units of study; to be undertaken at one of the collaborating institutions.
(d) a minimum of 12 credit points of core elective units of study.

4. Transitional arrangements
No students currently involved in the degree will be affected. The MHRD (Asia-Pacific) has a semester 2 commencement structure and all current students (2014-15 cohort) are completing their final units of study. The next cohort (2015-16 cohort) is due to commence in semester 2 2015. The cohort predominantly comprises EU funded scholarship holders (20 students in total) who we are already in communication with. The scholarship cohort and full-fee paying students will be advised of the changes via email, the MHRD (Asia-Pacific) website and our dedicated and comprehensive degree handbook.

5. Other relevant information
The proposed amendments are considered to be minor. They allow the program design to accommodate identified funding and capacity risks, which compromise the delivery and quality of the program. The changes allow students to access additional curriculum at the University of Sydney (if funding ceases or if they desire) which has equivalency to the curriculum offered in the region. Students may still opt a traditional curriculum pathway offered through the current 2015 degree resolutions.

6. Signature of Dean
12.2 Report of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee meeting held on 4 March 2015

The Academic Standards and Policy Committee met on 4 March 2015, when there were present: Associate Professor D Traini (Chair), presiding, Associate Professor J Barrett, Mr K Blakeney, Dr I Gelissen, Associate Professor P Gibbens, Ms K Henderson, Associate Professor P McCallum, Dr C Owens, Ms P Rozenberg, Dr R Saunders, Associate Professor C Sutton-Brady, Professor G Tolhurst and Professor K Trigwell. In attendance were: Mr T Greenwell, Ms M Kemmis, Ms S Paynter (Committee Officer) and Ms F Seeto.

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

12.2.1 Learning and Teaching Policy Framework

The Committee discussed the proposed terms of reference for the Learning and Teaching Policy Framework Working Party, noting that the Chair of the Academic Board would chair the group and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) would be a member.

Members agreed to recommend that the proposed consultation strategy be broadened to include appropriate PSU’s and relevant support staff within faculties.

The Committee nominated Associate Professor Catherine Sutton-Brady to the Working Party and would be nominating a further two ASPC members to join the Group.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the Committee’s report on its discussion of the Learning and Teaching Policy Framework Working Party.

12.2.2 Professional Placement Policy Working Party

The Committee noted that the Professional Placement Policy would not be included within the group of policies considered under the Learning and Teaching Policy Framework Working Party as it required an individual focus as it involved multiple external stakeholders and was written to cover the academic and administrative requirements of professional placements.

Members resolved to seek clarification on whether student representatives would be invited to participate on the Working Party and if not, would suggest that the membership be amended to include them.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the Committee’s report on its discussion of the Professional Placement Policy Working Party.

12.2.3 2015 Guidelines for managing the Opt-Out process for lecture recordings in University-managed lecture theatres

The Committee discussed the opt-out guidelines at length, focusing on issues of privacy and intellectual property, equity and access for students, specifically appropriately meeting the needs of students with a disability and the quality of the student learning experience.

It was noted that for staff in certain faculties this was the first time they had experienced mandatory recording of lectures whilst for other teaching staff it had become a regular part of their teaching practice. Members agreed that the recording of lectures meant that certain may be required to reframe their teaching approaches and the use of political and/or culturally sensitive content to evoke specific learning experiences, to ensure that such references would not be taken out of context.

The issue of appropriate delegation in faculties to grant permission to opt-out of lecture recording was discussed; specifically whether this should be the Dean, Head of School or Associate Dean Learning and Teaching and what the scale of work would be. Members talked through the scenarios where there would be automatic opt-out which included a lecture given by a non-employee of the University, bloke mode teaching, a lecture which formed part of a flipped learning experience and any student presentations.
The suggestion was made that resources could be better used to support the production of a professional set of recorded lectures which academics would be happy to circulate. It was noted however that the guidelines set out to support students with a disability stipulated that these students required access to the actual recording of the lecture.

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board note the Committee’s report on its discussion of the 2015 Guidelines for managing the Opt-Out process for lecture recordings in University-managed lecture theatres.

12.2.4 Proceedings of the Committee

The Committee also noted:

- the report of the Academic Board meeting of 11 February 2015;
- an update on the proposed amendments to the *University of Sydney (Academic Governance)* Rule 2003 (as amended);
- an update on policy reviews and developments;
- an update on the Higher Education Standards Framework; and
- an update on Education and Research policy Developments.

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board note the report on the Committee’s proceedings.
13.1 Academic Promotions Policy and Procedures 2015
The Academic Board is asked to endorse the attached Academic Promotions Policy and Procedures 2015.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board endorse the Academic Promotions Policy and Procedures 2015, as set out in the report presented.
ACADEMIC PROMOTIONS POLICY 2014

With the approval of the Academic Board, the Vice-Chancellor and Principal, as delegate of the Senate of the University of Sydney, adopts the following policy.

Dated: _______ 10 January 2014

Last amended: 10 December 2014 Insert date

Signature:

Name: Dr Michael Spence
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1 Name of policy

This is the Academic Promotions Policy 2014.

2 Commencement

This policy commences on 1 January 2014.
3 Policy is binding

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

4 Statement of intent

This policy:

(a) sets out the principles upon which, and the process by which, the University promotes its academic staff; and

(b) provides for the fair and consistent application of absolute indicators of academic performance, benchmarked across disciplines and against institutions of similar international standing.

5 Application

This policy applies to:

(a) all academic staff employed by the University on a continuing or eligible fixed term contract basis who wish to apply for promotion to a higher grade of employment; and

(b) holders of conjoint titles who wish to apply for a higher conjoint title.

Note: See Honorary Titles Policy 2013.

6 Definitions

Academic Board nominee means an individual selected from the list of Academic Board nominees published by the Academic Board on the University website.

Note: As at the date of this policy, this list is available at http://sydney.edu.au/provost/promotions.shtml

additional member means a member of a committee appointed as such in accordance with the committee’s terms of reference.

Note: See Schedules 2 & 3 of this policy.

assessor means an expert in an applicant’s field of expertise, external to the University and of high international standing, who is requested to provide an expert assessment of the work of an applicant for promotion to Level E, in accordance with clause 14 of this policy.

CPC means Central Promotions Committee.

day means calendar day.

delegate means a person or persons holding delegated authority from the Senate to undertake a particular action, as set out in the University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule.
2010 (as amended).

Director means, as appropriate, a director of a University centre or institute.

effective date means 1 January each year in the case of annual promotions rounds, and from the first pay period after the contract is signed for “out of round” promotions.

Head of School includes, where there is no Head of School, a person nominated by the relevant Dean to undertake the role and responsibilities of a Head of School under this policy.

LPC means Local Promotions Committee.

“out of round” promotion means a promotion resulting from the process specified in clause 17 of this policy.

promotion means movement from one grade of academic employment to another, higher grade. It does not refer to role changes within a single grading.

reserve member means any member of a committee appointed as such in accordance with the committee’s terms of reference.

Note: See Schedules 2 and 3 of this policy.

7 Promotion generally

(1) The University is committed to equal employment opportunity, and promotion opportunity, for all staff. It does not discriminate against employees (including in promotion) on the grounds of:

(a) sex;
(b) pregnancy;
(c) race (including colour, ethnic background or national identity);
(d) marital status;
(e) disability;
(f) sexual preference;
(g) transgender status;
(h) political or religious belief; or
(i) age.

(2) The University expects that, during their careers, all academic staff will:

(a) be active in research and scholarship; and
(b) be committed to and participate in research-enriched teaching.

(3) Each academic staff member is appointed to a position at a particular level, classified from Level A to Level E. Within these levels staff undertake particular roles, which may vary over time and over the course of a career.

(4) There are three streams for promotion:

(a) teaching and research;
(b) education-focussed; and
(c) research-focussed.

(5) Promotion committees must ensure that each applicant’s achievements are assessed relative to their opportunities to undertake tasks as compared to other members of staff at an equivalent level. This will include consideration of the impact of factors such as:

(a) part-time or fractional employment;
(b) significant parenting or other caring responsibilities; or
(c) clinical responsibilities.

(6) Promotions commence as from the next effective date.

(7) A promotion approval does not constitute an extension of employment in circumstances where the staff member’s employment does not extend beyond the next effective date.

(8) The level of remuneration consequent upon a promotion will be determined by the relevant delegate, and will generally be at the first level of the payment scale applicable to the new appointment. An LPC or CPC may make recommendations in relation to remuneration.

(9) The academic promotion process will be administered by the Academic Promotions Unit.

8 Eligibility for promotion

(1) Academic staff at Levels A to D may apply for promotion if:

(a) their appointment is continuing; or
(b) their fixed term contract extends to the end of the year in which application is being made; and
(c) they have completed an academic planning and development or performance management and development review in the past fifteen months.

Note: See Performance Planning and Development Policy 2012.

(2) Fractional and conjoint appointees may apply for promotion, and their applications will be assessed against the requirements expected for the relevant level, adjusted in terms of opportunities.

(3) Where a position is funded by a grant, eligibility for promotion will depend on the grant conditions governing the funding of employment. Staff holding such positions may only apply for promotion under this policy if the applicable grant does not:

(a) specify the classification or salary level; or
(b) prohibit personal promotion.

9 Criteria for promotion

(1) The Provost may, in procedures associated with this policy, publish normative criteria setting out the achievement expectations for each level of academic employment. Staff considering applying for promotion should refer to any such criteria when constructing their application for promotion.
(2) Applicants must provide:
   (a) evidence of their capacity to perform at the level to which they are seeking
       promotion; and
   (b) clear evidence of an upward trajectory in their performance, such as would
       warrant advancement to the next level of employment.

(3) Applicants must demonstrate achievement of at least the minimum standards set
    out in Schedule 1 to this policy.

10 Applying for promotion

(1) The Academic Promotions Unit will determine the closing date for applications for
    academic promotions, and will publish this date on the University website at least
    six weeks in advance.

(2) A staff member may apply for promotion in any stream, regardless of their current
    role or appointment.

(3) Applicants may change the stream in which they seek promotion provided that
    notice of such change is provided to the Academic Promotions Unit within any
    specified time limit.

(4) Applications must be provided to the Academic Promotions Unit in the form and
    manner, and with the content, specified in the procedures.

(5) In exceptional cases, applicants for promotion below Level E may apply to be
    promoted two levels.

(6) Applicants must provide details of a sufficient number of referees to enable at least
    three referees’ reports to be provided.

(7) The Academic Promotions Unit will notify each applicant of:
   (a) the membership of the LPC which will consider their application;
   (b) the membership of any CPC which will consider their application;
   (c) in the case of Level E, the names of assessors who will report on their
       application; and
   (d) any changes to committee memberships or assessors.

(8) An applicant may make written objection to the membership of either the LPC or
    CPC, or an assessor, no later than seven days after notification.
   (a) All objections must be made in writing and provided to the Academic
       Promotions Unit.
   (b) Objections will be determined by the committee Chair or, if the objection is to
       the Chair, by the Provost.
   (c) If the objection is upheld the applicant will be notified of the outcome in
       writing and a new LPC/CPC member or assessor will be nominated.
   (d) Any subsequent objection to a replacement LPC/CPC member or assessor
       must be lodged in writing and provided to the Academic Promotions Unit no
       later than four calendar days after notification.

(9) Applicants are not entitled to nominate members of LPCs, CPCs or assessors.

(10) An applicant may update his or her application once only in the manner
    provided in the procedures. Responses to requests for clarification do not
    constitute updates.
11 Local Promotions Committees

(1) All applications will initially be considered and assessed by an LPC.
(2) Applications may not be considered unless at least three referees’ reports have been obtained.
(3) Applicants from centres outside the normal faculty structure will be assessed by the LPC for the faculty which in the opinion of the Provost is most relevant to the centre.
(4) Each LPC is formed under the authority of the Provost and serves a faculty or group of faculties, as the Provost deems appropriate.
(5) The Academic Promotions Unit, in consultation with the relevant Deans, will convene LPCs and determine the optimum number of such committees.
(6) Separate LPCs will consider applications for promotion to each level.
(7) LPCs will be constituted, and have the terms of reference and operation, as specified in Schedule 2.
(8) The membership of each LPC will be determined as follows.
   (a) The Chair of each LPC will provide a list of recommended committee members, including reserves, to the Provost for approval.
   (b) The Provost must approve any subsequent changes to LPC memberships, other than minor changes which may be approved by the Executive Manager of the Office of the Provost.

12 Central Promotions Committees

(1) The following applications must be considered by a CPC in addition to an LPC:
   (a) all applications for promotion to Levels D or E;
   (b) any application for promotion to Level C which is recommended by an LPC convened for a single faculty and which has considered only applicants from that faculty.
(2) CPCs will be convened by the Academic Promotions Unit.
(3) Separate CPCs will consider:
   (a) applications for promotion to Levels C or D; and
   (b) applications for promotion to Level E.
(4) CPCs will be constituted, and have the terms of reference and operation, as specified in Schedule 3.

13 Assessing applications for promotion to Levels B to D inclusive

(1) When notified by the Academic Promotions Unit of the applicants for promotion from their school, the Head of School will:
   (a) verify each applicant’s teaching and research student supervision activities;
   (b) prepare and submit to the Academic Promotions Unit a written report on each applicant; and
   (c) discuss the content of their report with each applicant.
(2) Where a Head of School is also an applicant for promotion, the relevant Dean will nominate another member of the school or faculty to provide reports on applicants for promotion to the level to which the Head of School seeks promotion.

(3) The Academic Promotions Unit will:
   (a) provide each applicant with a copy of the relevant Head of School’s report; and
   (b) verify with the applicant that the relevant Head of School has discussed the report with them.

(4) Applicants may provide a written response to the Head of School’s report if they wish. The Head of School is not entitled to submit any further reply or response.

(5) As soon as possible after receiving applicants’ details from the Academic Promotions Unit, the Chair of each LPC will:
   (a) check with each member of the committee that he or she has no conflict of interests in considering any of the applications;
      Note: For the definition of conflict of interests, and further details of the University’s expectations about such matters, see the External Interests Policy 2010. For the avoidance of doubt, a committee member will have a conflict of interests if they act as a referee or assessor for an applicant to be considered by their committee.
   (b) consider each possible conflict of interests and, if necessary, appoint a replacement member for the committee; and
   (c) arrange one preliminary and one final committee meeting, and advise all members (including reserve and additional members) and the Academic Promotions Unit of the dates, times and places of the meetings.

(6) The relevant LPC chair will notify applicants at least seven days in advance of the preliminary and final LPC meeting dates.

(7) LPCs for promotion to Levels B-D will meet twice, being:
   (a) once for a preliminary meeting to discuss each application and to determine what, if any, further information is required from applicants; and
   (b) once for a final meeting at which final decisions are made about whether or not to recommend each applicant for promotion.

(8) LPCs will not interview applicants other than for Level E, except with the express authorisation of the Provost.

(9) Each of these meetings will be conducted in the manner specified in the procedures.

(10) No applicant may be recommended for promotion without the number of votes in favour being at least twice the number of votes against promotion.

(11) The LPC may recommend that:
   (a) an applicant who applies for promotion by two levels be promoted by only one;
   (b) an applicant who would not be promoted in the stream for which they have applied be promoted in another stream where appropriate.

(12) The LPC Chair, in consultation with the core members of the committee, will prepare a final report on the committee’s decisions in the format and with the content prescribed in the procedures.
(a) Appropriate sections of the report must be sent to the additional member for comment.
(b) The report must be endorsed by each member of the committee in writing or by email.

(13) The Academic Promotions Unit will provide copies of LPC reports to the relevant delegate:
   (a) for approval, in the case of promotions which do not need to be considered by a CPC; or
   (b) for confirmation that the report is in correct form and provision to the CPC Chair, in the case of promotions which need to be considered by a CPC.

(14) The CPC Chair will consider the LPC report and discuss any concerns about procedural matters with the Chair of the relevant LPC.
   (a) The CPC Chair may then, if necessary, request further reporting from the LPC or direct the reconvening of the LPC and the provision of a new report.
   (b) Any such request or direction must be made in writing and conveyed through the Academic Promotions Unit.

(15) As soon as possible after receiving the final LPC report, the CPC Chair will:
   (a) check with each member of the CPC that he or she has no conflict of interests in considering any of the applications;
      Note: For the definition of conflict of interests, and further details of the University's expectations about such matters, see the External Interests Policy 2010. For the avoidance of doubt, a committee member will have a conflict of interests if they act as a referee or assessor for an applicant to be considered by their committee.
   (b) consider each possible conflict of interests and if necessary appoint a replacement member for the committee; and
   (c) arrange for the committee to meet, and advise all members (including reserve and additional members) and the Academic Promotions Unit of the date and time.

(16) CPCs will meet once, and the meeting will be conducted in the manner specified in the procedures.

(17) No applicant may be recommended for promotion without the number of votes in favour being at least twice the number of votes against promotion.

(18) The CPC may consult the Chair of the relevant LPC in considering any application, and must do so before making a final decision not to endorse an LPC recommendation. The LPC Chair will attend the CPC meeting for this purpose if required but may not be present for, or take part in, any vote.

(19) Where an applicant has applied for promotion by two levels, the CPC may endorse promotion by only one, even if the LPC has recommended promotion by two.

(20) The CPC may recommend promotion in a stream other than the stream in which an applicant has applied if:
   (a) the CPC believes the alternative stream to be more appropriate; and
   (b) the CPC is not prepared to endorse a recommendation for promotion in the stream applied for.
(21) The CPC Chair will provide a written statement to the LPC Chair on any decision not to endorse an LPC recommendation, including reasons. The LPC Chair will provide a copy of this statement to each member of the relevant LPC.

14 Assessing applications for promotion to Level E

(1) No Head of School report is required for applications for promotion to Level E.

(2) LPCs will meet only once to consider applications for promotion to Level E at which meeting they will:

(a) interview applicants; and

(b) make final decisions about whether or not to recommend each applicant for promotion.

(3) As soon as possible after receiving applicants’ details from the Academic Promotions Unit, the Chair of the LPC will:

(i) nominate to the Provost an assessor and a reserve assessor for each application, ensuring that each nominee has first agreed to participate, and to comply with applicable time frames if the nomination is approved;

(ii) check with each member of the committee that he or she has no conflict of interests in considering any of the applications;

Note: For the definition of conflict of interests, and further details of the University’s expectations about such matters see the External Interests Policy 2010. For the avoidance of doubt, a committee member will have a conflict of interests if they act as a referee or assessor for an applicant to be considered by their committee.

(iii) consider each possible conflict of interests and, if necessary, appoint a replacement member; and

(iv) arrange for the committee to meet, scheduling sufficient time for a 40 minute interview of each applicant plus discussion time;

(v) advise all members and the Academic Promotions Unit of the date, time and place of the meeting.

(4) The Provost must approve each assessor.

(5) The relevant LPC Chair will provide each applicant with at least seven days’ notice of the date, time and place of the interview.

(6) The LPC must interview each candidate for promotion to Level E.

(7) No candidate may be recommended for promotion without the number of votes in favour being at least twice the number of votes against promotion.

(8) The LPC Chair, in consultation with the core members of the committee, will prepare a final report on the committee’s decisions. The report must:

(a) be endorsed by each member of the committee in writing or by email; and

(b) provide a detailed explanation for the committee’s decision on each applicant.

(9) The CPC Chair will consider the LPC report and discuss any concerns about procedural matters with the LPC Chair.

(a) The CPC Chair may then, if necessary request further reporting from the LPC or direct the reconvening of the LPC and the provision of a new report.
(b) Any such request or direction must be made in writing, through the Academic Promotions Unit.

(10) As soon as possible after receiving the final LPC report, the CPC Chair will:

(a) check with each member of the CPC that he or she has no conflict of interests in considering any of the applications;

Note: For a definition of conflict of interests, and further details of the University’s expectations about such matters, see the External Interests Policy 2010.

(b) consider each possible conflict of interests and, if necessary, request the relevant nominator (as specified in Schedule 3) to appoint a replacement member; and

(c) advise all members and the Academic Promotions Unit of the date, time and place of the meeting.

(11) The CPC Chair will advise the applicant of the date and time of the CPC meeting.

(12) CPCs will meet once and the meeting will be conducted in the manner specified in the procedures.

(13) No applicant may be recommended for promotion without the number of votes in favour being at least twice the number of votes against promotion.

(14) The CPC may consult the Chair of the relevant LPC in considering any application, and must do so before making a final decision not to endorse an LPC recommendation. The LPC Chair will attend the CPC meeting for this purpose if required, but may not be present for, or take part in, any vote.

(15) The CPC Chair will provide a written statement to the LPC Chair on any decision not to endorse an LPC recommendation, including reasons. The LPC Chair will provide a copy of this statement to each member of the relevant LPC.

15 Approving promotions

(1) Promotions recommended by LPCs and CPCs must be approved by the relevant delegate.

(2) The Academic Promotions Unit is responsible for providing delegates with the relevant recommendations.

16 Annual promotions rounds

(1) The Academic Promotions Unit will call for applications for academic promotions annually. Applications for Level E will only be called for at this time.

(2) Some faculties may elect to conduct a further promotions round for promotions below Level E, in which case the Academic Promotions Unit will also call for such applications.

17 “Out of round” promotions

(1) An “out of round” promotion may be initiated by any of:

(a) a Head of School;

(b) a Dean;
(c) a Director;
(d) the Provost; or
(e) the Vice-Chancellor;

if:

(f) a valuable staff member has been offered an appointment at another institution; and

(g) the University wishes to offer promotion as a retention strategy.

(2) Submissions requesting “out of round” promotion must be prepared and lodged with the Academic Promotions Unit in the manner specified in the procedures.

(3) The Provost must be satisfied that a genuine offer has been made, and give approval for an “out of round” committee to be convened.

(4) Submissions for “out of round” promotion will be considered by the following committees:

(a) For promotion to Levels C or D:
   (i) The Provost, or nominee (Chair);
   (ii) The Chair of the Academic Board, or nominee;
   (iii) The relevant Dean, or nominee.

(b) For promotion to Level E:
   (i) The Vice-Chancellor, or nominee (Chair);
   (ii) The Provost, or nominee;
   (iii) The Chair of the Academic Board, or nominee;
   (iv) The relevant Dean, or nominee.

(c) Where the originator of the submission would otherwise sit on the committee, a nominee must be appointed.

(5) The relevant committee will assess the submission as expeditiously as possible, applying the standards and criteria for the applicable position specified in this policy and the procedures.

(6) The committee may adopt a unanimous recommendation by circulation. Otherwise a meeting must be held, at which a submission will be recommended if supported by a simple majority of votes.

(7) The Academic Promotions Unit will forward the recommendation to the relevant delegate.

(8) Where promotion is recommended and approved, only one offer may be made.

### 18 Appeals

(1) The only basis for appeal against an academic promotion decision is if:

   (a) there has been a significant breach of this policy; and
   (b) it can be demonstrated that this may have affected the outcome of an application.

(2) No appeal is available from an “out of round” promotion submission.

(3) Potential appellants should:
(a) within 14 days of receiving notice of the outcome of their application, meet with the relevant LPC Chair and at least one of:
(i) their Head of School;
(ii) the relevant Associate Dean (or equivalent);
(iii) the Dean;
and
(b) within a further seven days, meet with the CPC Chair (if the application was considered by a CPC);
and
(c) within a further seven days, submit a formal appeal if they still intend to proceed.

(4) Appeals will be determined by:
(a) the Provost, for applications for promotion to Levels B or C; or
(b) the Vice-Chancellor, for applications for promotion to Levels D or E.

(5) Appeals must be submitted by letter, and no further materials may be submitted after the appeal is lodged.

(6) If the Vice-Chancellor chaired a CPC the subject of an appeal, the Vice-Chancellor will nominate a Deputy Vice-Chancellor to consider the appeal.

(7) In deciding an appeal, the decision maker will have regard to:
(a) the applicant’s letter setting out the basis of the appeal;
(b) the application for promotion;
(c) reports submitted by referees, Head of School and or assessor, as applicable;
(d) LPC report;
(e) CPC recommendation, if applicable; and
(f) any other information expressly sought by the decision maker.

(8) The decision maker will determine only the issues stated in subclause 18(1), and will not reassess the application for promotion.

(9) If the appeal is upheld, the application will be reconsidered in accordance with the provisions of this policy.

(a) The application will be reconsidered by the LPC and CPC which originally considered it.
(b) Committee members whose conduct has constituted the basis of the appeal must not participate in the reconsideration.
(c) If fewer than three quarters (to the nearest whole number) of an original committee is available, reserve committee members will be used. If, including reserve members, there are still fewer than three quarters (to the nearest whole number) of an original committee available, the Chair will appoint the required number of new committee members.
(d) The reconsidering committee(s) will refer to the information originally considered plus any additional information related to the appeal.
(e) The reconsidering committee(s) will apply this policy and its associated procedures, resulting in a recommendation to the relevant delegate as to whether or not the applicant should be promoted.

(10) If the appeal is not upheld, the application will not be reconsidered and no further appeal will be entertained.

19 Confidentiality

(1) Subject to any legal requirement for disclosure, the following are confidential and not to be disclosed outside the academic promotions process:
   (a) names of applicants;
   (b) information contained in applications, referees’ reports or assessors’ reports;
   (c) the content of interviews; or
   (d) the content of discussions within LPCs or CPCs.

Note: See the Privacy Policy 2013 and the Privacy Management Plan.

(2) Any committee member who breaches confidentiality will be required to withdraw from the relevant committee and may be subject to disciplinary action.

(3) At the end of each LPC and CPC process, all hard copy committee papers must be collected by the committee Chair and returned to the Academic Promotions Unit.
   (a) The Academic Promotions Unit will retain only those materials required by the University Recordkeeping Policy.
   (b) The Academic Promotions Unit will ensure that all other hard copy materials are confidentially destroyed.

(4) At the end of each LPC and CPC process, committee members must:
   (a) destroy any hard copy materials in their possession;
   (b) delete any electronic copy materials in their possession; and
   (c) confirm to the committee Chair that they have done so.

20 Roles and responsibilities

(1) Applicants are responsible for:
   (a) ensuring their applications are lodged on time and in the appropriate manner and form;
   (b) ensuring their applications address the relevant criteria for promotion;
   (c) ensuring their referees are willing and able to provide reports within applicable timeframes;
   (d) responding to requests for further information or clarification within applicable time frames; and
   (e) ensuring they are available to attend scheduled interviews.

(2) Heads of School are responsible for:
   (a) being available to give confidential advice and other forms of support to potential applicants before applications are submitted;
(b) having a sound knowledge of all facets of the applicant’s work relevant to their application for promotion;
(c) providing reports on applicants for promotion to Levels B, C and D;
(d) verifying the appropriate section of the Teaching and Research Student Supervision Activities form for all levels;
(e) providing guidance to relevant LPCs and CPCs on the research and teaching norms expected of their discipline, including an assessment of the standard of the mechanisms used for dissemination of research relative to the norms of the discipline; and
(f) providing guidance to unsuccessful applicants if requested.

(3) The Academic Promotions Unit is responsible for:
(a) calling for applications in annual promotions rounds and setting applicable dates;
(b) convening LPCs and CPCs;
(c) notifying applicants of the membership of relevant LPCs and CPCs, and assessors for Level E applicants, including any changes;
(d) managing all communications between applicants and LPCs, CPCs, and assessors;
(e) requesting referees’ and assessors’ reports, and seeking further information from third parties where requested to do so by an LPC or CPC;
(f) providing policy and procedural advice to LPCs, CPCs and their Chairs; and
(g) providing committee recommendations to the relevant delegates for approval.

(4) LPCs and CPCs are responsible for:
(a) assessing academic promotions applications presented to them;
(b) following all required policies and procedures;
(c) making clear recommendations in relation to each applicant as to:
   (i) whether the applicant should be promoted;
   (ii) the stream in which the applicant should be promoted; and
   (iii) the level to which the applicant should be promoted.

(5) Chairs of committees are responsible for:
(a) arranging and conducting committee meetings;
(b) distributing materials and papers to the committee members as required;
(c) ensuring that the committee follows all required policies and procedures and that all members are aware of these;
(d) appointing replacement committee members when required;
(e) preparing and submitting necessary reports and forms;
(f) for Chairs of LPCs, ensuring they are available to attend any CPC meeting which is considering recommendations made in their reports; and
(g) providing feedback to unsuccessful applicants if requested.

(6) Members of committees are responsible for:
(a) ensuring their availability to attend all scheduled committee meetings;
(b) declaring any conflict of interests (actual, potential or perceived) to the relevant Chair as soon as they are aware of it;

Note: See the definition of conflict of interests in the External Interests Policy 2010

(c) appropriately managing any conflicts of interests;

(d) ensuring that they understand and comply with all policy and procedural requirements; and

(e) providing all necessary feedback to the Chair of their committee in a timely fashion.

21 Rescissions

This policy replaces the former Academic Promotions Policy and the former ‘Out of Round’ Promotion Policy and Procedures, both of which are rescinded with effect from the commencement date of this policy.
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SCHEDULE 1

MINIMUM STANDARDS REQUIRED FOR ACADEMIC PROMOTION

The following definitions apply in this schedule.

**Exceptional**
Demonstrates highly significant achievements and contributions, which already well exceed the minimum criteria applicable to the level to which promotion is being sought.

**Outstanding**
Demonstrates achievements and contributions which already clearly meet the minimum criteria for the level to which promotion is being sought.

**Superior**
Demonstrates highly significant achievements and contributions at the level at which the applicant is currently classified.

**Satisfactory**
Demonstrates achievements and contributions at the level at which the applicant is currently classified.

### TEACHING AND RESEARCH STREAM – Minimum required standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion sought</th>
<th>Teaching standard</th>
<th>Research standard</th>
<th>Service standard</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level A to Level B; Level B to Level C; Level C to Level D.</td>
<td>Superior or Outstanding</td>
<td>Superior or Outstanding</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>At least one Outstanding in either Teaching or Research is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level D to Level E</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EDUCATION-FOCUSSED STREAM – Minimum required standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion sought</th>
<th>Teaching standard</th>
<th>Research standard</th>
<th>Service standard</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All.</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>Superior or Satisfactory</td>
<td>Superior or Satisfactory</td>
<td>At least one Superior is required, in either Research or Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESEARCH-FOCUSSED STREAM – Minimum required standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion sought</th>
<th>Teaching standard</th>
<th>Research standard</th>
<th>Service standard</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All.</td>
<td>Superior or Satisfactory</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>Superior or Satisfactory</td>
<td>At least one Superior is required, in either Teaching or Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHEDULE 2

LOCAL PROMOTIONS COMMITTEES

TERMS OF REFERENCE AND OPERATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

(1) LPCs will assess faculty applications for academic promotion.
(2) LPCs will not act as advocates for such applications.
(3) Having assessed the applications before them, LPCs will vote on each application and recommend successful candidates for promotion.

CONSTITUTION

LPC for Levels B - D inclusive

(1) An LPC for promotion to Levels B –D inclusive will consist of at least five and no more than seven core members, plus one additional member, as follows:
   (a) Chair, being a dean of one of the participating faculties or a nominee approved by the Provost;
   (b) three members, from at least two different faculties, including one member from the applicant’s faculty;
   (c) one Academic Board nominee; and
   (d) up to two other members in exceptional circumstances, from two different faculties.

(2) Where an LPC is considering applications from only one faculty, at least two of the members in category (1)(b) above must be from outside the applicants’ faculty.

(3) There will also be a reserve core member. If the reserve core member is called upon to replace the Academic Board nominee, the reserve core member may do so even if they are not themselves on the list of Academic Board nominees.

(4) Each LPC will have one additional member (plus one reserve additional member) specific to individual applications, who will have expertise in the applicant’s general field. These members will be appointed by the Chair, in consultation with the relevant Head(s) of School.

(5) Except with the authorisation of the Provost, members of the LPC must be of academic rank equal to or higher than the grade to which applicants under consideration are seeking promotion.
LPC for Level E

(1) An LPC for promotion to Level E will consist of at least six and no more than eight core members as follows:
   (a) Chair, being a dean of one of the participating faculties, or a nominee approved by the Provost;
   (b) normally four and no more than six professors from at least two different faculties; and
   (c) one Academic Board nominee.

(2) Professors external to the University may sit on an LPC for promotion to Level E if the LPC is considering applications from a small faculty without a large professoriate (whether the LPC is considering applications from a single faculty or multiple faculties).

(3) The Head of School or other person who completed the Teaching and Research Supervision Activities data verification report for the applicant may sit as a core member of an LPC at this level.

(4) There will be a reserve core member. If the reserve core member is called upon to replace the Academic Board nominee, the reserve core member may do so even if they are not themselves on the list of Academic Board nominees.

(5) Each LPC will have one additional member (plus one reserve additional member) specific to individual applications, who will have expertise in the applicant’s general field. These members will be appointed by the Chair, in consultation with the relevant Head(s) of School.

MEETINGS

Quorum

The quorum for any meeting of an LPC for promotion to Levels B – D inclusive is five, being either five core members or four core members plus the reserve core member.

The quorum for any meeting an LPC for promotion to Level E is seven, being either seven core members or six core members plus the reserve core member.

Number of meetings

(1) The LPC will meet twice for applications for Levels B – D:
   (a) a preliminary meeting; and
   (b) a final meeting

(2) The LPC will meet once to consider applications for Level E.

Format of meeting

(1) Preliminary meetings may be held in person or by circulation.

(2) Final meetings, and meetings considering applications for Level E, must be held in person.

(3) With the consent of the Chair, the additional member, (but not other members), may attend any meeting by telephone, video link or similar arrangement.
(4) With the consent of the Chair, the applicant may be interviewed by telephone, video link or similar arrangement.

Voting

(1) All core members present must vote on each application.
(2) Additional members are not entitled to vote and must not be present when votes are taken.
(3) Each core member’s vote must be declared. Voting must not be done by secret ballot.
(4) No applicant may be recommended for promotion unless the number of votes in favour of promotion is at least twice the number of votes against.
SCHEDULE 3
CENTRAL PROMOTIONS COMMITTEES
TERMS OF REFERENCE AND OPERATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

(1) CPCs will review the operation and reports of LPCs in applications for promotion to Levels C – E inclusive.

(2) CPCs will be guided by the advice of the LPCs but will make the final recommendation for or against promotion.

(3) CPCs will ensure that standards for promotion to senior academic ranks are consistent and equitable across the University.

CONSTITUTION

CPC for Levels C and D

(1) A CPC for promotion to Levels C or D will consist of:
   (a) a Chair, being the Provost or nominee (ex officio)
   (b) the Chair of the Academic Board or nominee (ex officio)
   (c) one senior academic from another university, nominated by the Provost
   (d) three members of the University’s academic staff, nominated by the Provost
   (e) three members of the University’s academic staff, nominated by the Chair of the Academic Board

(2) There will be two reserve members, being members of the University’s academic staff nominated jointly by the Provost and the Chair of the Academic Board.

(3) Members other than ex officio members should not serve for more than three consecutive years.

(4) Individuals may not serve as members of a CPC if they have also been members of an LPC considering applications for promotion to the same level.

CPC for Level E

(1) A CPC for promotion to Level E will consist of:
   (a) a Chair, being the Vice-Chancellor or nominee (ex officio)
   (b) the Provost or nominee (ex officio)
   (c) the Chair of the Academic Board or nominee (ex officio)
   (d) two deans, nominated by the Provost
   (e) One senior academic from another university, nominated by the Vice-Chancellor
   (f) Three professors, nominated by the Chair of the Academic Board

(2) There will be two reserve members, being members of the University’s professoriate, nominated by the Chair of the Academic Board.
(3) Members other than ex officio members should not serve for more than three consecutive years.

(4) Individuals may not serve as members of a CPC if they have also been members of an LPC considering applications for promotion to the same level.
1 Purpose and application

(1) These procedures are to give effect to the Academic Promotions Policy 2014 (“the policy”).

(2) These procedures apply to:

(a) all academic staff employed by the University on a continuing or fixed term contract basis; and

(b) all applications for promotion of such academic staff.

2 Commencement

These procedures commence on 10 January 2014

3 Interpretation

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

   Note: See clause 6 of the policy.

(2) In relation to clause 4 of these procedures:

ERA means Excellence in Research Australia, a report on research activity in Australian higher educational institutions compiled annually by the Australian Research Council.
will means that staff at the relevant level are expected to meet this requirement.

may means that some but not all staff at the relevant level would meet this requirement.

will normally means that staff at the relevant level are expected to meet this requirement, but that compelling reasons in individual cases or the requirements of specific disciplines may mean that it is not met.

will, where appropriate means that staff at the relevant level are expected to meet this requirement where it is appropriate to their discipline.

4 Normative criteria for performance at each academic level

(1) All academic staff are expected to have the following generic attributes and responsibilities:

(a) will normally hold a relevant higher degree for appointment at Level A;
(b) will normally hold a PhD or other higher professional qualifications appropriate to their discipline for appointment at Level B or above;
(c) will develop expertise in either or both of teaching and research with an increasing degree of autonomy (for example, through enrolment in appropriate courses or workshops);
(d) will carry out the duties assigned to them under their school or faculty workload provisions, as appropriate to their academic level;
(e) will be actively engaged in research and scholarship;
(f) will disseminate their knowledge and expertise in education and their research skills as appropriate to their role and academic level;
(g) will be involved in both formal and informal staff mentoring programs;
(h) will engage in continuing professional development;
(i) will be institutionally engaged as a member of the University community through participation in committees, administrative duties and governance at any or all of school, faculty or University level, as appropriate to their role and academic level;
(j) will interact with staff and students in a professional and collegiate manner;
(k) will seek to engage with the wider community where appropriate;
(l) will, where appropriate, engage in translational research with a view to establishing strong partnerships with outputs such as commercialisation, improved practice and policy development;
(m) will seek to use their expertise to inform the general public or engage in public debate on key issues of public importance, where appropriate and consistent with University policy.

(2) Staff in education-focused roles are expected to:

(a) devote most of their effort to excellence in, and contribution to, teaching;
(b) contribute to research in either their discipline or the pedagogy of their discipline;
(c) be building (at junior levels) and to have achieved (at senior levels) national and international reputations for their contributions to pedagogical issues within their discipline and more broadly; and

(d) to have a record of success in competitive grant applications or teaching awards.

(3) **Staff in research-focussed roles** are expected to:

(a) devote most of their effort to research in their discipline;

(b) participate in teaching through supervision and instruction of postgraduate students, interaction with honours students or limited instruction to undergraduate students;

(c) be building (at junior levels) and to have achieved (at senior levels) national and international reputations for their research;

(d) to have a record of success in competitive external grant applications.

(4) **Level A staff**:

(a) will undertake administration primarily relating to their activities;

(b) may supervise research students at undergraduate level;

(c) may be mentored in a formal University mentoring program;

(d) will normally work under supervision of staff at Level B or above, with an increasing degree of autonomy as they gain skill and experience;

(e) will normally conduct research or scholarly activities under limited supervision either independently or as a member of a team;

(f) may, where appropriate, be involved or mentored in translational research with a view to external collaboration and establishing partnerships with outputs such as commercialisation, improved practice and policy.

(5) **Level B staff**:

(a) will contribute to any or all of research, scholarship or teaching, either independently or as part of a team, through professional practice and expertise;

(b) will co-ordinate or lead the activities of other staff as appropriate to their discipline;

(c) will be involved in evaluating teaching and learning, both at the program level and in relation to their own practice;

(d) will engage in scholarly development and engagement in their subject area;

(e) may be engaged in research evaluation and in the assessment of their own research practice through participation within the University or their discipline, whether as reviewer or subject of review;

(f) may have experience in education-related scholarly activities, which have resulted in demonstrated improvements in teaching quality or education outcomes, or successful outcomes in research supervision;

(g) may be involved in training in either or both of pedagogical skills or research;

(h) may be required to perform the full academic responsibilities, and related administration, of co-ordination of a unit of study within a faculty, consistently with the faculty’s workload provisions;

(i) may be mentored in a formal University mentoring program;
(j) will be an informal mentor for other staff at Levels A or B;

(k) will normally contribute to teaching at honours, undergraduate and postgraduate level in units of study or through research supervision;

(l) will normally demonstrate evidence of competitive grant applications within the University or externally, either individually or as part of a team;

(m) will, where appropriate, participate in continuing professional development (for example through seminars or conferences);

(n) may, where appropriate, be involved or mentored in translational research with a view to external collaboration and establishing partnerships with outputs such as commercialisation, improved practice and policy.

(6) **Level C staff:**

(a) will make independent and original contributions to scholarship within their discipline and will disseminate these among colleagues;

(b) will be acknowledged at national level as influential in:
   (i) expanding knowledge within their discipline; or
   (ii) pedagogical and curriculum issues;

(c) will be able to demonstrate a strong record of:
   (i) research;
   (ii) scholarly activities relating to their discipline; or
   (iii) teaching or teaching practices;

(d) will disseminate knowledge to benefit and promote good practice in their faculty and the University, in learning and teaching or research and research training;

(e) will provide leadership with a significant impact on their faculty or school in:
   (i) teaching, teaching innovation or curriculum development; or
   (ii) research training and supervision.

(f) will contribute to academic or professional journals on issues relevant to their discipline or contribute more broadly as appropriate to their discipline. A premium may be placed on ERA recognised contributions;

(g) will demonstrate evidence of competitive grant applications within the University or externally;

(h) will contribute to governance in their school or faculty or the University, through activities such as participation in committees, membership of the Academic Board or administrative roles in centres or institutes;

(i) may be pursuing education opportunities to enhance their expertise and professionalism in higher education;

(j) may be required to perform the full academic responsibilities, and related administration, of co-ordination of a large unit of study or award program or a number of small award programs, consistently with the faculty’s workload provisions;

(k) may be mentored in a formal University mentoring program and will be an informal mentor for other staff at Level C or below;

(l) may be a formal mentor for staff at Level C or below;
(m) may contribute to the University’s work of community and alumni engagement;

(n) may contribute their expertise and knowledge to broader forums of public debate, consistently with University policy;

(o) will normally make a significant contribution to any or all of the research, scholarship, teaching or administration activities of an organisational unit or interdisciplinary area at undergraduate honours or postgraduate level;

(p) will normally play a major role or provide a significant degree of leadership in scholarly, research or professional activities relevant to any or all of their profession, discipline or community;

(q) may, where appropriate, be involved or mentored in translational research with a view to external collaboration and establishing partnerships with outputs such as commercialisation, improved practice and policy.

(7) **Level D staff:**

(a) will have attained and maintained recognition at national or international level in their discipline;

(b) will make:
   
   (i) original and innovative contributions to their field of study or research, which are recognised as outstanding nationally or internationally; or
   
   (ii) original contributions to teaching, such as contributions to national efforts to enhance curriculum and providing high quality learning experiences in their discipline;

(c) will demonstrate engagement in publications and scholarly dissemination appropriate to their discipline. A premium may be placed on ERA recognised contributions;

(d) will have a sustained record of effective leadership of either or both of:
   
   (i) teaching teams (in curriculum design, implementation and innovations leading to improvements in student learning); or
   
   (ii) research (in fostering the research activities of others, and in research training);

(e) will demonstrate evidence of capability to lead developments in:
   
   (i) education quality, which enhance major aspects of the faculty’s operations through program management, curriculum development, faculty and institutional teaching roles (such as Associate Dean, Academic Board, SEG Education Committee); or
   
   (ii) research, which enhance the reputation of the faculty or University (such as leading participation in internationally-funded research projects);

(f) will be an informal mentor for other staff at Level D and below;

(g) will be a formal mentor for staff at Level C or below;

(h) may be mentored at a formal University mentoring program;

(i) will normally have evidence of major original and innovative contributions:
   
   (i) to curriculum development, which enhance the University’s standing as a national leader in education within their discipline; or
(ii) to the staff member’s field of study or research, which are recognised nationally or internationally as outstanding;

(j) will normally make an outstanding contribution to governance and collegial life within the University and in community and professional service;

(k) will, where appropriate, contribute to the University’s work of community and alumni engagement;

(l) will, where appropriate, contribute their expertise and knowledge to broader forums of public debate, consistently with University policy;

(m) will, where appropriate, assist the University in its development work;

(n) may, where appropriate, be involved in translational research with a view to external collaboration and establishing strong partnerships with outputs such as commercialisation, improved practice and policy;

(o) will, where appropriate, mentor and provide opportunities for other researchers to develop skills and engage in translational research.

(8) **Level E staff:**

(a) will have achieved and maintained international recognition through original, innovative and distinguished contributions to scholarship and research;

(b) will have a track record of competitive research grants;

(c) will have publications in peer-reviewed international journals or creative works recognised under the ERA in their discipline or more broadly;

(d) will have evidence of recognition within the broader research community, such as membership or editorship of journals, membership of national or international consultative bodies, membership of specialist committees or advisory boards;

(e) will have evidence of leadership in any or all of curriculum development, program development and management or research and scholarship;

(f) will have evidence of mentoring colleagues to leadership positions;

(g) will have evidence of capability to lead development which enhances major aspects of the University’s operations and its international reputation in:

(i) learning and teaching; or

(ii) research and scholarship;

(h) will make an outstanding contribution to governance and collegial life within and outside the University, for example by chairing school or faculty committees, undertaking significant administrative positions, or participating in or chairing University-level committees;

(i) will be mentored in a formal University mentoring program;

(j) will be an informal mentor for other staff at Level D or below;

(k) will be a formal mentor for staff at Levels E or below;

(l) will, where appropriate, contribute their expertise and knowledge to broader forums of public debate, consistently with University policy;

(m) will, where appropriate, assist the University in its development work;
(n) may, where appropriate, be involved in translational research with a view to external collaboration and establishing strong partnerships with outputs such as commercialisation, improved practice and policy;

(o) will, where appropriate mentor and provide opportunities for other researchers to develop skills and engage in translational research.

5 Applications for annual promotion rounds

(1) Applications must be submitted electronically to the Academic Promotions Unit using the form specified in the announcement of the opening of applications.

(2) Applications must comply with all maximum word limits.

(3) Applications must provide:
   (a) information about the applicant’s whole career;
   (b) a clear account of achievements and publications since the applicant’s last employment or promotion at the University;
   (c) evidence of appropriate upward career trajectory; and
   (d) the names of five referees and a statement of the applicant’s relationship to each.

(4) Applications for promotion by two levels must:
   (a) set out a strong case for such a promotion;
   (b) be supported by the applicant’s Head of School;
   (c) be approved by the relevant Dean and the Provost; and
   (d) be provided to the Academic Promotions Unit at least 14 days before the advertised closing date for promotions for the level to which they are applying.

(5) Applications should:
   (a) provide information sufficient to allow the promotion committees to assess the significance and impact of the applicant’s publications or creative works; and
   (b) provide an explanation, if necessary, of any known special circumstances that have affected the applicant’s opportunity to meet the requirements for promotion.

6 Submissions for “out of round” promotion

(1) Submissions for “out of round” promotion must be prepared by the relevant Head of School, endorsed by the relevant Dean, and submitted to the Academic Promotions Unit.

(2) Submissions must contain:
   (a) the application for employment originally made by the subject staff member to the other institution offering the staff member employment;
   (b) the referee details which were part of that application;
   (c) a clear statement of the case for:
      (i) retaining the staff member;
(ii) promoting the staff member to the desired level; and
(iii) doing so “out of round”.

7 Updates to applications

(1) Applicants may provide to the LPC an update to their applications once only.

(2) An update to an application may not exceed one A4 page listing significant additional information arising since lodgement of the application, and must be lodged electronically in Word format.

(3) Updates must be lodged with the Academic Promotions Unit and the Chair of the relevant LPC no later than seven days prior to the final LPC meeting.

(4) Level D and E applicants (Level C applicants if the application is being considered by a CPC) may provide to the CPC a second update to their application.

(5) The second update to application may not exceed one A4 page listing significant additional information of national/international importance (excluding publications unless it is a book) arising since consideration of the application at the final LPC meeting (Level D) and interview (Level E).

(6) Second updates must be lodged electronically to the Academic Promotions Unit in Word format no later than four weeks prior to the CPC meeting.

(7) Applicants may change the stream in which they have sought promotion provided that:
   (a) they do so by notice in writing to the Academic Promotions Unit; and
   (b) the notice is received before the applicable deadline.

8 Communications between committees and applicants

(1) The Academic Promotions Unit will conduct, and keep appropriate records of, all communications between applicants and those considering their applications.

   Note: See the University Recordkeeping Policy and Recordkeeping Manual.

(2) Requests from committees for further information from applicants will be communicated to the applicant in writing, through the Academic Promotions Unit.

(3) Replies to such requests must be provided in writing, within seven days.

(4) Requests from committees for further information from sources other than the applicant should also be communicated through the Academic Promotions Unit, although this is not always possible. Any such information received by a committee or committee member must be copied to the Academic Promotions Unit.

9 Head of School reports for applications below Level E

(1) The relevant Head of School will verify an applicant’s teaching and research supervision activities by completing the online Teaching and Research Student Supervision Activities form.

(2) The Head of School will consult relevant staff of the school and prepare a written report on each applicant.
(2) [3] The consultation process wouldmust exclude any staff member in the school/department who is also an applicant for promotion to the same level.

(3) [4] The Head of School’s report must include:

(a) the names and positions of the staff who have been consulted;
(b) if a staff member who has been consulted objects to being named, then the report should not include the names of any of the staff consulted. The report must instead then list the number of and general description of the positions of staff consulted (for example, three lecturers and two associate professors);
(c) views of relevant staff who have been consulted, including divergent views; and
(d) comment on the standing of the applicant’s referees.

10 Referees’ reports

(1) The Academic Promotions Unit will contact nominated referees to request reports from them.

(2) Referees should where possible hold a higher academic rank than that of the applicant.

(3) The list of referees should include at least two who are external to the applicant’s faculty.

(4) Unless applying in the research-focused stream, applicants must nominate at least one referee who is familiar with and can comment on their teaching.

(5) Referees’ reports should address:

(a) the nature and duration of the referee’s association with the applicant;
(b) the referee’s view of the applicant’s standing in their field at a national and, if appropriate, international level;
(c) some of the applicant’s notable achievements or contributions in any or all of research, teaching or service; and
(d) the referee’s assessment of the applicant’s career trajectory, with reference to the normative criteria for the relevant academic rank.

11 Assessors’ reports

(1) The Academic Promotions Unit will contact assessors and request provision of a written report which addresses:

(a) any association between the assessor and the applicant;
(b) the assessor’s opinion of the applicant as a scholar in their field;
(c) details of the applicant’s achievements in their field;
(d) whether the applicant has published in well reputed journals;
(e) the assessor’s view of the value of the applicant’s publications; and
(f) an assessment of the applicant’s career trajectory in light of the normative criteria for Level E staff.

(2) Assessors’ reports must be provided within 21 days of request.
12 Procedure for LPC preliminary meetings for promotions below Level E

(1) LPC preliminary meetings for promotions below Level E may be held face-to-face or by circulation.

(2) For all such meetings, whether held face-to-face or by circulation:
   (a) each member of the LPC will consider each application in accordance with the standards specified in Schedule 1 to the policy;
   (b) the additional member of the LPC will be asked to comment on each application;
   (c) the LPC will identify any applications which require further information or clarification from the applicant;
   (d) the LPC will agree on the questions to be put to the applicant, which will be listed in the preliminary report template;
   (e) core members will vote on each application for which no further information or clarification is required;
   (f) applications which receive unanimous support will be recommended for promotion without further consideration;
   (g) applications which do not receive unanimous support or which require further information or clarification from the applicant will be considered at the final meeting;
   (h) requests for further information or clarification from an applicant will be provided to the Academic Promotions Unit, which will collect the information and provide it to the LPC.

(3) Where the meeting is held face-to-face:
   (a) core members will vote on relevant applications after discussion;
   (b) voting will take place in the absence of the additional member.

(4) Where the meeting is held by circulation:
   (a) each member of the LPC will identify any applications in relation to which they require further information or clarification, from either the additional member or the applicant;
   (b) each member of the LPC will forward by email to all other members of the LPC:
      (i) the member’s questions or requests for the additional member; and
      (ii) the member’s questions or requests for each applicant;
   (c) the additional member will provide their comments, and answers to any questions or requests, by email to all other members of the LPC;
   (d) the Chair will collate the questions and requests for information from applicants and provide them to the Academic Promotions Unit;
   (e) the Chair will circulate to all members of the LPC a list of applicants from whom no further information or clarification is required;
   (f) formal voting on remaining applications:
      (i) will take place only after the additional member has provided answers and comments on the remaining applications; and
(ii) Will be undertaken by means of each core member completing a voting sheet and forwarding this sheet to the Chair;

(g) the Chair will collate the voting sheets and inform each member of the LPC of the outcome of the voting.

13 Procedure for LPC final meetings for promotions below Level E

(1) The additional member will be asked to comment on an application under consideration.

(2) The committee will consider and discuss each application, including any additional information or amendment which has been provided.

(3) The core members of the committee will vote on each application.

14 Procedure for LPC meetings for promotions to Level E

(1) The committee will interview the applicant.

(a) Wherever possible, interviews should be conducted in person.

(b) The LPC Chair may approve interviews being held by other means, provided that the applicant and all committee members are able to interact at the same time.

(c) The Academic Promotions Unit will inform the applicant as soon as possible if it is decided to conduct an interview otherwise than in person.

(2) The committee will consider and discuss each application, including any additional information which has been provided.

(3) The core members of the committee will vote on each application.

15 LPC Committee reports

(1) LPC Committee reports must be prepared using the form supplied for this purpose by the Academic Promotions Unit.

(2) The reports must be submitted electronically to the Academic Promotions Unit.

(3) Reports must:

(a) note unanimous recommendations for promotion to Levels B or C;

(b) provide sufficient detail in all other cases to explain the basis for each decision; and

(c) provide a detailed commentary on each application for promotion to Level D or E, regardless of the decision.

16 Procedure for CPC meetings

(1) Prior to the CPC meeting, the Academic Promotions Unit will ask each CPC member to provide a preliminary vote on each application.

(2) The Academic Promotions Unit will tabulate the preliminary votes and make the tabulation available to the CPC at its meeting.
(3) The CPC will consider:
   (a) the LPC report;
   (b) the application;
   (c) any updates to, or further information provided in relation to, the application;
   (d) referees’ reports; and
   (e) assessor’s reports (for Level E applications).

(4) After discussion, the committee will vote on each application.

17 Procedure for “out of round” committee meetings

(1) The committee will assess the application against the standards and criteria set out in the policy and these procedures.

(2) Within 2 days of receipt of the submission, the Chair will circulate it to all members of the committee and will request an electronic response within a nominated time frame.

(3) Unless a unanimous response is received within the nominated time frame, the Chair will call a meeting of the committee.

(4) The committee may invite the staff member to attend a formal interview if it wishes.

(5) The Chair may request additional information or clarification which may include either or both of:
   (a) assessors’ reports; or
   (b) written confirmation of the offer from the other institution.

(6) The committee will vote on the submission.

18 Titles consequent upon promotion

(1) Successful applicants for promotion to Level E may select a professorial title in an appropriate specific field. The selected title must be endorsed by the relevant Dean and approved by the Vice-Chancellor.

(2) Successful applicants for promotion will otherwise have the titles specified in Schedule 1.
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## SCHEDULE 1
### PERSONAL AND POSITIONAL TITLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantive Position</th>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>Personal Title</th>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>Personal Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>As per personal status (Dr, Ms, Mrs, Mr, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Fellow or Lecturer</td>
<td>As per personal status (Dr, Ms, Mrs, Mr, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>As per personal status (Dr, Ms, Mrs, Mr, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Research Fellow or Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>As per personal status (Dr, Ms, Mrs, Mr, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level D</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Research Fellow or Associate Professor</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level E</td>
<td>Professor or Professor in a specific field, as requested by the candidate, endorsed by the Dean and approved by the Vice-Chancellor</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professorial Research Fellow or Professor in a specific field, as requested by the candidate, endorsed by the Dean and approved by the Vice-Chancellor</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>