NOTICE OF MEETING

A meeting of the Academic Board will be held at 2:00 pm on Wednesday, 28 October 2015 in the Professorial Board Room. Members who are unable to attend are asked to notify Mr Matthew Charet (matthew.charet@sydney.edu.au). Enquiries concerning this meeting may also be directed to Mr Charet.

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

Megan Kemmis
Secretary to Academic Board
21 October 2015

AGENDA

1. Apologies
   Apologies have been received from: Professor S Garton, Professor Y-H Jeon, Dr D Larkin, Associate Professor S McGrath-Champ, Professor I Ramzan, Professor J Riley 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 16 September 2015

   Recommendation
   That the Academic Board adopt the minutes of the previous meeting held on 16 September 2015 as a true record.

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

5. Presentation: Vice-Chancellor's Taskforce on Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism (Chair of the Academic Board)
6. Report of the Chair

6.1 Report on Senate Matters

6.1.1 Report of the Senate meeting held on 28 September 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 28 September 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 2015 Academic Board elections

6.3.1.1 Academic Staff elections

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board:
1. appoint the academic staff members nominated by their deans to fill casual vacancies for the term 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2017; and
2. note the report on the 2015 Academic Board elections as set out in the report presented.

6.3.1.2 Student elections

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board note the report on the 2015 Academic Board elections for student members as set out in the report presented.

6.3.1.3 Election of Chair of Academic Board

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board note the report on the 2015 Academic Board elections for the Chair of the Academic Board.

6.3.2 OLT grant application “Institutional strategies for academic integrity in the digital age”

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board note the Chair’s report on the proposed OLT grant application “Institutional strategies for academic integrity in the digital age”.

6.3.3 2016 Academic Board meeting dates

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board note the schedule of meeting dates for 2016 as presented.

6.3.4 End-of-year Celebrations

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board endorse a charitable collection to be run as part of the end-of-year celebrations following the Board’s final meeting for the year on 2 December 2015.
6.3.5 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 28 September 2015

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal on matters considered by Senate at its meeting of 28 September 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 Amendment to Constitution: Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

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

9.2 2016 Semester Dates

9.2.1 Faculty of Education and Social Work

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the request from the Faculty of Education and Social Work to amend its semester dates for 2016 with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

9.2.2 Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the request from the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery to amend its semester dates for 2016 with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

9.2.3 Faculty of Veterinary Science

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the request from the Faculty of Veterinary Science to amend its semester dates for 2016 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 29 September 2015

10.2.1 Amended Terms of Reference

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the proposed amendment to the Terms of Reference, with immediate effect, as presented.

10.2.2 Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve a revised schedule for the recognition of the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education (HKDSE) as an entry pathway to the University, with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

10.2.3 Proceedings of the Committee

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Admissions Committee meeting held on 29 September 2015, as set out in the report presented.

11. Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee

11.1 Oral report of the Chair

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Admissions Committee.

11.2 Report of the meeting held on 14 October 2015

11.2.1 Minor course amendment proposals

11.2.1.1 University of Sydney Business School: Faculty Resolutions

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend sections of its Faculty Resolutions; and
(2) approve the amendment of the Faculty Resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

11.2.1.2 Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies: Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Civil) / Bachelor of Design in Architecture

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to approve a change to the Bachelor of Engineering Honours Combined Degree Resolutions to clarify the requirements for the Architecture component of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Civil) / Bachelor of Design in Architecture; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.
11.2.1.3 Faculty of Health Sciences: Bachelor Applied Science (Physiotherapy)/ Bachelor of Applied Science (Occupational Therapy)  

Recommendation  
That the Academic Board:  
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Undergraduate English Language Requirements for the Bachelor of Applied Science (Physiotherapy) and Bachelor of Applied Science (Occupational Therapy); and  
(2) approve the amendment of the schedule of approved Faculty variations above the University minimum requirements in the Undergraduate English Language Requirements (as referenced in clause 21(3) of the Coursework Policy 2014)  
with effect from 1 January 2017, as set out in the report presented.

11.2.1.4 Faculty of Law: Bachelor of Laws  

Recommendation  
That the Academic Board:  
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Law to amend the names of the existing units of study in the Bachelor of Laws as described above; and  
(2) approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from this proposal  
with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

11.2.1.5 Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery: Bachelor of Nursing (Honours)  

Recommendation  
That the Academic Board:  
(1) approve the proposal from the Sydney Nursing School to amend the Bachelor of Nursing (Honours); and  
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal  
with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

11.2.1.6 Sydney College of the Arts: Bachelor of Visual Arts (Honours)  

Recommendation  
That the Academic Board:  
(1) approve the proposal from the Sydney College of the Arts to amend the Bachelor of Visual Arts (Honours); and  
(2) approve the amendments to the course resolutions arising from this proposal  
with effect from 1 January 2016 as set out in the report presented.

11.2.2 Proceedings of the Committee  

Recommendation  
That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Undergraduate Studies Committee meeting held on 14 October 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 Graduate Studies Committee.

12.2  Report of the meeting held on 14 October 2015

12.2.1 Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy and Procedures 2015

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board approve the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy and Procedures 2015 with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

12.2.2 Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Policy and Procedures 2015

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board approve the amendments to the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Policy and Procedures 2015 with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

12.2.3 Proposals for new and amended postgraduate courses

12.2.3.1 Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning: Master of Urban Design, Graduate Diploma in Urban Design, Graduate Certificate in Urban Design

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning to delete the streams in Architectural and Urban Design and Urban Design and Planning from the Master of Urban Design;
(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.

12.2.4 Minor course amendment proposals

12.2.4.1 Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning

(1) Master of Heritage Conservation, Graduate Diploma in Heritage Conservation

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the elective units of study for the Master of Heritage Conservation and Graduate Diploma in Heritage Conservation; and
(2) approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.
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(2) Master of Philosophy

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

12.2.4.2 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: Master of Creative Writing

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Creative Writing; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

12.2.4.3 University of Sydney Business School: Faculty Resolutions

12.2.4.4 Faculty of Dentistry: Doctor of Clinical Dentistry

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Dentistry to amend the Doctor of Clinical Dentistry;
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal; and
(3) approve the amendment of the schedule of postgraduate English language requirements arising from the proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

12.2.4.5 Faculty of Health Sciences: Master of Physiotherapy, Master of Occupational Therapy

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the English language requirements for admission to the Master of Physiotherapy and Master of Occupational Therapy; and
(2) approve the amendment of the schedule of Postgraduate English Language Requirements arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2017, as set out in the report presented.

12.2.4.6 Faculty of Law: Changes to units of study

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Law to amend various units of study; and
(2) approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from this proposal
12.2.4.7 Faculty of Medicine: Master of Medicine, Master of Medicine (Advanced), Master of Science in Medicine, Master of Science in Medicine (Advanced), Graduate Diploma in Medicine, Graduate Diploma in Science in Medicine, Graduate Certificate in Medicine, Graduate Certificate in Science in Medicine

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine to amend the Master of Medicine, Master of Medicine (Advanced), Master of Science in Medicine, Master of Science in Medicine (Advanced), Graduate Diploma in Medicine, Graduate Diploma in Science in Medicine, Graduate Certificate in Medicine and Graduate Certificate in Science in Medicine; and
(2) approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

12.2.4.8 Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery: Master of Advanced Nursing Practice, Master of Cancer and Haematology Nursing, Master of Emergency Nursing, Master of Intensive Care Nursing, Master of Mental Health Nursing, Master of Primary Health Care Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Advanced Nursing Practice, Graduate Diploma in Cancer and Haematology Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Emergency Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Intensive Care Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Mental Health Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Primary Health Care Nursing

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

12.2.4.9 Sydney College of the Arts: Master of Fine Arts

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Sydney College of the Arts to amend the Master of Fine Arts; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.
12.2.5 Proceedings of the Committee

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on 14 October 2015, as set out in the report presented.

13 Report of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee

13.1 Oral report of the Chair

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

13.2 Report of the meeting held on 30 September 2015

13.2.1 Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce 2nd report

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) note the second report of the Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce;
(2) endorse in principle all four further Taskforce recommendations with a view to implementation by the start of 2017;
(3) approve for implementation:
   (a) the introduction of integrity checks for HDR student work at the first milestone during candidacy, to be part of the development of processes around the Progress Planning and Review Policy, and as part of the centralised submission process
   (b) removal of the student discipline procedures from the University of Sydney By-law and development of a new Rule of Senate; and
   (c) expansion of the TRIM workflow system to handle all student misconduct matters;
(4) join the Taskforce in recommending immediate action by faculties on the development of local provisions to give effect to the Research Data Management Policy; and
(5) note the next steps in relation to the other recommendations of the Taskforce.

13.2.2 Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2016

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2016 in principle for introduction in 2016, noting that the final version of the policy together with the associated procedures will be submitted to the December 2015 meeting of the Academic Board.

13.2.3 Student Placement Policy 2015

Recommendation
That the Academic Board endorse the draft Student Placement Policy 2015.

13.2.4 Academic Board/SEG Faculty Reviews: Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery Review and advise SEG of its decision.
13.2.5 Proceedings of the Committee

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the proceeding of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee meeting held on 30 September 2015, as set out in the report presented.

14 General Business
Minutes of the meeting of the Academic Board
held at 2.00pm on Wednesday 16 September 2015 in the Professorial Board Room

There were present: the Chair (Associate Professor P McCallum) presiding; the Vice-Chancellor and Principal (Dr M Spence); the Chairs of the Standing Committees (Associate Professor S Cattle, Professor J Hanrahan, Associate Professor T Masters and Associate Professor D Traini); Associate Professor J Anderson, Associate Professor J Barrett (for Professor B Caine), Associate Professor S Barrie, Mr K Blakeney, Dr J Bloomfield, Dr R Bourne, Professor B Buckley, Professor T Carlin, Associate Professor W Davis, Associate Professor D Easdown, Professor S Garton, Professor M Graeber, Mr T Greenwell, Associate Professor T Grewal, Ms K Hartman-Warren, Professor M Hindson, Ms A Irish, Mr S Isaac, Professor D Ivison, Dr N Jarkey, Professor Y-H Jeon, Professor A Johnston, Mr C Jones, Dr P Knight, Associate Professor S van der Laan, Professor P Leong, Dr J Ma, Dr M Millington, Professor E Mpofu, Associate Professor L Nicholson, Professor P Pattison, Professor C Peck, Professor I Ramzan, Professor K Refshauge, Ms A Rose, Dr J Saleeba, Dr R Saunders, Professor J Shields, Associate Professor C Taylor, Professor G Tolhurst, Professor C Wade, Associate Professor R Walker, Associate Professor G White, Dr P White and Associate Professor T Wilkinson.

Present as observers: Associate Professor M Bohua (Taizhor Polytechnic Centre), Ms S Harrison (Office of the Provost) and Ms L Rose (Office of the Provost)

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

The Chair welcomed Associate Professor Mu Bohua from Taizhor Polytechnic Centre in China, who is visiting the University of Sydney.

1. Apologies

   Apologies have been received from: Dr R Bathgate, Ms A Bell, Dr T Bell, Dr B Church, Ms T Clement, Professor M Crock, Ms C Fahd, Associate Professor J Glister, Dr J Gullick, Professor N Gurran, Professor T Hambley, Professor S Houston, Dr D Larkin, Professor D Lowe, Ms D Mair, Dr S Matthew, Ms E May, Professor D Mayer, Professor A McBratney, Associate Professor S McGrath-Champ, Dr C Owens, Professor J Redmond, Professor J Riley, Professor B Robinson, Dr K Rooney, Ms J Smith, Professor R Stancliffe, Associate Professor C Sutton-Brady, Professor D Waters, Professor G Whitwell and Professor P Young.

2. Arrangement of agenda

   2.1 Starring of items

      The following item was starred: 4.1

   2.2 Adoption of unstarring items

      Resolution AB_6_208/15

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

Resolution AB_6_209/15
That the Academic Board adopted the minutes of the previous meeting held on 19
August 2015 as a true record.

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

4.1 Coursework Policy and Procedure Amendments – Item 13.2.1, 19 August
2015
The Chair reminded members that there were extensive discussions at the last
meeting on this item, particularly the removal of references to informal applications
for special consideration (also known as simple extensions). While the
amendments were approved by a majority of members, the Chair advised that he
has met with student members to discuss their concerns regarding this change. A
number of options have been canvassed, but the main proposal will be referred to
the next Academic Standards and Policy Committee meeting before coming to the
October meeting of the Academic Board. More details need to be developed, but
he advised that the proposal will separate simple extensions from the special
consideration process.

Resolution AB_6_210/15
That the Academic Board note the Chair’s report on this matter.

5. Presentation: Strategic Plan 2016-2020 – Organisational Design
The Chair invited Professor Garton to make his presentation. Professor Garton advised
members that around twenty meetings have already been held regarding this part of the
Strategic Plan and around fifty submissions have been received, with the discussion paper
to be released by the end of the month. This has allowed a range of options to be
discussed with faculties which will be narrowed down for the discussion paper which will
also look at organisational design at the sub-faculty level, with a view to developing
common structures to improve decision-making and governance. He pointed out that it is
almost impossible to generate an authoritative list of the heads of schools, departments
and other faculty units from any one database at the University. Additionally, students are
dissatisfied with the impact of the existing structure on student administration and study
choices, academic staff feel they spend too much time on administrative matters, and
resources (including staff time) are wasted in supporting an overly complex structure. The
University has the most faculties of any of the Group of Eight universities, and more than
most comparable institutions overseas. The faculties themselves are highly variable,
ranging in size from 680 academic staff to 35 academic staff, and from 8,800 EFTSL to 514
EFTSL. Some faculties experience a large volume of cross-faculty enrolments, while
others are essentially “quarantined” by the nature of the courses they offer.

Given the strong case in support of restructuring, what principles should the University use
to determine an appropriate structure? Professor Garton outlined the following: research
and education synergies should be the underlying driver; improvement in student
experience should be a priority; it must drive improvement in performance and
accountability of services; it must generate savings for reinvestment in education and
research; and there should be economies of scale, without losing identity and
distinctiveness. He raised Pharmacy as a case study. This faculty could potentially
become part of an expanded medical or science faculty, and there are potential research
and teaching synergies in both options. However these need to be considered in terms of
impact on the external accreditation of Pharmacy and the international student market.
The faculty has suggested creating a School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences in
a medical faculty [CHECK].

Professor Garton showed a range of possible structures to which the University's existing
faculties can be mapped. Some of the more interesting suggestions are the creation of a
Faculty of Professions (as currently exists at the University of Adelaide) embracing
Architecture, Education and Law; or a faculty of biomedical sciences with a separate
medical/health faculty focussed on clinical health. The merging of Agriculture, Science and
Veterinary Science is already supported and initial steps have been taken via the creation
of a School of Life and Environmental Sciences. However possible changes to Arts and
Social Sciences need further consideration, particularly how much larger the existing
faculty should become. Other issues include the location of Social Work (should it move
with Education or become part of a medical faculty), how large should any potential health or medical faculty become, and where is Architecture best located. He concluded by advising that a final structure should be determined by the end of this year and implemented in 2017.

Members commented on the presentation as follows:
- The Chair agreed that faculty structures needed clarification, mentioning that the review of teaching and learning policies has highlighted the current complexity;
- Ms Hartman-Warren pointed out that some of the smaller faculties have very distinctive identities, with Professor Garton noting that the implementation of any restructure will be a complex process;
- Professor Graeber asked how much of the restructure would be virtual, rather than physical; Professor Garton advised that the current focus is on the vertical structure of faculties, but there are horizontal and virtual structures outlined in the research discussion papers;
- the Chair noted that cross-faculty research requires the University to transcend the faculty structure, but curriculum is still focussed on individual faculties, adding that this could be circumvented by having degrees owned by boards of study instead of faculties; Professor Garton noted the rise of cross-faculty degrees and agreed that delegations of authority should be reviewed, however his main area of concern is the disciplinary communities which is where the duplication of units of study occurs;
- Associate Professor Masters asked if there are models which are more likely to meet the principles for restructuring, and Professor Garton advised that the discussion paper will outline how well each model meets the principles;
- Mr Isaac asked how the restructuring will take into account the accreditation requirements of the University’s health disciplines and associated degrees, with Professor Garton agreeing that it will be a challenge to create teaching and research synergies while preserving and protecting the professional distinctiveness and accreditation requirements; the Vice-Chancellor pointed out that many of the University’s currently accredited degrees exist within schools rather than faculties, with the Chair adding that the Faculty of Health Sciences has thirteen different degrees requiring accreditation;
- Professor Refshauge asked if an implementation group would be formed and how it would operate; Professor Garton confirmed that a group of academic and professional staff would be convened with different sub-groups looking at different implementation issues; the Vice-Chancellor added that implementation is also being considered as part of the broader suite of projects occurring at the University, including the Student Administrative Services review;
- Dr Jarkey asked if the current system of divisions would be realigned or removed, with Professor Garton advising that the divisions would be removed; the Vice-Chancellor added that the divisions had been introduced to address the issue of fragmentation at the University and to bring people together for strategic conversations regarding budget, planning and risk management; it had been a deliberate decision to not provide the divisions with any administrative structures to make it easier to remove them at an appropriate time.

The Chair thanked Professor Garton for his presentation.

Resolution AB_6_211/15
That the Academic Board note the presentation from the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor on Organisation Design and the 2016-2020 Strategic Plan.

6. Report of the Chair

6.1 Report on Senate Matters
No Senate meeting has been held since the last Academic Board meeting

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

Resolution AB_6_212/15
That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Board on the honours and distinctions and congratulate the recipients, as set out in the report presented.
Action: Chair of the Academic Board to write to recipients congratulating them on their honours and distinctions.

6.3 General Report

6.3.1 Academic Board Standing Committees: Nominations for Membership
Members approved the nomination

Resolution AB_6_213/15
That the Academic Board approve the nomination of Dr Wayne Cotton as the representative of the Faculty of Education and Social Work on the Undergraduate Studies Committee for a term of membership expiring 31 December 2015.

Action: Executive Officer to update membership list.

6.3.2 Coursework Policy and ESOS compliance
The Chair advised that this amendment has been put forward by the Office of General Counsel to ensure the timelines outlined in clause 101 are aligned with those in the ESOS National Code. The amendment will have immediate effect as the University needs to comply with the code. Members approved the amendment.

Resolution AB_6_214/15
That the Academic Board approve the proposed amendment to clause 101 of the Coursework Policy 2014 with immediate effect.

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

6.3.3 Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce Report
The Chair advised that he had planned to bring the second report of the taskforce to this meeting, but it needs to be reviewed by Senate first. He advised that the report will include recommendations on staff training, HDR students (including recommendations that theses be submitted to Turnitin, and that policies related to academic misconduct and HDR students be collated in one document), sanctions and referrals to the Registrar (it is recommended that Chapter 8 of the By-Law be replaced by a Rule of Senate), and that the Student Code of Conduct be reviewed by a panel of students as part of building a culture of academic honesty amongst students. Members noted the report.

Resolution AB_6_215/15
That the Academic Board note the update report on the work of the Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce.

6.3.4 2014 University of Sydney Indicators of Perceived Quality of Student Learning Experiences and Graduate Outcomes
The Chair invited Professor Pattison to present this item. She noted that there are some concerning aspects to these statistics, but also grounds for optimism. There have been improvement in learner engagement and on the generic skills scales, but teaching quality and employment outcomes are middling and the results for learning resources and student support are concerning. She reminded members that many of the initiatives outlined in the second education discussion paper relate to building student skills to improve graduate outcomes. She added that her office will make student feedback data as widely available as possible.

The Chair thanked Professor Pattison for this report, noting that the University's rankings compared with other Group of Eight universities needs to improve. The employability of undergraduate students is particularly concerning, more so when considered in the context of how disruptive technology changes will affect employment prospects in the future. Professor Pattison agreed that this is a sector-wide concern, but
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pointed out there are recommendations to revise the University’s curricula to address this. Professor Masters asked if it is possible to drill further down on the data to assess how effective teaching is in specific courses. He particularly noted Table 2B (coursework postgraduates in full-time employment) with respect to the Faculty of Science, and Professor Pattison pointed out that a significant number of science students go on to further research study. However the employment prospects are not good, and while there is a national push for more STEM graduates there is yet to be an increase in job opportunities.

Resolution AB_6_216/15
That the Academic Board note the 2014 University of Sydney Indicators of Perceived Quality of Student Learning Experiences and Graduate Outcomes.

6.3.5 Correspondence Register
There are no items to report to this meeting

6.3.6 Preparing more Indigenous teachers at the University of Sydney
The Chair advised that the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Indigenous Strategy and Services) and the Dean of the Faculty of Education and Social Work are requesting that the Academic Board facilitate a taskforce to look at the issue of training indigenous teachers. The Faculty had been preparing a course proposal in this area, but has had to abandon the course due to a range of external and internal issues. Members endorsed the proposal to form a taskforce.

Resolution AB_6_217/15
That the Academic Board endorse the formation of a taskforce to create an institution-wide discussion on optimal ways of delivering teacher education for Indigenous students as set out in the report presented.

6.3.7 Higher Education Policy updates
Members noted the two reports from the Higher Education Policy unit.

Resolution AB_6_218/15
That the Academic Board note the reports from the Higher Education Policy unit on the recent TEQSA provider roundtable, student fees and work integrated learning experiences for STEM students, as set out in the report presented.

The Chair advised members that elections for academic staff and student members of the Academic Board would commence in the following week, adding that any queries should be directed to the Executive Officer.

7. Report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal
7.1 Report on Senate Matters
No Senate meeting has been held since the last Academic Board meeting

7.2 General report
The Vice-Chancellor began by apologising for some of his comments regarding simple extensions at the previous meeting which had been misconstrued, explaining that he had wanted to highlight the variability of the current system. He spoke to members on the following matters:

- The development of the Strategic Plan: the next discussion paper to be released will be a short paper on culture based on the “Many Values” workshops, and he encouraged members to comment on this and the previous papers on education and research;
- Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce: the Vice-Chancellor thanked the Chair of the Academic Board for his work in chairing the working party and developing the two reports, adding that the Chair is also leading a review on continuing education;
- Survey on incidence of sexual harassment and assault: this survey will be released at the end of the month to obtain a base line on incidents of this
nature in the student population; the University will also be reviewing its policies and procedures and education (this would go beyond consent to cover such issues as respectful relationships); the University will also look at empowering people to protect themselves and the use of alcohol on campus; the Vice-Chancellor pointed out this is an issue for university campuses globally, and will be getting more attention next year with the release of the US documentary "The Hunting Ground"; the University will be speaking with the distributors about how the film could be screened on campus and what support can be provided to people for whom the film raises issues;
- Group of Eight: the Vice-Chancellor will be taking over chairing the Group of Eight from Professor Ian Young;
- The Quality Assurance Council of Hong Kong: he noted that his involvement with this organisation has proved useful as many of the universities of Hong Kong are exploring issues similar to those raised in our education strategy consultation papers; and
- The Athena SWAN program: the program was launched today in Canberra, and the University is also launching a sponsorship program for women from culturally or linguistically diverse backgrounds who have been identified as potential academic leaders.

Mr Blakeney noted the Vice-Chancellor’s report regarding a survey on incidents of sexual harassment and assault, advising that the SRC has held discussions on campus security, lighting, access to the campus by people who aren’t part of the University community, and other issues. Both the University of Sydney Union (USU) and SRC run a range of educational programs such as the USU's radical sex and consent week, and the SRC’s Wom*n’s Collective and self-defence training. He suggested the University increase their support for these initiatives. He added that assaults are more likely to happen after events on campus than at them, which is why the SRC supports doing more to improve security. He also recommended doing more to improve the culture in the residential colleges. The Vice-Chancellor agreed that after hours security is important, but more needs to be done to deal with people being attacked by people they know. He added that the University needs to work with the student organisations on this issue but the student organisations also need to continue their own work.

**Resolution AB_6_219/15**
That the Academic Board note the report presented by the Provost.

8. **Question time**

Mr Blakeney referred to the discussion at the previous Academic Board meeting regarding student accommodation and the Vice-Chancellor apologised that the promised report had not been forthcoming and undertook to chase it up.

Professor Masters advised member that the Decadal Plan for Chemistry, developed by the Australian Academy of Science’s National Committee for Chemistry, contains a recommendation that the government mandate study of chemistry in Year 12 for admission to chemistry units at university. He expressed concern that inviting the government to be involved in the admissions criteria for university courses could lead to involvement in the curriculum, and he urged any staff involved with the academies to be cautious of such recommendations. The Vice-Chancellor agreed, noting that the government has already intervened in the area of teacher training. Professor Pattison advised that a Universities Australia group has been working with peak bodies in the professions to develop principles for accreditation which might address parallel issues in that context.

**Resolution AB_6_220/15**
That the Academic Board note the responses to the questions raised.

9. **Reports of the Faculties**

9.1 **Board of Studies in Rural Management: Amendment to membership**

**Resolution AB_6_221/15**
That the Academic Board approve the proposed change to membership of the Board of Studies in Rural Management with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

28 October 2015
Action: Executive Officer to update the membership list.

9.2 Faculty of Science: Amendment to Faculty Constitution

Resolution AB_6_222/15
That the Academic Board recommend that Senate approve the amendments to the Senate Resolutions relating to the Constitution of the Faculty of Science with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

Action: Chair to recommend that Senate approve amendments to the Resolutions of Senate related to the Constitution of the Faculty of Science.

The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Science, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Resolutions of Senate related to the Constitution of the Faculty of Science.

10. Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee

10.1 Oral report of the Chair
Associate Professor Cattle advised the committee had dealt with a number of minor course amendments at its last meeting. The Chair added that the proposal to amend the units of study in the Civil Engineering stream of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours had been contentious.

Resolution AB_6_223/15
That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Undergraduate Studies Committee.

10.2 Report of the meeting held on 2 September 2015

10.2.1 Minor course amendment proposals

10.2.1.1 Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies

(1) Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Civil Engineering)

Resolution AB_6_224/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Civil Engineering stream of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours; and
(2) approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Civil Engineering stream of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours.

(2) Bachelor of Project Management

Resolution AB_6_225/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Project Management; and
(2) approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies, to note the Academic Board’s
10.2.1.2 Faculty of Science: Resolutions of the Faculty of Science for coursework awards

Resolution AB_6_226/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Faculty Resolutions; and
(2) approve the amendments to the Faculty Resolutions arising from this proposal with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

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

11.2.2 Proceedings of the Committee

Resolution AB_6_227/15
That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Admissions Committee meeting held on 2 September 2015, as set out in the report presented.

11. Report of the Graduate Studies Committee

11.1 Oral report of the Chair
Professor Masters referred to the ranking guidelines approved under item 11.2.3, and advised that there were questions from some faculties regarding the operation of the guidelines which have been referred back to the Postgraduate Awards Subcommittee with the request that they work with the faculties to address their issues. The Chair noted that the major review of the ranking guidelines performed by Professor Carroll had led to the revisions approved late last year and that it would be worthwhile reviewing the operation of the guidelines in another year.

Resolution AB_6_228/15
That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee.

11.2 Report of the meeting held on 2 September 2015

11.2.1 Minor course amendment proposals

11.2.1.1 University of Sydney Business School: Master of Business Administration

Resolution AB_6_229/15
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend the Master of Business Administration; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

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

(1) Master of Medicine, Master of Medicine (Advanced), Master of Science in Medicine, Master of Science in Medicine (Advanced), Graduate Diploma in Medicine, Graduate Diploma in Science in Medicine, Graduate Certificate in Medicine, Graduate Certificate in Science in Medicine

Resolution AB_6_230/15

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine to amend the Master of Medicine, Master of Medicine (Advanced), Master of Science in Medicine, Master of Science in Medicine (Advanced), Graduate Diploma in Medicine, Graduate Diploma in Science in Medicine, Graduate Certificate in Medicine and Graduate Certificate in Science in Medicine; and

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

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

(2) Changes to Tables of Units of Study

Resolution AB_6_231/15

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine to amend tables of units of study for the study areas of Clinical Epidemiology, Genetic Counselling, Public Health and Qualitative Health Research; and

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

Action: The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Medicine, to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend tables of units of study for the study areas of Clinical Epidemiology, Genetic Counselling, Public Health and Qualitative Health Research.

11.2.2 English Standards for Admission to Higher Degrees by Research

Resolution AB_6_232/15

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the amendment of the Schedule of approved Faculty variations, above the University minimum requirements with immediate effect, and

(2) note the future amendment of the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 as set out in the report presented.

Action: Executive Officer to update Schedule on website.
11.2.3 Ranking Guidelines for the Award of Postgraduate Scholarships

Resolution AB_6_233/15
That the Academic Board approve the amendments to the ranking guidelines with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

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

11.2.4 Intellectual Property Policy 2015

Resolution AB_6_234/15
That the Academic Board endorse the Intellectual Property Policy 2015.

11.2.5 Proceedings of the Committee

Resolution AB_6_235/15
That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on 2 September 2015, as set out in the report presented.

12. General Business

The meeting finished at 3:46 pm

Signed as a correct record

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

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

6.1.1 Report on the Senate meeting held on 28 September 2015

At its meeting on 28 September 2015, Senate resolved as follows:

(1) **Faculty Constitutions – Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Faculty of Science**

Approved the amendments of the constitution of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the constitution of the Faculty of Science.

(2) **Courses**

Endorsed the Academic Board’s approval of proposals from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

and

Approved the amendments of the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates with effect from 1 January 2019 for the Graduate Certificate in China Studies, 1 January 2020 for the Graduate Diploma in China Studies and 1 January 2022 for the Master of China Studies in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

(3) **Minor Course Amendments**

Endorsed the Academic Board’s approval of a range of minor amendments to existing courses, with effect from various dates as set out in the report presented to Senate.

**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 28 September 2015.

6.2 Honours and Distinctions

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

**Professor Warwick ANDERSON**, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

Awarded the General History award for *Intolerant Bodies: A Short History of Autoimmunity* at this year’s NSW Premier’s History Awards.

**Emeritus Professor Alan ATKINSON**, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

Awarded the Australian History Prize at this year’s NSW Premier’s History Awards for his third, and final, volume in the landmark, award-winning series *The Europeans in Australia* (titled *Nation*).

**Professor Elaine BAKER**, Faculty of Science


**Dr Michael BOWEN**, Faculty of Science

Awarded the inaugural NSW Early Career Researcher of the Year award in the 2015 NSW Premier’s Prizes for Science and Engineering.

**Dr Jonathan BRETT**, Faculty of Pharmacy

Awarded the NMRC Gustav Nossal Scholarship for his research into pharmaceutical wastage.

**Dr Anne CUST**, Faculty of Medicine

Awarded a Research Action Award from the Sax Institute.

**Professor Nick ENFIELD**, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

Awarded an Ig Nobel Prize for breakthrough research in linguistics that found evidence of a universal trait in human conversation.
Associate Professor Jaime GONGORA, Faculty of Veterinary Science
Awarded a 2015 Citation for Outstanding Contributions to Student Learning by the OLT (Office for Teaching and Learning).

Associate Professor Lisa HARVEY, Faculty of Medicine

Professor Nalini JOSHI, Faculty of Science

Dr Manreena KAUR, Brain and Mind Centre
Awarded a Society for Mental Health Research (SMHR) 2015 Early Career Researcher Award.

Associate Professor Ian KERRIDGE, Centre for Values, Ethics and the Law in Medicine
Awarded the NHMRC Ethics Award for dissecting ethical issues in health practice and policy, and promoting high ethical standards in health care and research.

Associate Professor Julie LEASK, Faculty of Medicine
Awarded a Research Action Award from the Sax Institute.

Professor Robert PARK, Faculty of Agriculture and Environment
Elected as a Fellow of the Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering.

Professor Anushka PATEL, The George Institute
Awarded the NHMRC Elizabeth Blackburn Fellowship for Public Health for her research into effective treatments for the prevention and management of cardiovascular and other chronic diseases.

Associate Professor Ian SEPPELT, The George Institute
Awarded the highest ranked project grant by the NHMRC for a clinical trial to test the impacts of treatments for critically ill ventilated patients.

Associate Professor Alyson SIMPSON, Faculty of Education and Social Work
Awarded a 2015 Citation for Outstanding Contributions to Student Learning by the OLT (Office for Teaching and Learning).

Professor Salah SUKKARIEH, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies
Elected as a Fellow of the Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering.

Professor Branka VUCETIC, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies
Elected as a Fellow of the Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering.

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 2015 Academic Board elections

As members will be aware, elections are being conducted to elect academic staff members and student members from each of the faculties. One election is still being held for the Faculty of Science and the results of this election will be reported at the meeting of the Academic Board. Those members from other faculties elected unopposed are outlined on pages B5-B6 as are a number of nominations from Deans to fill vacancies as follows:

Agriculture and Environment
Dr Tina Bell
Associate Professor Tom Bishop
Associate Professor Robyn McConchie
The above representatives are nominated to fill remaining vacancies for the term 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2017.

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board:
(1) appoint the academic staff members nominated by their deans to fill casual vacancies for the term 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2017; and
(2) note the report on the 2015 Academic Board elections as set out in the report presented.

### 6.3.1.2 Student elections

While not all results are available as yet, those students declared elected unopposed are outlined on page B7. A number of elections are currently underway, and these results will be advised at the Academic Board meeting.

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board note the report on the 2015 Academic Board elections for student members as set out in the report presented.

### 6.3.1.3 Election of Chair of Academic Board

The Chair will provide advice at the meeting regarding the nominations received for the election of the Chair of Academic Board.

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board note the report on the 2015 Academic Board elections for the Chair of the Academic Board.
6.3.2 OLT grant application “Institutional strategies for academic integrity in the digital age”

At its 2014 Annual Conference, the national group of Chairs of Academic Boards and Senates discussed establishing a joint research project, with contributions (hopefully) from all institutions, along the theme of Academic Integrity in the Digital Age. Subsequently the OLT announced “Academic Integrity and good practice in assessment” as one of the priority areas for its Strategic Priority Commissioned Grants for 2016. The Chair is currently working with other colleagues to produce an OLT grant application along the lines outlined below:

Institutional strategies for academic integrity in the digital age

Aims: This project aims to tackle the challenges that universities face in ensuring academic integrity in the digital age from the perspective of institution-wide and sector-wide strategies. It seeks to understand the effectiveness of institution-wide strategies for different types of universities and to build models for institution-wide and sector-wide engagement. Key to this is understanding the role of academics in establishing shared, collegially derived standards, the role of students in shaping and changing culture, the effectiveness of educational approaches and remediation strategies, and good practice for policy formulation, implementation and ongoing review. Higher education institutions need to develop ways of sharing information on the reasons for academic misconduct, modern pressures on students and the drivers for misconduct that may arise unintentionally from curriculum structures, approaches to assessment, compliance frameworks and pedagogical practice. Institutions need a nuanced understanding of threats and opportunities in relation to academic integrity that arise from new technology, and of the role of social media in shaping attitudes and practice.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the Chair’s report on the proposed OLT grant application “Institutional strategies for academic integrity in the digital age”.

6.3.3 2016 Academic Board meeting dates

Members are advised that the schedule of meeting dates for 2016 is attached.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the schedule of meeting dates for 2016 as presented.

6.3.4 End-of-year Celebrations

The Chair will provide an oral report on plans for the end-of-year celebrations to be held following the Board’s final meeting for the year on 2 December 2015. The Board will be asked to endorse holding a charitable collection as part of this function.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board endorse a charitable collection to be run as part of the end-of-year celebrations following the Board’s final meeting for the year on 2 December 2015.

6.3.5 Correspondence Register

Members are asked to note the following items of correspondence:

29/9/15 Correspondence with Academic Board nominee regarding training
16/10/15 Correspondence with Chair of NSW/Territories Committee of Chairs of Academic Board and Senates regarding proposed OLT grant application on “Academic Integrity and good practice in assessment”
20/10/15 Correspondence with the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor regarding proposed amendments to the Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy.
Correspondence with the Vice-President of SUPRA regarding proposed amendments to the Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the register of correspondence, as set out in the report presented.
6.3.1.1 Academic Board elections 2015: Academic Staff elections

5.1.4 the following elected academic staff members, who do not already hold office as members under Rule 5.1.1, 5.1.2 or 5.1.3 elected:

5.1.4.1 by a group of voters defined by each relevant Faculty and approved by the Academic Board; and

5.1.4.2 according to guidelines approved from time to time by the Academic Board and the Senate:

5.1.4.2.1 three academic staff members for each faculty with 40 or fewer full-time academic staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Academic Staff Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>Associate Professor Wendy Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Nicole Gurran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Sandra Loschke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>Vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Midwifery</td>
<td>Dr Jacqueline Bloomfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Tom Buckley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Robyn Gallagher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>Associate Professor Ann Elias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Oliver Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Justin Trendall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>Dr Tina Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor Tom Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor Robyn McConchie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor Balwant Singh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>Associate Professor Tim Allender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor Judy Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Jen Curwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Ilektra Spandagou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Associate Professor Jamie Glister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Greg Tolhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>Associate Professor Thomas Grewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Carl Schneider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>Dr Jeanell Carrigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Alan Maddox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor Neal Peres da Costa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Jennifer Rowley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>Associate Professor Alexandre Vieira Chaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Peter White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.4.2.2 four academic staff members for each faculty with more than 40 but fewer than 100 full-time academic staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Academic Staff Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>Dr Tina Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor Tom Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor Robyn McConchie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor Balwant Singh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>Associate Professor Tim Allender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor Judy Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Jen Curwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Ilektra Spandagou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Associate Professor Jamie Glister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Greg Tolhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>Associate Professor Thomas Grewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Carl Schneider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>Dr Jeanell Carrigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Alan Maddox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor Neal Peres da Costa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Jennifer Rowley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>Associate Professor Alexandre Vieira Chaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Peter White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.4.2.3 five academic staff members for each faculty with more than 100 full-time academic staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Academic Staff Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Dr Nerida Jarkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Frances di Lauro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor Susan Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Rebecca Suter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor Graham White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>Ms Patty Kamvounias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Board Report of the Chair – Appendix B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dr Eric Knight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Associate Professor Susan McGrath-Champ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Associate Professor Maurice Peat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Associate Professor Catherine Sutton-Brady</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dr Douglass Auld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professor Alan Fekete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professor David Lowe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vacancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vacancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professor Patrick Brennan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dr Anne Honey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Associate Professor Mark McEntee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dr Rhonda Orr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professor Roger Stancliffe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Associate Professor Rachel Codd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professor Manuel Graeber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dr Lenka Munoz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Associate Professor Henry Woo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vacancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ELECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ELECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ELECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ELECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3.1.2 Academic Board elections 2015: Student elections

5.1.5 the following elected student members:

| Faculty of Agriculture and Environment | Ms Isobella Revell | UG |
| Faculty of Architecture, Design & Planning | Vacancy | |
| Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences | Election | |
| University of Sydney Business School | Vacancy | |
| Faculty of Dentistry | Vacancy | |
| Faculty of Education & Social Work | Ms Angela Rose | PG |
| Faculty of Engineering & Information Technologies | Vacancy | |
| Faculty of Health Sciences | Vacancy | |
| Faculty of Law | Mr Michael Butler | PG |
| Faculty of Medicine | Election | |
| Faculty of Nursing & Midwifery | Ms Alexandra Catterson | UG |
| Faculty of Pharmacy | Election | |
| Faculty of Science | Ms Philippa Specker | UG |
| Faculty of Veterinary Science | Ms Dana Kolsky | UG |
| Sydney College of the Arts | Vacancy | |
| Sydney Conservatorium of Music | Election | |
6.3.2 2016 Academic Board meeting dates

The 2016 meeting dates for the Academic Board are set out below.
Also included in the schedule are the dates by which material must be presented to the Academic Board Office in order for it to be included in the agenda for the next meeting and the dates when it is expected that the agenda will be mailed and available on the Web.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Close-off for receipt of reports</th>
<th>Academic Board meeting date</th>
<th>provision for deferred meeting of Academic Board (rarely invoked)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agenda mailed and available on Web</td>
<td>Professorial Board Room, 2 pm</td>
<td>Professorial Board Room, 2 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 February</td>
<td>17 February</td>
<td>24 February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 March</td>
<td>23 March</td>
<td>30 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 May</td>
<td>11 May</td>
<td>18 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 June</td>
<td>22 June</td>
<td>29 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 August</td>
<td>10 August</td>
<td>17 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 August</td>
<td>7 September</td>
<td>14 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 October</td>
<td>26 October</td>
<td>2 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 November</td>
<td>30 November</td>
<td>7 December</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Easter: Friday 25 to Monday 28 March inclusive
Anzac Day Public Holiday: Monday 25 April
Queen’s Birthday: Monday 13 June
Labour Day: Monday 3 October
AVCC Common Weeks / non-teaching periods: Friday 25 March to Friday 1 April inclusive; Monday 4 to Friday 8 July inclusive; Monday 26 to Friday 30 September inclusive.
Report on Senate Matters

7.1 Report of the Senate meeting held on 28 September 2015

At its meeting held on 28 September 2015, I provided to Senate an update on the 2015 strategic priorities. My report to Senate on the strategic priorities is attached for information.

(1) Senate decisions

Senate resolved to approve:

- in relation to items from the Vice-Chancellor's report the revoking of three degrees conferred, the degrees could be re-conferred once the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine notified the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) that the students involved had satisfactorily completed the remedial actions indicated in the report.

[Members wishing to receive further information regarding the approval made by Senate should contact the Executive Officer to Senate via email mark.j.smith@sydney.edu.au]

(2) Other matters

Senate at its September meeting held an in-depth discussion on the development of the 2016 – 2020 Strategic Plan.

Senate also noted and discussed at its September meeting the following items:

- updated information on the Taskforce on Student Misconduct and gave in principle support to the drafting of a new Rule of Senate on Student Discipline to replace Chapter 8 of the By-law as recommended by the Taskforce;
- authorised the Secretary to Senate and the General Counsel to review the University of Sydney By-law and identify any other necessary amendments and liaise with the Office of Parliamentary Counsel to arrange for the repeal of Chapter 8 of the By-law;
- the Vice-Chancellor undertaking the role of Chair of the Go8 in 2016;
- the opportunity to thank Mr Mark Easson, Chief Financial Officer, for his contribution to the University and wished him well for his future endeavours; and
- the reports from the Building and Estates Committee, the Chair Appointments Committee, the Finance and Audit Committee, the Nominations and Appointments Committee and the Safety and Risk Management Committee.

[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]

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal on matters considered by Senate at its meeting of 28 September 2015.
Vice-Chancellor’s Report to Senate – 28 September 2015

Items for approval

7.1 Strategy discussion for September meeting

Senate Fellows will have received a copy of the Culture strategy discussion paper, *A culture built on our values*, on Wednesday 16 September. I would encourage and appreciate feedback on this significant theme of the Strategic Plan 2016–20 within the next four weeks. Your comments may be sent either to me personally at michael.spence@sydney.edu.au or to university.strategy@sydney.edu.au.

At this Senate meeting, the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor will provide Fellows with an update on Organisational Design, including the feedback he has received from the many consultation sessions he has conducted. It is anticipated that the final discussion paper on this theme will be released shortly after the Senate meeting at the end of September 2015.

7.2 Year in Preview

In February, I tabled the 2015 *Year in Preview* document and committed to bringing you an update in September.

A full report and analysis of the *Year in Preview* will be provided at the December 2015 meeting.

7.3 Items for Decision

1) Student Academic Misconduct Taskforce update

A soft copy of the second report of the Student Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce (the Taskforce) has been provided to all Senate Fellows and is accessible on the Senate 28 September meeting website.

This report and its recommendations were approved and endorsed by SEG on 17 September 2015.

The second report has built on the recommendations of the first report, focusing on the policies and procedures for managing allegations of student misconduct. To prepare the second report, the working party undertook a series of workshops with Nominated Academics from across the University, held a forum with student representatives, and interviewed key University personnel. A number of specialist reports were also produced to investigate key processes across the University.

Complementing the first report’s recommendations, the Taskforce has now recommended that a refreshed program of specialist workshops and other programs be implemented to support staff in addressing issues of academic integrity. A number of recommendations have also focused on the issue of student research misconduct, including expanding the implementation of Turnitin to check theses, and ensuring that research data is handled appropriately.

The Taskforce has also recommended that the student discipline provisions of the University of Sydney By-law 1999 (as amended) be removed and replaced by a new Rule of Senate to allow the University greater control over the process and greater flexibility to change the process in the future as the need arises. The Taskforce has also made several recommendations as to how the current process can be simplified to improve efficiency. It is also proposed that the recordkeeping system recommended in the first report be expanded to ensure all student misconduct matters are recorded appropriately.

Several recommendations are also made to support a continuing culture of academic integrity at the University, including improvements in communication and recommending consideration be given to introducing an education and awareness program around the Student Code of Conduct that may help realise some of the documented advantages experienced in universities that have implemented honour codes.
Implementation of the Taskforce’s first report recommendations, as endorsed by SEG and the Academic Board is currently underway. Following endorsement of the second report recommendations, projects to implement these will be commenced as appropriate. The Taskforce will meet for a final time in mid-November, when it will consider an update on the implementation of its recommendations and the ongoing program of work to be rolled out during 2016.

The Taskforce was established in April 2015 in response to the MyMaster allegations and the allegations that surfaced in regard to student academic misconduct in the Sydney Medical School in the Integrated Population Medicine component of the medical degree course. The investigation into the final three cases, the students who have since graduated, is now complete and a submission by the University’s General Counsel, Richard Fisher providing details for Senate Fellows was provided.

In summary, investigations were initiated pursuant to paragraph 47(2)(a) and paragraph 47(2)(f) of the University of Sydney By-law 1999 to investigate allegations of misconduct in regard to three medical graduates. Professor Fiona Blyth (Associate Dean and Head of School, Concord Clinical School) and Associate Professor Christopher Dennis (Associate Dean and Head of School, Northern Clinical School, Consultant Physician, Department of Respiratory Medicine, Royal North Shore Hospital) (the Panel) were appointed to investigate the allegations. The Panel found that the three medical graduates engaged in conduct contrary to the University's policies and procedures and recommended the remedial action.

The general question of the management of misconduct cases and the procedures to decide penalties has been reviewed and considered by the Taskforce, with several recommendations arising from this review. While these recommendations have been endorsed for implementation, there has been the immediate need to manage the cases in the Sydney Medical School in a fair, just and consistent manner. With the support of Professor Pearl Rozenberg from the Business School, a framework was developed to manage the decisions for this cohort of students.

As part of the broader review of the students undertaking the Integrated Population Medicine component of their course, students were given an opportunity to self-report whether the assignment(s) submitted by them included inaccuracies or omissions or if they had misrepresented the number of patient meetings.

A large number of students self-reported as part of this process. Given the volume of students who had self-reported, panels were formed to assess each student’s conduct and a table was developed entitled Decision criteria for consideration of students within Integrated Population Medicine Program for Academic Dishonesty and Personal and Professional Development. The Decision Criteria categorised students according to their conduct by reference to 8 categories. These categories represented similarity of conduct, not necessarily in order of severity.

The conduct of the three graduates for consideration by Senate Fellows was reviewed in accordance with this Decision Criteria. Each of the graduates in question fell into Category 4 of the Decision Criteria:

- Genuine, independent patient recruited and consent form signed, but fewer meetings occurred than required and some meeting details or content fabricated or inaccurately reported.

Category 4 was broken into two sub-categories; Category 4(a), where 3 or more meetings were accurately reported; and Category 4(b), where only 1 or 2 meetings occurred while others were falsified. Each of the medical graduates in question fell into category 4(b).

The penalty for Category 4(b) is described as follows:

- Academic dishonesty less than student misconduct — warning AND level 2 remediation +/- apply fail grade to all or part of the assessment (s5.8.1, 5.8.3 AD&PP)
- Breach constitutes breach statement of expectations BUT NOT failure to make satisfactory progress — level 2 remediation (s7(4)P&SPP).

Notwithstanding that the Decision Criteria mentioned the possibility of a fail grade being applied in the case of certain categories of conduct, generally in practice fail grades were not applied. Rather,
most students were required to undertake counselling, complete a remedial essay or essays depending on whether deficiencies were identified with respect to both the Unit itself and the Personal and Professional Development (PPD) theme. The penalties proposed to apply to the three medical graduates are consistent with this approach, but entail the additional temporary revocation of their degrees.

The School of Public Health is currently reviewing the assessments in their courses. This is in line with the Taskforce recommendation that an assessment matrix be developed for all degrees across the University to reflect best practice and minimise the opportunities for plagiarism and academic dishonesty.

7.4 Items for Information

(1) Philanthropy update

Campaign Update
Our current Campaign total is at $595 million, just under our INSPIRED goal of $600M. This compares to the University of Melbourne’s current total of $470 million, and the soon-to-be-announced University of Queensland Campaign of $350 million. The University’s academics are telling their stories to donors and prospects more effectively than ever — and more often. This week we surpassed 10,000 donors for 2015, and we are on track to raise over $120 million in this calendar year. This represents a 40% increase in philanthropic revenue over 2014.

Pave the Way
On 3 September 2015, Pave the Way raised a total of $3.6 million, donated by 1009 donors and staff donors totalling 300. 19% of gifts were directed to youth mental health research at the Brain and Mind Centre, and 18% to Indigenous scholarships.

We were very grateful to receive a major gift from Chancellor Belinda Hutchinson AM and her husband Roger Massy-Greene to improve science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) teaching in disadvantaged schools. The $1 million gift will provide scholarships to attract the University’s top STEM graduates to the Master of Teaching program and prepare them as specialist STEM teachers for disadvantaged high schools in the Sydney area. The initiative is intended to increase the number of STEM teachers in the Master of Teaching program, increase the number of students from disadvantaged schools who choose to study STEM subjects at senior levels, improve their HSC results, and increase the number of students who continue STEM study at a tertiary level.

Pave the Way is a community event — this year 364 alumni, staff and donors acted as ambassadors, creating an extensive reach across social media networks. The video created by the Marketing and Communications team for the day was viewed more than 22,000 times, with the hashtag trending across the country. Further information on the activities of the day has been provided in the Vice-Chancellor’s monthly newsletter.

Update on $15 million museum gift from Dr Chau Chak Wing
On Monday 14 September 2015, I hosted a lunch in my boardroom with Dr Chau, to thank him for his generous donation. The lunch was preceded by a behind-the-scenes tour of the University Museums led by David Ellis.

Dr Chau’s $15 million gift and the University’s plans to create a new cultural destination for the city of Sydney (by bringing together its significant collections under the same roof in one museum) will be announced to the public on 23 September 2015. Key stakeholders have been kept informed personally in advance of the announcement, and feedback has been uniformly positive. With confidence that the new museum project is going forward, Penelope Seidler has made a gift of $750,000, which will be announced in mid-October, and other supporters are actively considering six- and seven-figure donations to ensure the new museum realises its full potential.

The University will be inviting expressions of interest for the project from architects specialised in adapting heritage buildings. The Chau Chak Wing Museum is scheduled to open in 2018.
limited number of naming opportunities are available for galleries, study rooms and other spaces.

As requested by Fellows at the August meeting, I provide the following information outlining how the founders of the current museums will be appropriately recognised in the new museum. The Development Office, Campus and Infrastructure Services, senior curatorial staff at the Macleay and Nicholson Museums and University Art Gallery and members of the Council of the Friends of the Nicholson Museum were consulted to ensure that there was agreement about the appropriate recognition.

The Nicholson Museum was established as the Museum of Antiquities in 1860 through a donation of 2,300 artefacts by Sir Charles Nicholson. The Nicholson Museum name was first used in 1880 and appears to have been adopted through common usage.

The Macleay family collections were gifted to the University in 1873. At that time William Macleay expressed his wish that the collection be known as the Macleayan Collection of Natural History. The museum opened in the late 1880’s. The Macleay Museum name was adopted through common usage.

All parties consulted have agreed that the museum founders and the collections should be recognised through the naming of galleries and spaces as well as in interpretative displays. Specifically, the founders of the Nicholson Museum and Macleay Museum will be formally recognised in the new Chau Chak Wing Museum with collections (and individual items) retaining their association with their history, for example items in the Nicholson Museum will retain Nicholson Collection as part of their provenance, making it easy for future scholars and researchers to use these collections and understand their history. It is proposed to name a gallery associated with the Nicholson Collection as the Sir Charles Nicholson Gallery.

Items previously in the Macleay Museum will be referred to as the Macleay Collection. It is proposed to name a gallery associated with the Macleay Collection as the Macleay Gallery (as numerous family members were associated with the collection it is appropriate it be simply called the Macleay Gallery). The founder of the family collection, Sir Alexander Macleay, could be recognised through the naming of a collection study room.

In addition, it is proposed to name galleries housing both semi-permanent and temporary exhibitions, study and tutorial rooms and lecture theatres within the museum, after museum founders, past and present benefactors, and scholars.

A proposed introductory exhibition will introduce visitors to highlights of the collections and their history including the Macleay family and Sir Charles Nicholson as well as subsequent donors (such as John Wardell Power), curators and collectors. Furthermore, the museum website will provide a detailed history of the University’s cultural and scientific collections.

The approach is consistent with the University’s *Naming of buildings and other significant physical assets policy* (2005) (amended October 2011).

The costs associated with naming recognition such as signage will be incorporated into the infrastructure budget.

The number, size and location of rooms and galleries within the Chau Chak Wing Museum are yet to be finalised. Preliminary planning of the new museum is underway and detailed floor plans are expected to be finalised in 2017, approximately twelve months prior to the opening of the new museum (expected to be June 2018). Naming proposals will be submitted to the Vice-Chancellor when the detailed floor plans are finalised for approval under the *University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule 2010 (as amended)*. It is proposed that room and gallery names will be made public prior to the opening of the museum in mid-2018.

**Gift of $5 million to Child Health Research**

Research on child health will benefit from a $5 million gift to the University of Sydney’s Charles Perkins Centre from the Financial Markets Foundation for Children.
The Financial Markets Foundation for Children Chair of Translational Childhood Medicine will oversee an Australian-first study of 10,000 couples and their children, which will show in unprecedented detail how biology interacts with environment and lifestyle to affect a child’s health. The study will chart the influence on a child’s health of the health of their parents, their environment in-utero, and their environment in the first years of life.

One in four Australian children aged five to 17 is overweight or obese, and in young children there has been a sharp rise in the incidence of diabetes, cardiovascular disease risk factors, and numerous other disorders. The new position, which will also work with the Children’s Hospital Westmead, responds to an increasing body of evidence pointing to the correlation between declining child health and the rising prevalence of obesity, the increased consumption of nutritionally poor foods, and the decline in physical activity of parents. The Chair will work across the University to transform research into new treatments and therapies, innovative devices, better practices and new lifestyle choices.

(2) New appointments
Executive searches for a new Chief Financial Officer and Chief Information Officer are underway. It is expected that we will announce new incumbents for both roles by the end of October.

The roles of both the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement) and the Vice-Principal (External Relations) have been advertised.

(3) Continuing Education Strategy Working Party
The work of the Continuing Education Strategy Working Party is well underway. The Working Party has requested, received and considered reports from the CEO of Sydney Learning and the Centre for Continuing Education, the results of a survey of the Continuing Professional Development programs offered within the faculties of the University, a paper on alignment with the University’s alumni strategy and an organisational options papers prepared by the Deputy CFO. Senate members have also been invited to make submissions to the working party for consideration as the strategy is developed.

Over the next month, the working party will consider a number of further papers (on MOOCs (Massive Online Open Courses), SPOCs (Small Public Open Courses and the Open Curriculum), a competitor analysis, and a paper on alignment with the University’s Western Sydney strategy. A final report on the proposed strategy will make recommendations on the overall strategic alignment of continuing education for the University, the appropriate business model to deliver this, the necessary governance, and the risks that should be considered. This report will be finalised within the next three months.
9.1 Amendment to Constitution: Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences is proposing to amend its constitution. Following the disestablishment of the Board of Studies in Indigenous Studies and the transfer of its courses to the Faculty of Education and Social Work, there is no longer any need to include the Director of the Koori Centre (or their nominee) in the membership of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

**Recommendation**

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

9.2 2016 Semester Dates

9.2.1 Faculty of Education and Social Work

On behalf of the Faculty of Education and Social Work, the Dean recommends the variation of the semester and vacation dates for 2016 as set out in the report presented. These variations are mainly to allow for fulfilment of practicum requirements.

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board approve the request from the Faculty of Education and Social Work to amend its semester dates for 2016 with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

9.2.2 Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery

The Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery has provided its semester and vacation dates for 2016. This calendar reflects the relevant components of each program by year and specifies teaching periods and clinical placements as required by the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Accreditation Council, and important university dates. The calendar was compiled in consultation with Faculty staff and approved by the Faculty Board on 7 September 2015. Students, the SRC and SUPRA have also been consulted regarding this calendar.

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board approve the request from the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery to amend its semester dates for 2016 with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

9.2.3 Faculty of Veterinary Science

The Faculty of Veterinary Science is proposing to amend its semester and vacation dates for 2016 as set out in the report provided.

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board approve the request from the Faculty of Veterinary Science to amend its semester dates for 2016 with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.
9.1 Amendment to Constitution: Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

Constitution of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

1. The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences shall comprise the following persons:
   1.1 the professors, readers, associate professors, senior lecturers, lecturers and associate lecturers
       who are full-time or fractional permanent or temporary members of the teaching staff or
       research staff of the schools, departments, centres and programs placed under the supervision
       of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences;
   1.2 from the Koori Centre, the Director, or a nominee of the Director;
   1.3 from the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning, the Dean, or a nominee of the Dean;
   1.4 from the University of Sydney Business School, the Dean, or a nominee of the Dean;
   1.5 from the Faculty of Education & Social Work, the Dean, or a nominee of the Dean;
   1.6 from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies, the Dean, or a nominee of the
       Dean;
   1.7 from the Faculty of Law, the Dean, or a nominee of the Dean;
   1.8 from the Faculty of Nursing & Midwifery, the Dean, or a nominee of the Dean;
   1.9 from the Faculty of Science, the Dean, or a nominee of the Dean, and:
       1.9.1 the Heads of the Schools of Mathematics & Statistics, Geosciences and Psychology, or their
           nominees;
   1.10 from the Sydney Conservatorium of Music, the Dean, or a nominee of the Dean;
   1.11 from the Sydney College of the Arts, the Dean, or a nominee of the Dean;
   1.12 not more than eight students elected annually in the manner prescribed by resolution of the
       Senate.

2. Subject to section 2.3, the members appointed in accordance with sections 1.3 to 1.11 shall
   hold office for a period of two years commencing on 1 January following their appointments;
   Members shall be eligible for reappointment or re-election;
   A person shall cease to hold office if that person ceases to hold the qualifications in respect of
   which he or she was eligible to hold office;
   If a vacancy occurs in the office of a member appointed in accordance with sections 1.3 to 1.12,
   the vacancy may be filled in like manner to the appointment and the person so appointed shall
   hold office for the term of the person being replaced.

Membership of the Faculty – schools and departments, centres and programs

1. The schools, departments, centres and programs that the Vice-Chancellor has determined shall
   be placed under the supervision of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences are:
   1.1 School of Letters, Art and Media comprising the following:
       1.1.1 Art History
       1.1.2 English
       1.1.3 Linguistics
       1.1.4 Media and Communications
       1.1.5 Museum Studies
       1.1.6 Theatre and Performance Studies
       1.1.7 Studies in Religion
       1.1.8 Australian Literature Program
       1.1.9 Celtic Studies Program
       1.1.10 Digital Cultures Program
       1.1.11 Film Studies Program
       1.1.12 Centre for Medieval Studies
       1.1.13 Pacific and Regional Archive for Digital Sources in Endangered Cultures
       1.1.14 The Power Institute
   1.2 School of Languages and Cultures comprising the following:
       1.2.1 Arabic Language and Cultures
       1.2.2 Chinese Studies
       1.2.3 Japanese Studies
       1.2.4 French Studies
       1.2.5 Germanic Studies
       1.2.6 Hebrew, Biblical and Jewish Studies
       1.2.7 Indian Sub-Continental Studies
       1.2.8 Indonesian Studies
       1.2.9 Italian Studies
       1.2.10 Korean Studies
       1.2.11 Modern Greek Studies
1.2.12 South East Asian Studies
1.2.13 Spanish and Latin American Studies
1.2.14 Asian Studies Program
1.2.15 Buddhist Studies Program
1.2.16 European Studies Program
1.2.17 International and Comparative Literature Studies (ICLS) Program
1.3 School of Philosophical and Historical Inquiry comprising the following:
1.3.1 Archaeology
1.3.2 Classics and Ancient History
1.3.3 Gender and Cultural Studies
1.3.4 History
1.3.5 Philosophy
1.3.6 American Studies Program
1.3.7 Australian Archaeological Institute at Athens
1.3.8 Centre for Time
1.3.9 Heritage Studies Program
1.3.10 Sydney Centre for the Foundations of Science
1.4 School of Social and Political Sciences comprising the following:
1.4.1 Anthropology
1.4.2 Government and International Relations
1.4.3 Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies
1.4.4 Political Economy
1.4.5 Sociology and Social Policy
1.4.6 Graduate School of Government
1.4.7 Centre for International Security Studies
1.5 School of Economics
### 2016 Semester Dates: Faculty of Education and Social Work

#### Report of the Faculty of Education and Social Work

On behalf of the Faculty of Education and Social Work, the Dean recommends the variation of the semester and vacation dates for 2016 as follows in respect of this Faculty. These variations are mainly to allow for fulfilment of practicum requirements.

#### 2016 Semester Dates – Faculty of Education and Social Work

**Semester 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTeach Year 1</td>
<td>29 February</td>
<td>17 June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTeach Year 2</td>
<td>29 February</td>
<td>24 June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd (Combined) Year 3</td>
<td>29 February</td>
<td>17 June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd (Combined) Year 4</td>
<td>29 February</td>
<td>10 June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd (Primary) Year 4</td>
<td>29 February</td>
<td>17 June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd (HMHE) Year 1</td>
<td>29 February</td>
<td>17 June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd (HMHE) Year 3</td>
<td>29 February</td>
<td>24 June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd (Early Childhood) Year 4</td>
<td>29 February</td>
<td>24 June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSW Year 4</td>
<td>15 February</td>
<td>31 June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Semester 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTeach Year 2</td>
<td>18 July</td>
<td>23 September</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd (Combined) Year 5</td>
<td>18 July</td>
<td>2 December</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd (Primary) Year 2</td>
<td>25 July</td>
<td>11 November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd (Primary) Year 3</td>
<td>25 July</td>
<td>11 November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd (Primary) Year 4</td>
<td>25 July</td>
<td>18 November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd (HMHE) Year 2</td>
<td>25 July</td>
<td>18 November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd (HMHE) Year 4</td>
<td>25 July</td>
<td>18 November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd (Early Childhood) Year 2</td>
<td>25 July</td>
<td>11 November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd (Early Childhood) Year 3</td>
<td>25 July</td>
<td>11 November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd (Early Childhood) Year 4</td>
<td>25 July</td>
<td>18 November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSW Year 3</td>
<td>25 July</td>
<td>4 November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 9.2.2 2016 Semester Dates: Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BN Yr 1</td>
<td>BN Yr 2</td>
<td>BN Yr 3</td>
<td>BN Yr 1</td>
<td>BN Yr 2</td>
<td>BN Yr 3</td>
<td>BN Yr 1</td>
<td>BN Yr 2</td>
<td>BN Yr 3</td>
<td>BN Yr 1</td>
<td>BN Yr 2</td>
<td>BN Yr 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN Yr 4</td>
<td>BN Yr 5</td>
<td>Postgrad Clinical</td>
<td>BN (Post-Reg) STA</td>
<td>BN Yrs</td>
<td>Research Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**
- **Teaching**
- ** Clinical**
- **Seminars**
- **Lab**
- **Study**
- **Exam**
- **Exams**
- **Public Holidays**
- **Extra Days**
- **BN** (BN photoshop.png)
- **MN** (MN photoshop.png)
- **CD** (CD photoshop.png)
- **Postgrad** (Postgrad photoshop.png)
- **SIM** (SIM photoshop.png)
- **Reg** (Reg photoshop.png)
- **BN Hons** (BN Hons photoshop.png)
- **Postgrad** (Postgrad photoshop.png)
- **Community Health** (Community Health photoshop.png)
- **Exams** (Exams photoshop.png)

**Note:** The University agrees to three Universities Australia Common Vacation Weeks each year.

**Note:** The University is expected to close down for the Christmas break between 19/12/16 - 2/1/17 inclusive.

**Public Holidays**
- Good Friday, Friday 25 March
- Easter Monday, Monday 28 March
- ANZAC Day, Monday 25 April
- Queen's Birthday, Monday 1 June
- Labour Day, Monday 3 October

**Note:** Clinical placements are subject to change based on staff, student, and clinical capacity. Note the hours required for each Placement.

**Contingency Clinical Placements.** Students are required to be available during designated 'Contingency' periods in case clinical placements are unavailable at earlier times.

**Any individual student would only be allocated to a Clinical Placement(s) covering part of the last time available.**

**Any individual student would only be allocated to a Clinical Placement(s) covering part of the last time available.**
9.2.3 2016 Semester Dates: Faculty of Veterinary Science

Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Veterinary Science

Contact person:

1. **Name of award course**
   - Bachelor of Animal and Veterinary Bioscience
   - Bachelor of Veterinary Science
   - Bachelor of Veterinary Biology
   - Doctor of Veterinary Medicine

2. **Purpose of proposal**
   To advise the Academic Board of the Faculty of Veterinary Science semester timetables for the academic year 2016. This schedule shows the semester dates for students enrolled in the Faculty’s postgraduate professional program (Doctor of Veterinary Medicine), and the Faculty’s undergraduate programs:
   - Years 1-2 of the Bachelor of Veterinary Biology (BVBiol) degree,
   - Years 1-4 of the Bachelor of Animal and Veterinary Bioscience (BAnVetBioSc),
   - Year 4 of the Bachelor of Veterinary Science (BVSc) degree, and
   - the clinical placements (rotations) in Year 5 of the BVSc

   The faculty is currently in a transition between the end-dated BVSc (last new admission in 2013) and the DVM (first new admission in 2015).

   Semester 1 dates for undergraduate Years 1-4 are identical to the University calendar. For students enrolled in Year 4 of the BAnVetBioSc and the BVSc degree programs Semester 2 begins and ends one week earlier than the University calendar. Similarly study vacation and the formal examination period are also one week earlier than the University calendar. This variation to the University calendar is required to allow adequate time for Semester 2 examination marking to be completed prior to Year 4 BVSc students progressing into Year 5 clinical placements in November of each year. There is a barrier to progression that prevents students enrolled in the BVSc from entering Year 5 until they have successfully completed all Year 4 units of study. Students enrolled in Year 4 of the BAnVetBioSc degree follow the same Semester 2 dates as the year 4 BVSc students for harmonisation of teaching and examination periods at the Camden Campus, where both student cohorts are taught, and to allow graduation of this cohort at the main veterinary science ceremony in December.

   Year 5 clinical placements in the BVSc degree are scheduled throughout the year to allow students adequate time to complete the ten rotations required by the degree before November of the following year.

   Years 1 and 2 of the DVM have extended semester dates for the following reasons:
   (i) to allow for the incorporation of weeks for students to go on animal husbandry placements. Having these weeks during normal semester time allows the students more opportunities to complete the required placements.
   (ii) An emphasis on practical skills development in the new curriculum. 14 week semesters allows more time for the students to develop their practical skills.

3. **Details of amendment**
   It is proposed that the attached semester schedule documents the semester dates for the Faculty of Veterinary Science for the 2016 academic year.

4. **Transitional arrangements**
   No transitional arrangements are required for this amendment.

5. **Other relevant information**

6. **Signature of Dean**
### FACULTY OF VETERINARY SCIENCE
#### SEMESTER TIMETABLE 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG Year 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Year 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Year 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Year 4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Year 5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Information**

- Academic Board Reports of the Faculties – Appendix D
- Postgraduate Professional program (DVM) - replaces BVSc, transition arrangements until 2018
- UG Teaching period yrs 1-3
- UG Teaching Period yet
- UG Year 5 Clinical Rotations
- BVSc, transition arrangements until 2018
- BVSc, Animal Husbandry Placement

### FACULTY OF VETERINARY SCIENCE
#### SEMESTER TIMETABLE 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG DVM Year 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG DVM Year 2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG DVM Year 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Information**

- Academic Board Reports of the Faculties – Appendix D
- Postgraduate Professional program (DVM) - replaces BVSc, transition arrangements until 2018
- UG Teaching period yrs 1-3
- UG Teaching Period yet
- UG Year 5 Clinical Rotations
- BVSc, transition arrangements until 2018
- BVSc, Animal Husbandry Placement
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10.2 Report of the Admissions Committee meeting held on 29 September 2015

The Admissions Committee met at 10am on Tuesday, 29 September 2015, when there were present: Professor J Hanrahan (Chair), Professor T Carlin, Ms L Carmichael, Ms W Chai, Mr K Ghezel, Mr S Isaac, Dr S Jenkins (for Ms J Chambers), Ms M Kemmis, Ms F Kiernan, Associate Professor A Masters, Associate Professor P McCallum, Mr N Smith (for Professor R Cooper), Associate Professor T Wilkinson and Mr M Charet (Committee Secretary).

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

10.2.1 Amended Terms of Reference

The Committee endorsed changes to its constitution, as embodied in the Terms of Reference for the Committee. These changes are intended to remove a position which is no longer occupied and to better utilise University resources by removing unnecessary duplication of staff from the same area. The amendments are as follows:

**Constitution**

**Ex Officio Members**
- the Chair of the Committee
- the Chair of the Academic Board, or nominee
- the Chairs of the Undergraduate Studies and Graduate Studies Committees
- the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar)
- the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Affairs)
- the Director, Student Centre, or nominee
- the Director, Student Recruitment, or nominee
- the Director, Admissions, or nominee
- the President of the Students' Representative Council, or nominee
- the President of the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association, or nominee

**Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board approve the proposed amendment to the Terms of Reference, with immediate effect, as presented.*

10.2.2 Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education

The Committee endorsed the adoption of a revised schedule for the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education (HKDSE) as an entry pathway to the University. Noting that the current schedule requires a number of mandatory subjects (including proficiency in classical Chinese poetry) and applies a disadvantageous scaling system for students proficient in the humanities, it was recommended that applicants with this qualification be assessed on their best five results from Category A and C subjects. The Committee supported the request.

**Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board approve a revised schedule for the recognition of the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education (HKDSE) as an entry pathway to the University, with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.*

10.2.3 Proceedings of the Committee

The Committee also:
- noted the reports of the Academic Board meetings of 19 August and 16 September 2015;
- received a verbal report form the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) on admissions-related activities;
- discussed faculty opt-out from University admissions schemes; and
- noted 2016 meeting dates.

**Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Admissions Committee meeting held on 29 September 2015, as set out in the report presented.*
10.2.2 Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education

Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education (HKDSE)

Background
The HKDSE was introduced in 2012. Students must take four compulsory subjects, plus two or three electives, from any of three categories: Category A (Academic subjects), Category B (Applied learning subjects), or Category C (Other languages).

The compulsory subjects are Chinese language, English language, Liberal Studies and compulsory Mathematics.

Current Schedule
UAC created a schedule in 2011 for the new qualification. The UAC schedule is assessed on the four compulsory subjects plus one Category A subject only. UAC does not assess Category C subjects (other languages, i.e. French, German, Hindi, Japanese, Spanish and Urdu), because these are assessed as being at AS level. Category B (Applied Learning) subjects are also not assessed.

The schedule scores grades (except Maths) as follows: 5** & 5* = 6, 5 = 5, 4 = 4, 3 = 3, 2 = 2, 1 = 1.

Compulsory Mathematics: 5** & 5* = 3, 5 = 2.5, 4 = 2, 3 = 1.5, 2 = 2, 1 = 0.5

Extended Mathematics ('Calculus & Statistics' or 'Algebra & Calculus'): 5** & 5* = 4, 5 = 3.5, 4 = 3, 3 = 2.5, 2 = 2, 1 = 1.5

Academic standard
The UAC schedule is out of line with the assessment practice of other Go8 institutions. It is overly harsh and disadvantages applicants who may be interested in studying humanities.

It is impossible to gain the maximum available UAC rank without taking elective maths. A student taking the compulsory load without extension maths and taking a Category A subject with a 5** grade for all subjects, has a top score under the UAC schedule of 27, giving a rank of 98.80. If an applicant is taking Category C subjects without extension Maths, they could get straight 5** grades and only get a UAC score of 21, translating to a rank of only 84.

In addition to requiring more than the compulsory load to attain the highest rank through the UAC schedule, many otherwise excellent students do comparatively poorly in one of the compulsory subjects, particularly the Chinese language subject, which requires the study of ancient Chinese poetry.

As can be seen from the benchmarking attachment, none of the other Go8 universities require all of the core subjects to be included in the total result, while some specifically exclude the compulsory Chinese subject.

The HKDSE applicants who have managed to gain admittance here are performing significantly better than their counterparts who applied through the UAC. The average 2014 S2 WAM of commencing students who were admitted on the basis of the HKDSE was 69.3. This is not only higher than the mean AAM of commencing UAC students in 2014 (67.2), it is higher than any of the subgroups (eg HSC, NRSL, etc.).

Recommendations
1. That we assess HKDSE applicants on the basis of their best five subjects, including any combination of compulsory and Category A and C electives, but excluding category B (Applied Learning).
2. That we assess all subjects (including Maths) as 5** & 5* = 6, 5 = 5, 4 = 4, 3 = 3, 2 = 2, 1 = 1, thus providing a maximum score of 30.
Benchmarking

**ANU**
Assessed on the best 4 subjects excluding Chinese Language, Physical Education, Technology and Living, Tourism and Hospitality, Health Management and Social Care, Religious Studies, Chinese Literature and Chinese History where 5**= 6; 5*= 5.5; 5 = 5; 4 = 4; 3 = 3; 2 = 2; and 1 = 1.

Cut-offs range from 15 (4,4,4,3) -23 (5**,5**,5*,5*)

**Melbourne**
Entry Scores are calculated using the best five core and elective (category A and C) subjects. Subjects with a score of three or below will not be included in the calculation. International students must meet course prerequisites.

Care needs to be taken when comparing with Melbourne, as Melbourne do not allocate higher marks for 5* and 5**, therefore making the high score a mark out of 25 rather than 30.

**Monash**
Total of the best five subjects (Category A and C only). Scores grades as follows: Level 1 = 1, Level 2 = 2, Level 3 = 3, Level 4 = 4, Level 5 = 5 or A = 5, B=4, C=3, D=2, E=1.

**UNSW**
Grades for all subjects are as per UAC schedule, but include total points achieved from the best 5 Category A subjects. Category B and C subjects are not counted.

**UQ**
Combined total of the best five subjects (Category A, B or C), where 5*, 5** = 6, 5=5, 4=4, 3=3, 2=2=, 1=1; A*=6, A=5, B=4, C=3, D=2, E=1, Attained with Distinction = 3, Attained = 1. For all subjects with the exception of Mathematics, the Subject Result must be used. For Mathematics, if two modules are undertaken calculate the average of the two reported Subject Results. The compulsory module, taken on its own, will count as a full subject.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electives included</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Monash</th>
<th>UNSW</th>
<th>UQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1xA only</td>
<td>A and C</td>
<td>A and C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A, B and C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>17-22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>15-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; IT</td>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>18-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>17-24</td>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>29^</td>
<td>23-25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>16-23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19-22</td>
<td>17-23</td>
<td>19-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Science</td>
<td>20^</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest available score</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ Applicants must be qualified for University entry and have satisfied the course-specific extra requirements

### Sample results of 2014 applicants

**Student 1: 440073053 B Vet Bio/DVM  WAM 84**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>HKDSE results</th>
<th>UAC rank</th>
<th>Proposed rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>5**</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5**</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory Maths</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Maths</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>4, 4, 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22.5 (94)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student 2: 440074991  B Pharmacy WAM 81.6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>HKDSE results</th>
<th>UAC rank</th>
<th>Proposed rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory Maths</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Maths</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>5*, 5*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22 (94)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student 3: 440072218  Combined Law WAM 66.9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>HKDSE results</th>
<th>UAC rank</th>
<th>Proposed rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5**</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory Maths</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Maths</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>5, 5, 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23 (95)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rejected Applicants

#### Applicant 1: 440062666 B Applied Science (OT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>HKDSE results</th>
<th>UAC rank</th>
<th>Proposed rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory Maths</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Maths</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>4, 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18 (84)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Applicant 2: 440074670 B Commerce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>HKDSE results</th>
<th>UAC rank</th>
<th>Proposed rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory Maths</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Maths</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>5, 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21 (92)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Applicant 3: 440572073 B Eng

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>HKDSE results</th>
<th>UAC rank</th>
<th>Proposed rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory Maths</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Maths</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.5 (80)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Applicant 4: 450051760 B Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>HKDSE results</th>
<th>UAC rank</th>
<th>Proposed rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory Maths</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Maths</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>4, 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15 (74)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>18/30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM 10
Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee

11.2 Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee meeting held on 14 October 2015
The Committee met on 14 October 2015, when there were present: Associate Professor S Cattle (Chair), presiding, Associate Professor R Cooper, Dr W Davis, Dr M Hardie, Dr J Humberstone, Associate Professor P McCallum, Dr T Newsome, Associate Professor L Smith, Associate Professor T Wilkinson. In attendance: Mr S French, Professor S Kilbreath, Associate Professor H McKenzie, Ms M Kemmis, Dr J Rule.

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

11.2.1 Minor course amendment proposals

11.2.1.1 University of Sydney Business School: Faculty Resolutions F4-F7
The University of Sydney Business School is proposing to amend its faculty resolutions to:
• remove the restriction preventing credit towards undergraduate award courses on the basis of conferred awards (4.1);
• delete resolutions where no variation from Coursework Policy exists (2, 4);
• add required and recommended text as specified in the Course Management Template (6, 7, 8, 12.1, 12.2, 12.4);
• add conditions pertaining to admission to the honours program to codify existing practice (13); and
• make minor contextual amendments (9, 13, 14).

The Undergraduate Studies Committee endorsed the proposal but requested that several changes be made to the wording for purposes of clarity. A revised proposal incorporating the Committee’s amendments was submitted following the meeting

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend sections of its Faculty Resolutions; and
(2) approve the amendment of the Faculty Resolutions arising from this proposal
with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

11.2.1.2 Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies: Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Civil) / Bachelor of Design in Architecture F8-F16
A proposal has been received from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies proposing a change to the Bachelor of Engineering Honours Combined Degree Resolutions previously approved by Academic Board 19 August 2015 to clarify the requirements for the Architecture component of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Civil) / Bachelor of Design in Architecture.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to approve a change to the Bachelor of Engineering Honours Combined Degree Resolutions to clarify the requirements for the Architecture component of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Civil) / Bachelor of Design in Architecture; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal
with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

11.2.1.3 Faculty of Health Sciences: Bachelor Applied Science (Physiotherapy)/ Bachelor of Applied Science (Occupational Therapy) F17
A proposal has been received from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Undergraduate English Language Requirements for the Bachelor of Applied Science (Physiotherapy) and Bachelor of Applied Science (Occupational Therapy). This proposal seeks to raise the minimum level of English proficiency required for
admission to 7.0 in each of the components of the IELTS (or equivalent in the TOEFL and TOEFL iBT), as part of the Faculty's approach to ensuring students have the English language proficiency required to carry out the Inherent Requirements of their course – particularly in the context of communication on professional and clinical placements. This amendment will also bring the English Requirements for admission in line with the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency registration standards for English language skills, now in force for Physiotherapy and Occupational Therapy professional registration.

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board:

1. approve the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Undergraduate English Language Requirements for the Bachelor of Applied Science (Physiotherapy) and Bachelor of Applied Science (Occupational Therapy); and
2. approve the amendment of the schedule of approved Faculty variations above the University minimum requirements in the Undergraduate English Language Requirements (as referenced in clause 21(3) of the Coursework Policy 2014)

with effect from 1 January 2017, as set out in the report presented.

### 11.2.1.4 Faculty of Law: Bachelor of Laws

A proposal has been received from the Faculty of Law to amend the names of existing units of study in the Bachelor of Laws as below:

- **LAWS3431** ‘External Placement Program’ to become ‘Social Justice Legal Clinic B’.
- **LAWS3461** ‘Social Justice Clinical Program’ to become ‘Social Justice Legal Clinic A’.

The Undergraduate Studies Committee endorsed the proposal but noted that it was necessary to check that Sydney Student could accommodate the change of course codes.

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board:

1. approve the proposal from the Faculty of Law to amend the names of the existing units of study in the Bachelor of Laws as described above; and
2. approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from this proposal

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

### 11.2.1.5 Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery: Bachelor of Nursing (Honours)

A proposal has been received from the Sydney Nursing School to amend the Resolutions for the Bachelor of Nursing (Honours) degree to ensure terminology is consistent and the Resolutions are in accordance with the current University policies.

The Undergraduate Studies Committee endorsed the proposal but requested that the faculty clarify the meaning of the term ‘a significant disparity’ in clause 6.2 (Examination of Thesis). The faculty submitted a revised proposal following the meeting.

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board:

1. approve the proposal from the Sydney Nursing School to amend the Bachelor of Nursing (Honours); and
2. approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal

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

### 11.2.1.6 Sydney College of the Arts: Bachelor of Visual Arts (Honours)

A proposal has been received from the Sydney College of the Arts to amend the course resolutions for the Bachelor of Visual Arts (Honours) degree in order to:
• remove part-time option according to the University Coursework Policy and credit point structure of the degree.
• allow flexibility for Honours students to take one-year leave
• remove section 2(b) to bring in line with the Coursework Rule that stipulates maximum period for meeting course requirements

The Undergraduate Studies Committee endorsed the proposal, subject to removing clause 3.6.4 which stated that ‘Candidates in the Honours year can be suspended for a year in exceptional circumstances, and with permission from the Associate Dean.’ This amendment was made following the meeting.

**Recommendation**

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Sydney College of the Arts to amend the Bachelor of Visual Arts (Honours); and
(2) approve the amendments to the course resolutions arising from this proposal
with effect from 1 January 2016 as set out in the report presented.

---

### 11.2.2 Proceedings of the Committee

The Undergraduate Studies Committee:

• noted the report of the Academic Board meeting of 16 September 2015.

**Recommendation:**

*That the Academic Board note the above report on the Committee proceedings.*
Academic Board Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee – Appendix F

11.2.1.1 University of Sydney Business School: Faculty Resolutions

Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: University of Sydney Business School

Contact person: Kate Munro

1. Name of award course
   Business School Resolutions

2. Purpose of proposal
   The purpose of this proposal is to:
   (1) remove the restriction preventing credit towards undergraduate award courses on the basis of conferred awards (4.1);
   (2) delete resolutions where no variation from Coursework Policy exists (2, 4);
   (3) add required and recommended text as specified in the Course Management Template (6, 7, 8, 12.1, 12.2, 12.4);
   (4) add conditions pertaining to admission to the honours program to codify existing practice (13); and
   (5) make minor contextual amendments (9, 13, 14).

3. Details of amendment
   Resolutions of the University of Sydney Business School for coursework awards
   These resolutions apply to all undergraduate and postgraduate coursework award courses in the School, unless specifically indicated otherwise. Students enrolled in postgraduate research awards should consult the resolutions for their course. These resolutions must be read in conjunction with applicable University By-laws, Rules and policies including (but not limited to) the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014 (the 'Coursework Rule'), the resolutions for the course of enrolment, the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended) and the Academic Board policies on Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism.

Part 1: Course enrolment

1 Enrolment restrictions
   Except as with the permission of the Business School a student may not enrol in units of study with a total value of more than 24 credit points in either semester one or two, twelve credit points in the summer session and six credit points in the winter session.

2 Time limits
   (1) The Coursework Rule limits the time students may take to complete their course; part time students should ensure their enrolment pattern allows completion within the maximum time. The Rule also defines how time limits are affected by periods of suspension or absence, and the time limits for recognition of prior learning.
   (2) Periods of suspension will be included within maximum completion times.

3 Suspension, discontinuation and lapse of candidature
   The Coursework Policy specifies the conditions for suspending or discontinuing candidature, and return to candidature after these events. The Policy also defines the circumstances when candidature is deemed to have lapsed. Students should pay careful attention to the significant dates in these processes and their effect on results and financial liability.

4 Recognition of prior learning
   The Coursework Policy specifies the general conditions for recognition of prior learning.
   (1) The award of credit for previous study to undergraduate courses in the University of Sydney Business School will be consistent with the Coursework Rule, with the provision that, no credit will be permitted from awards already conferred, unless
      (a) there is an existing articulation agreement relating to the conferred award; or
      (b) the student is a candidate for the combined Bachelor of Commerce/Bachelor of Science in which case up to 48 credit points may be granted towards the requirements for the Bachelor of Science.
   (2) In postgraduate coursework award courses, the volume of learning may be reduced by up to 50% of course requirements in recognition of prior learning, as stated in the relevant award course resolutions.
   (3) Waivers may also be granted in recognition of prior learning. In this case the student will be required to complete alternative units of study prescribed by the Business School.
Part 2: Unit of study enrolment

5 Cross-institutional study

(1) Provided permission has been obtained in advance, the Business School may permit a student to complete a unit of study at another institution and have that unit credited to the student's course requirements, provided that:
   (a) the resolutions of the student's course of enrolment do not specifically exclude cross-institutional study; and
   (b) the unit of study content is not taught in any corresponding unit of study at the University; or
   (c) the student is unable, for good reason, to attend a corresponding unit of study at the University.

(2) Cross-institutional study is another form of credit and this will be taken into consideration when considering eligibility.

6 International exchange

The Business School encourages students to participate in international exchange programs, unless specified otherwise in the resolutions for a particular course.

Part 3: Studying and assessment

7 Attendance, participation and achievement of learning outcomes

(1) Students are required to be in attendance at the correct time and place of any formal, informal or replacement examinations. Non attendance on any grounds insufficient to claim special consideration, special arrangement or previously arranged disability adjustment will result in the forfeiture of marks associated with the assessment.

(2) Students are expected to attend a minimum of 90% of timetabled activities for a unit of study, unless granted exemption through special consideration, special arrangement, previously arranged disability adjustment or by the Associate Dean. The Associate Dean may determine that a student fails a unit of study because of inadequate attendance. Alternatively, at their discretion, they may set additional assessment items where attendance is lower than 90%.

(3) Participation in a minimum number of assessment items or learning activities may be a requirement of any unit of study.

(4) Mandatory or barrier assessments where students must show achievement of learning outcomes above a certain standard before they are able to pass a unit of study may be a requirement in any unit of study.

8 Late submission policy

(1) It is expected that unless an application for special consideration, special arrangement or previously arranged disability adjustment has approved an extension, students will submit all assessment for a unit of study on or before the due date specified. If the assessment is completed or submitted by the student before the due date or within the period of extension, no academic penalty will be applied to that piece of assessment.

(2) If assessments are submitted after the due date or if an extension is not granted, or is granted but work is submitted by the student after the extended due date, the late submission of assessment will result in an academic penalty as follows:
   (a) any assessment submitted after the due time and date (or extended due time and date) will incur a late penalty of 10% of the total marks per 24 hour period day, or part thereof day, late. Since submission is electronic, weekend days and public holidays count as days in the same way as a working day.
   (b) assessments submitted after the “Closing Date” noted in the Unit of Study Outline will not be marked or assessed.

9 Special consideration (for illness, injury or misadventure), special arrangement (for known events such as military service, jury duty or religious observation) or disability adjustment (for registered disabilities)

Special consideration, special arrangement or disability adjustment is a process that affords equal opportunity to students who have experienced circumstances that adversely impact their ability to adequately complete an assessment task in a unit of study. The Coursework Policy provides full details of the University policy. The procedures for applying for special consideration, special arrangement and disability adjustment are described in each unit of study outline the Administration Manual for Students.

7.10 Re-assessment

The Business School does not offer opportunities for re-assessment other than on the grounds of approved special consideration, reasonable adjustments or special arrangements for
examination and assessment in accordance with the relevant sections of the Coursework Policy.

8 11 Concessional pass
The grade of PCON (Concessional Pass) is not awarded or recognised by the Business School and is treated as a failure for the purpose of progression and credit point accumulation.

Part 4: Progression, results and graduation
9 12 Satisfactory progress
(1) The Business School will monitor students for satisfactory progress towards the completion of their award course.

(2) In addition to the common triggers used to identify students not meeting academic progression requirements (as defined by the Progression requirements of the Coursework Policy), students must pass any unit of study identified in the course resolutions as being critical to progression through the course (barrier unit).

The Business School will monitor students for satisfactory progress towards the completion of their award course. Students will be regarded as not meeting academic progression requirements if they have failed to complete more than 50% of the credit points in which they have enrolled in a semester, have failed to achieve an average mark of 50 or above in the award course each semester, have failed a compulsory unit of study, have failed a unit of study more than once or will not be able to complete degree requirements within the time limit.

4013 Award of the bachelor's degree with honours
(1) To qualify for admission to the honours candidature degree a student must:
   (a) have completed the requirements for the pass degree at the University of Sydney or an equivalent recognised tertiary institution; and or be a graduate of no more than ten years' standing; and
   (b) have a WAM of at least 65 across all senior units attempted and a WAM of at least 70 across senior units of study in the major subject area relevant to the honours program; and
   (c) have the written permission of confirmation of the student's eligibility for admission to the honours year from the relevant Discipline(s)/Department(s); and
   (d) meet any other requirements set by the Discipline(s) or School, unless otherwise approved by the Business School.

(2) An applicant who is qualified to enrol in two honours courses may either complete a joint honours course, equivalent to an honours course in a single subject area, in the two subject areas. A joint honours course shall comprise such parts of the two honours courses as may be agreed by the Disciplines/Departments and the Business School.

(2) As places in the program are offered competitively and where there are appropriate supervisory resources, Where honours places are limited by quota, applicants will be ranked by WAM in order to select the most meritorious candidates.

(3) In exceptional circumstances, the Associate Dean (Undergraduate Studies) and Honours Program Director may admit applicants who do not meet the criteria specified in (1) who, in the opinion of the Business School, have qualifications and evidence of experience and achievement sufficient to successfully undertake the program.

(4) There is no mid-year intake for the honours program.

(5) Students must complete the honours requirements within no more than 10 years from the commencement of candidature in the pass degree.

(6) To qualify for the award of honours a student must complete 48 credit points of honours units of study as specified in the Business School's Tables of undergraduate units of study.

(7) The honours mark is determined by the Business School, based on the candidate's performance in the honours course in both coursework and thesis.

(8) Honours is awarded in the following classes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mark Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class I</td>
<td>Mark &gt;= 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class II (Division 1)</td>
<td>75 &lt;= Mark &lt; 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class II (Division 2)</td>
<td>70 &lt;= Mark &lt; 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class III</td>
<td>65 &lt;= Mark &lt; 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 University medal
A student with an honours mark of 90 or above may be awarded a university medal. The medal is awarded at the discretion of the Business School to the highest achieving students who in the opinion of the Business School have an outstanding academic record, in accordance with the Coursework Rule.

12 Weighted average mark (WAM)
(1) The University WAM is calculated using the following formula:

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

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

(2) The weight of a unit of study is assigned by the owning faculty. In the Business School all units are given a weighting of one.

Part 5: Other
13 Transitional provisions
(1) These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature after 1 January, 2015 2016 and students who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2015 who elect to proceed under these resolutions unless otherwise specified under the specific course resolutions.

(2) Students who commenced prior to 1 January, 2015 2016 may complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions in force at the time of their commencement, provided that requirements are completed by 1 January, 2020 2021, unless otherwise specified under the specific course resolutions. The Business School may specify a later date for completion or specify alternative requirements for completion of candidatures that extend beyond this time.

4. Transitional arrangements
N/A – codifies existing practice.

5. Other relevant information
N/A

6. Signature of Dean
11.2.1.2 Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies: Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Civil) / Bachelor of Design in Architecture

Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies

Contact person: Dr Peter Cafe ext. 12127, Christine Lacey ext. 40678

1. Name of award course
Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Civil) / Bachelor of Design in Architecture

2. Purpose of proposal
The Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies proposes a change to the 2016 BE(Hons) Combined Degree Resolutions previously approved by Academic Board 19 August 2015 to clarify the requirements for the Architecture component of the BE Hons (Civil) / BDesArch.

In the Course Resolutions for 2015 (and prior) the 96cp of units which defined the Architecture side of the BE/BDesArch degree were specifically listed. They were not exactly the same as the Faculty of Architecture core (which is 102cp). Two of the BDesArch core units were omitted from the core unit list for combined students, while one elective unit was added to form the list of 96cp.

Omitted core units:
BDES3011 Architectural History/Theory 3
BDES2024 Art Workshop 2

Added electives:
BDES3025 Architectural Professional Practice

The wording of the 2016 Combined Degree Resolutions stated simply that students must complete 96cp from the Bachelor of Design in Architecture Table. There was no distinction in the wording whether units had to be core or electives, and even if core was presumed there was no indication which of the core units could be omitted. Also if core was presumed there would be no opportunity for students to do the elective BDES3025.

The Faculty of Architecture strongly recommends that students complete the elective BDES3025 because it is a prerequisite for the Masters degree (which must be done to complete the qualifications of an Architect), so they are strongly in favour of retaining BDES3025 in the list of units available to BE/BDesArch students.

The Faculty of Architecture have resolved that a better approach would be to allow the students to decide themselves which of the three units listed above should be the one to complete the required 96cp.

3. Details of amendment
Change to BE(Hons) Combined Degree Resolutions Section 6.6 as per Appendix A.

Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Civil) and Bachelor of Design in Architecture - Architecture Table as per Appendix B.

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

5. Other relevant information
The proposal has been endorsed by the Faculty of Architecture.

6. Signature of Dean

28 October 2015
Appendix A:

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

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

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

These resolutions must be read in conjunction with applicable University By-laws, Rules and policies including (but not limited to) the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2000 (the 'Coursework Rule'), the Resolutions of the Faculty, the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended) and the Academic Board policies on Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism.

Course resolutions

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

1 Course codes

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

(1) The attendance pattern for the following programs is full-time only. The attendance pattern for all other Bachelor of Engineering combined courses is full time or part time.

(a) Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Design in Architecture
(b) Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Design in Architecture
(c) Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Laws
(d) Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Laws

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

3 Streams

(1) Completion of a stream is a requirement of the Bachelor of Engineering.

(2) Within the Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Design in Architecture and the Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Design in Architecture, the Bachelor of Engineering is available only in the Civil Engineering stream. For all other Bachelor of Engineering combined degrees, the streams available for the Bachelor of Engineering are listed under the course resolution for the Bachelor of Engineering.

(3) The Bachelor of Science degree is available in the following streams:

(a) Advanced
(b) Advanced Mathematics.

Completion of a stream is not a requirement of the Bachelor of Science. Candidates wishing to transfer between streams should contact the Faculty of Science student office.

(4) The Bachelor of Music Studies is available in the following streams:

(a) Composition
(b) Contemporary Music Practice
(c) Musicology
(d) Performance

Completion of a stream is a requirement of the Bachelor of Music Studies

4 Cross-Faculty management

(1) Candidates in the combined Engineering and Law courses will be under the general supervision of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies until the end of the semester in which they complete the requirements for the Bachelor of Engineering. They will then be under the supervision of the Faculty of Law. Candidates in all other combined degree programs will be under the general supervision of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies for the duration of the combined program.

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

5 Admission to Candidature

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

(2) Admission to the Bachelor of Engineering Honours and Bachelor of Music Studies will, in addition to the above, require the applicant to complete a music skills test or jazz aptitude test and:

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

(b) Principal Study in Contemporary Music Practice, to submit a portfolio with original work; song(s) or composition(s) in any genre that demonstrates a high level of creative potential and technical ability and to attend an interview;
(c) Principal Study in Musicology, to present an example of recent written work and to attend an interview;
(d) Principal Study in Performance, to undertake a practical audition in their nominated instrument or in voice.

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

**6 Requirements for Award**

(1) To qualify for the award of the combined degree:
   (a) For all Bachelor of Engineering combined degrees except the Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Laws, a candidate must complete 240 credit points and satisfy any additional requirements specified in the following clauses.
   (b) For the Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Laws combined degree, a candidate must complete 288 credit points and any additional requirements specified in the following clauses.
   (c) Where the requirements specified in the following clauses account for less than the total required credit, candidates must complete additional units of study (not including general electives) from the relevant Bachelor of Engineering specialist stream table subject to any conditions specified in that table as may be necessary to satisfy the requirements of the degree.

(2) For the Bachelor of Engineering component of a combined degree:
   (a) The units of study that may be taken for the Bachelor of Engineering component of the combined degree are set out in the tables of units of study for the Bachelor of Engineering single degree;
   (b) Except where varied by other clauses of these resolutions, all candidates must complete a minimum of 144 credit points comprising:
      (i) 36cp from the Engineering Core Table, including all required units;
      (ii) 108cp from the Engineering Stream Core Table pertaining to the specialist stream being undertaken, including all required units;
   (c) The Faculty Board may approve, based on appropriate academic justification, a list of approved unit alternatives. These alternatives specify, for particular Engineering stream / combined degree combinations, units within the normal requirements for the Bachelor of Engineering component of the combined degree that can be replaced by specified alternative units that would form part of the normal program for single degree students in that stream.

(3) For the Bachelor of Arts component of a combined degree:
   (a) The units of study that may be taken are set out in Table A from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Tables of units of study.
   (b) Candidates must complete a total of 84 credit points from Table A, including:
      (i) a major from Table A
      (ii) a minimum of 54 credit points of 2000/3000 level units of study.

(4) For the Bachelor of Commerce component of a combined degree:
   (a) The units of study that may be taken are set out in the Tables of Undergraduate Units of Study from The University of Sydney Business School.
   (b) Candidates must complete 96 credit points of units of study selected from the Table of Undergraduate Units of Study from The University of Sydney Business School including:
      (i) 36 credit points of core units of study (30 junior credit points and six senior credit points); and
      (ii) a major; and
      (iii) at least 48 credit points of 2000 and/or 3000 level units of study.

(5) For the Bachelor of Science component of a combined degree:
   (a) The units of study that may be taken are listed in Table 1 from the Faculty of Science.
   (b) Candidates must complete 96 credit points of Science units of study, including at least one major in a Science subject area.
   (c) Candidates completing the Bachelor of Science in the Advanced or the Advanced Mathematics stream must include as part of the above requirements:
      (i) a minimum of 54 credit points of intermediate or senior Science units of study, of which at least 36 credit points shall be completed at either the Advanced level or as Talented Student Program (TSP) units of study; and
      (ii) a minimum of 24 credit points of senior Science units of study at either the Advanced level or as TSP units in a single Science subject area.

(6) For the Bachelor of Design in Architecture component of a combined degree:
   (a) Candidates must complete 96cp of units of study from the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Civil) and Bachelor of Design in Architecture – Architecture Table Bachelor of Design in Architecture Table.
(7) For the Bachelor of Laws component of a combined degree:
   (a) The units of study that may be taken are set out in the Faculty of Law Undergraduate Table.
   (b) Candidates must complete 144 credit points of Law units of study taken from the Faculty of Law Undergraduate Table, comprising:
      i) 102 credit points of compulsory units of study; and
      ii) 42 credit points of elective units of study, of which a maximum of 36 credit points are taken from Part 1 and a minimum of 6 credit points are taken from Part 2.

(8) For the Bachelor of Medical Science component of a combined degree:
   (a) The units of study that may be taken are listed in Table IV for the Bachelor of Medical Science from the Faculty of Science.
   (b) The mathematics requirement for the Bachelor of Engineering component of the combined degree will also satisfy the mathematics requirements for the Bachelor of Medical Science component.
   (c) Candidates must complete 96 credit points of units including:
      i) A minimum of 24 credit points from junior Science units of study, including:
         - 12 credit points from Chemistry; and
         - MBLG1001/1901/1991 Introductory Molecular Biology and Genetics; and
         - 6 credit points of Junior Biology;
      ii) - 36 credit points of BMED240X units from Table IV (B) for the Bachelor of Medical Science; and
      iii) A minimum of 36 credit points of intermediate or senior Science units of study, including 24 credit points of senior Science units of study selected from the Bachelor of Medical Science Table IV (C).

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

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

     (i) Performance

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

     (ii) Composition

     | Area of Study                  | Credit Points | Minimum level of achievement |
     |--------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|
     | Principal Study               | 36            | Principal Study 1-6          |
     | Composition                   | 18            | Instrumentation & Orchestration; New Music, New Thinking; or Electroacoustic Music 1 & 2; Composer Performer Workshop 1 |
     | Performance                   | 6             | 6 cps Ensemble or 6 cps Composition Through Improvisation |
     | Music Skills                  | 24            | 18 cps of music theory and aural skills: Creative Music Technology; Sound Recording Fundamentals |
     | Analysis, history and culture studies | 12 | Comp Techniques: Number & Process; Comp Techniques: Tonal & Process |
(iii) Musicology

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

(iv) Contemporary Music Practice

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

7 Majors and Principal Studies

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

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

(3) For the Bachelor of Science component of a combined degree:
   (a) completion of at least one major is a requirement. The list of majors available in the Bachelor of Science is specified in the course resolutions for the Bachelor of Science.

(4) For the Bachelor of Medical Science component of a combined degree:
   (a) If the senior Science units of study completed by a candidate form a Science Table 1 major, the candidate shall have that major recorded on the Bachelor of Medical Science testamur at the completion of the degree.

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

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

8 Requirements for Honours

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

9 Award of the Degrees

(1) Candidates will be awarded a separate testamur for each degree completed.
(2) The award grades, and the criteria for the grades, are as defined in the resolutions for the constituent degrees.
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(3) Candidates who do not meet the requirements for the award of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours but who have otherwise satisfied the requirements of the Bachelor of Engineering shall graduate with the Bachelor of Engineering pass degree.

(4) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Arts (Honours) who do not meet the requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded the Bachelor of Arts pass degree.

(5) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Commerce (Honours) who do not meet the requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded the Bachelor of Commerce pass degree.

(6) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Design in Architecture (Honours) who do not meet the requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded the Bachelor of Design in Architecture pass degree.

(7) The Bachelor of Laws can be awarded in the grades of either Pass or Honours. Honours in the Bachelor of Laws is awarded in First Class or Second Class in accordance with the resolutions of the Bachelor of Laws.

(8) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Medical Science (Honours) who do not meet the requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded the Bachelor of Medical Science pass degree.

(9) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Science (Honours) who do not meet the requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded Bachelor of Science pass degree.

(10) Candidates for the award of the Bachelor of Music Studies (Honours) who do not meet the requirements, and who have not already graduated, will be awarded the Bachelor of Music Studies pass degree.

10 Course transfer
(1) For the Bachelor of Engineering combined with Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Design in Architecture, Bachelor of Project Management, Bachelor of Medical Science, and Bachelor of Music Studies, a candidate may abandon the combined program and elect to complete either the Bachelor of Engineering or the associated combined degree in accordance with the resolutions governing that degree.

(2) For the Bachelor of Engineering combined with Bachelor of Laws, a candidate may withdraw from the combined degree program and elect to transfer to the Bachelor of Engineering, by written application to the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies, and complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions governing that degree at the time of transfer. Candidature in the Bachelor of Laws will cease in these circumstances.

(3) For the Bachelor of Engineering combined with Bachelor of Commerce a candidate may abandon the combined program and elect to complete either the Bachelor of Engineering or the Bachelor of Commerce in accordance with the resolutions governing that degree. Transfer from a combined degree to the Bachelor of Commerce is also conditional on the student having met the entry requirements of the Bachelor of Commerce in force at the time of their enrolment in the combined degree.

(4) Completion of the abandoned degree in the future will require a new application for admission to that course and completion in accordance with the resolutions governing that degree.

11 Progression rules
(1) General progression rules for the combined degrees are covered by the resolutions of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies.

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

(3) Candidates in the combined Medical Science program:
   (a) Except with the permission of the Dean, students may not enrol in an intermediate core unit of study until they have completed 42 credit points from
      - 12 credit points from Mathematics; and
      - 12 credit points from Chemistry; and
      - MBLG1001/1901 Introductory Molecular Biology and Genetics; and
      - 6 credit points of Junior Biology ; and
      - 12 credit points of Engineering
(b) Students may not enrol in a Science senior unit of study until they have completed 18 credit points of intermediate core units of study including BMED2401.

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

12 Transitional provisions

(1) These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature on or after 1 January, 2016.

(2) Students who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2016 may:
   (a) complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions governing their candidature immediately prior to these changes; or
   (b) where approved by the Faculty, elect to proceed under these resolutions provided appropriate programs of study can be identified.

Appendix B:

Unit of Study Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of study</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
<th>A: Assumed knowledge</th>
<th>P: Prerequisites</th>
<th>C: Corequisites</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Civil) and Bachelor of Design in Architecture – Architecture Table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To satisfy the degree requirement of the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Civil) and Bachelor of Design in Architecture a candidate must study not less than 144 credit points of the core civil engineering units of study and 96 credit points of design in architecture units of study as set out in the table below.

Core units of study

Complete all 90 cp from:

- **BDES1011 Architectural History/Theory** 6 points  
  Semester 1

- **BDES1023 Architectural Technologies** 6 points  
  Semester 2

- **BDES1026 Architecture Studio 1A** 12 points  
  Semester 1

- **BDES1027 Architecture Studio 1B** 12 points  
  Semester 2

- **BDES2013 Architectural Technologies** 6 points  
  Semester 1

- **BDES2026 Architecture Studio 2A** 12 points  
  Semester 1

- **BDES2027 Architecture Studio 2B** 12 points  
  Semester 2

- **BDES3026 Architecture Studio 3A** 12 points  
  Semester 1

- **BDES3027 Architecture Studio 3B** 12 points  
  Semester 2
**Elective Units of Study**

Complete 6 cp from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Unit Name</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BDES3025</td>
<td>Architectural Professional Practice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Semester 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDES3011</td>
<td>Architectural History/Theory 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Semester 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDES2024</td>
<td>Art Workshop 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Semester 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Health Sciences

Contact person: Corinne Caillaud / Clare Higgins

1. Name of award course
   Bachelor of Applied Science (Physiotherapy)
   Bachelor of Applied Science (Occupational Therapy)

2. Purpose of proposal
   To amend the Undergraduate English Language Requirements for the Bachelor of Applied Science (Physiotherapy) and Bachelor of Applied Science (Occupational Therapy),

   This proposal seeks to raise the minimum level of English proficiency required for admission to 7.0 in each of the components of the IELTS (or equivalent in the TOEFL and TOEFL iBT), as part of the Faculty’s approach to ensuring students have the English language proficiency required to carry out the Inherent Requirements of their course – particularly in the context of communication on professional and clinical placements. This amendment will also bring the English Requirements for admission in line with the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency registration standards for English language skills, now in force for Physiotherapy and Occupational Therapy professional registration.

2. Details of amendment
   Amend the schedule of approved Faculty variations above the University minimum requirements in the Undergraduate English Language Requirements (as referenced in clause 21(3) of the Coursework Policy 2014) as follows, with effect from 2017:

   Undergraduate English Language Requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty/Course</th>
<th>English Language Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Health Sciences</td>
<td>Overall band score of 7.0 or better with a minimum score of 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Health Sciences (including combined degrees)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Applied Science (Speech Pathology)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Applied Science (Occupational Therapy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Transitional arrangements
   N/A

5. Other relevant information
   N/A

6. Signature of Dean
   28 October 2015
11.2.1.4 Faculty of Law: Bachelor of Laws

Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Law

Contact person: Peter Lead, Executive Officer (x10411)

1. Name of award course
   Bachelor of Laws

2. Purpose of proposal
   To amend the names of existing units of study.

3. Details of amendment
   LAWS3431 ‘External Placement Program’ to become ‘Social Justice Legal Clinic B’.
   LAWS3461 ‘Social Justice Clinical Program’ to become ‘Social Justice Legal Clinic A’.

4. Transitional arrangements
   N/A

5. Other relevant information

6. Signature of Dean
   Approved by Faculty Board.

[Signature]

Professor Joellen Riley
Dean
Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Sydney Nursing School
Contact person: Prof. Trudy Rudge

1. Name of award course
   Bachelor of Nursing (Honours)

2. Purpose of proposal
   To amend the Resolutions for the Bachelor of Nursing (Honours) degree to ensure terminology is consistent and the Resolutions are in accordance with the current University policies.

Course resolutions

1. Course codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GH041</td>
<td>Bachelor of Nursing (Honours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH042</td>
<td>Bachelor of Nursing (Honours) (offshore)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Attendance pattern
   The attendance pattern for this course can be full time or part time according to candidate choice.

3 Admission to candidature
   (1) Availability of places
       Admission to candidature is dependent on appropriate supervision being available within the faculty. Places will be offered to qualified applicants in the order in which complete applications are received, according to the following admission criteria.
       (a) Admission to the Bachelor of Nursing (Honours) requires:
           (a) satisfaction of the English language proficiency requirements detailed in the faculty resolutions; and
           (b) completion of a Bachelor of Nursing pass degree at the University of Sydney or equivalent qualification with a minimum WAM of 65; and
           (c) current registration to practise nursing in Australia or another country.
       (3) Qualifications used as the basis of admission must have been completed less than ten years prior to application. Qualifications older than ten years will be considered subject to the applicant providing further information substantiating appropriate continuing education and development. In these cases, admission will be at the discretion of the Dean.

3 Candidate
   (1) Appointment of supervisor
       (a) the Chair of the Honours Degrees Sub-Committee will appoint a research supervisor in consultation with the Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching) and notification to the Associate Dean (Academic).
   (2) Attendance pattern
       (a) the attendance pattern for this course can be full time or part time according to candidate choice.

4 Requirements for award
   (1) To qualify for the award of the Bachelor of Nursing (Honours) degree candidates must complete:
       (a) 24 credit points of specified units of study as specified in the unit of study table located in the handbook; and
       (b) a 24 credit point thesis of up to 15,000 words.
   (2) The grade of honours and the honours mark are determined by performance in the degree, according to the table in clause 5.7(1).

5 Enrolment and progression
   (1) Candidate progression will be reviewed every six (6) months with the supervisor, as per assessment schedule.
   (2) Documentation of the candidate’s progress will be reviewed by the Honours Degrees Sub-Committee, and feedback will be provided to the candidate and supervisors about level of progress.
(3) Time limits:
(a) A full-time candidate must complete all the requirements for the course within two (2) calendar years of first enrolment.
(b) A part-time candidate must complete all the requirements for the course within three (3) years of first enrolment.

6 Examination of the thesis
(1) Two examiners internal to the University will be appointed by the Honours Degrees Sub-Committee in consultation with the supervisor.
(2) The Honours Degrees Sub-Committee determines the award mark taking into account the reports of the examiners. The Sub-Committee may appoint a third examiner (who may be external to the University) to assist in determining the award mark. The final estimation of the award mark is determined according to the table in clause 5 7(1).

5 Award of the degree
(1) The Bachelor of Nursing (Honours) is awarded in the following classes ranging from First Class to Third Class:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mark Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class I</td>
<td>80 or greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class II Division 1</td>
<td>75 to 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class II Division 2</td>
<td>70 to 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Class III</td>
<td>65 to 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours not awarded</td>
<td>Below 65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>A student who achieves an honours mark in the range …</th>
<th>will be awarded honours …</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>80 ≤ honours mark ≤ 100</td>
<td>First Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75 ≤ honours mark &lt; 80</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>70 ≤ honours mark &lt; 75</td>
<td>Second Class / Division 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>65 ≤ honours mark &lt; 70</td>
<td>Third Class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) The class of Honours shall be determined by the marks achieved in the Honours year weighted according to units of study as follows: 40% NURS4020 (10%), 40% NURS4021 (10%) and 80% NURS4022 and NURS4023 (80%).

6 University medal
A student who receives an honours mark of 90 or above may be awarded a university medal. The medal is awarded at the discretion of the faculty to the highest achieving students who, in the opinion of the faculty, have an outstanding academic record, in accordance with the Coursework Rule Policy 2014.

7 Time limits
A candidate must complete all the requirements for the course within three years of first enrolment, including periods of suspension.

8 Transitional provisions
(1) These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature after 1 January, 2013, and students who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2013 who elect to proceed under these resolutions.
(2) Candidates who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2016 may complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions in force at the time, provided they complete requirements within the maximum period of candidature specified in those resolutions. The Faculty may specify a later date for completion or specify alternative requirements for completion for students whose candidatures extend beyond the maximum period of candidature specified in the resolutions under which they were enrolled.

(2) Candidates who commenced prior to 1 January, 2013 may complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions in force at the time of their commencement, provided that the requirements are completed by 1 January, 2018. The Faculty may specify a later date for completion or specify alternative requirements for completion of candidatures that extend beyond this time.
11.2.1.6 Sydney College of the Arts: Bachelor of Visual Arts (Honours)

Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Sydney College of the Arts

Contact person: Andrew Lavery

1. Name of award course
   Bachelor of Visual Arts (Honours)

2. Purpose of proposal
   To amend the course resolutions for the Bachelor of Visual Arts (Honours) degree to:
   - To remove part-time option according to the University Coursework Policy and credit point structure of the degree
   - To allow flexibility for Honours students to take one-year leave
   - To remove section 2(b) to bring in line with the Coursework Rule that stipulates maximum period for meeting course requirements

3. Details of amendment
   Bachelor of Visual Arts
   Bachelor of Visual Arts (Honours) course resolutions chapter 6 sections 1-3:

   6 Requirements for the Honours degree
   (1) Honours, involving a research project, is available to meritorious candidates, who complete an additional year of full time study after the completion of the pass degree. Part-time study is permitted if the Associate Dean is satisfied the candidate cannot undertake full-time study. Honours can be undertaken by studio practice and research paper or by dissertation.
   (2) To qualify for admission to the honours year an applicant should:
      (a) have completed the requirements of the pass degree of the Bachelor of Visual Arts, or equivalent degree from a recognised institution, with a weighted average mark (using the WAM formula below) across intermediate and senior units of at least 65; and
      (b) must complete the honours requirements within no more than 10 years from commencement of candidature in pass degree.
   (3) Candidature in the Honours year cannot be suspended nor deferred.

4. Transitional arrangements
   N/A

5. Other relevant information
   N/A

6. Signature of Dean
   28 October 2015
Report of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on 14 October 2015

The Committee met on 2 September 2015 when there were present: The Chair (Associate Professor T Masters) presiding; Professor R Coleman, Associate Professor W Davis (for Associate Professor P Jones), Mr S French, Associate Professor G Frost, Associate Professor D Hamer, Dr A Harmer, Associate Professor D Hirsh, Mr C Jones, Dr J Kavanagh, Professor I Krass, Associate Professor P McCallum, Dr A McCloughen, Dr J Saleeba and Mr J Trendall. Ms S Brown, Ms M Kemmis, Ms L Rose, Ms J Ross and Mr T Smithers were in attendance.

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

12.2.1 Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy and Procedures 2015 G5-G26

The Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy and Procedures 2015 has been developed by the Student Administrative Services Project and the Progression and Annual Progress Review Working Group. It aims to provide a consistent approach across the University to progress planning and review and the setting of milestones for all HDR candidatures.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy and Procedures 2015 with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

12.2.2 Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Policy and Procedures 2015 G27-G65

The Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Policy and Procedures 2015 have been amended to:

- correct issues identified during the implementation of the policy;
- clarify the wording of some clauses; and
- allow for the creation of the HDR centre.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the amendments to the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Policy and Procedures 2015 with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

12.2.3 Proposals for new and amended postgraduate courses

12.2.3.1 Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning: Master of Urban Design, Graduate Diploma in Urban Design, Graduate Certificate in Urban Design G66-G69

The Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning is proposing to delete the streams in Architectural and Urban Design and Urban Design and Planning from the Master of Urban Design.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:

1. approve the proposal from the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning to delete the streams in Architectural and Urban Design and Urban Design and Planning from the Master of Urban Design;

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.
12.2.4 Minor course amendment proposals

12.2.4.1 Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning

(1) Master of Heritage Conservation, Graduate Diploma in Heritage Conservation

The Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning is proposing to amend the elective units of study for the Master of Heritage Conservation and Graduate Diploma in Heritage Conservation.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the elective units of study for the Master of Heritage Conservation and Graduate Diploma in Heritage Conservation; and
(2) approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from this proposal

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

(2) Master of Philosophy

The Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning is proposing to amend the admission requirements for the Master of Philosophy.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Master of Philosophy; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal

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

12.2.4.2 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: Master of Creative Writing

The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences is proposing to amend the Master of Creative Writing to clarify the requirements for award.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Creative Writing; and
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal

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

12.2.4.3 University of Sydney Business School: Faculty Resolutions

The Committee supported the proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend its faculty resolutions as set out in item 11.2.1.1 in the report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee.

12.2.4.4 Faculty of Dentistry: Doctor of Clinical Dentistry

The Faculty of Dental Science is proposing to amend the Doctor of Clinical Dentistry to:

- clarify the assessment of the research component of the degree; and
- align the English language requirements for the course with Australian Health Practitioners Regulation Agency (AHPRA) requirements.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Dentistry to amend the Doctor of Clinical Dentistry;
(2) approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal; and
(3) approve the amendment of the schedule of postgraduate English language requirements arising from the proposal

with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.
12.2.4.5 Faculty of Health Sciences: Master of Physiotherapy, Master of Occupational Therapy

The Faculty of Health Sciences is proposing to amend the English language requirements for admission to the Master of Physiotherapy and Master of Occupational Therapy.

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the English language requirements for admission to the Master of Physiotherapy and Master of Occupational Therapy; and
(2) approve the amendment of the schedule of Postgraduate English Language Requirements arising from this proposal
with effect from 1 January 2017, as set out in the report presented.

12.2.4.6 Faculty of Law: Changes to units of study

The Faculty of Law is proposing a range of changes to units of study affecting the Juris Doctor, Master of Business Law, Master of Criminology, Master of Global Law, Master of Health Law, Master of Jurisprudence, Master of Law and International Development, Master of Laws, Graduate Diploma of Criminology, Graduate Diploma in Health Law, Graduate Diploma of Jurisprudence, Graduate Diploma in Law, Graduate Diploma in Public Health Law.

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Law to amend various units of study; and
(2) approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from this proposal
with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

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

The Faculty of Medicine is proposing to amend the table of units of study for the sleep medicine stream in the Master of Medicine and Master of Science in Medicine.

**Recommendation**
That the Academic Board:
(1) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine to amend the Master of Medicine, Master of Medicine (Advanced), Master of Science in Medicine, Master of Science in Medicine (Advanced), Graduate Diploma in Medicine, Graduate Diploma in Science in Medicine, Graduate Certificate in Medicine, Graduate Certificate in Science in Medicine; and
(2) approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from this proposal
with effect from 1 January 2016, as set out in the report presented.

12.2.4.8 Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery: Master of Advanced Nursing Practice, Master of Cancer and Haematology Nursing, Master of Emergency Nursing, Master of Intensive Care Nursing, Master of Mental Health Nursing, Master of Primary Health Care Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Advanced Nursing Practice, Graduate Diploma in Cancer and Haematology Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Emergency Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Intensive Care Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Mental Health Nursing, Graduate Diploma in Primary Health Care Nursing

The Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery is proposing to amend the award requirements for the above courses to correct errors relating to the number of core and elective units of study required.
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Recommendation

That the Academic Board:

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

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

12.2.4.9 Sydney College of the Arts: Master of Fine Arts

The Sydney College of the Arts is proposing to amend the course resolutions for the Master of Fine Arts to align the resolutions with recent changes to higher degrees by research policies.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board:

(1) approve the proposal from the Sydney College of the Arts to amend the Master of Fine Arts; and

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

12.2.5 Proceedings of the Committee

The Committee also:

• noted the report of the meeting of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meeting of 29 September 2015; and

• noted the report of the Academic Board meeting of 16 September 2015.
SUBMISSION TO ACADEMIC BOARD
Meeting: Wednesday, 28 OCTOBER 2015
PROGRESS PLANNING AND REVIEW FOR HIGHER DEGREE BY RESEARCH STUDENTS
POLICY AND PROCEDURES 2015

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Student Administration Services (SAS) Project aligns with Strategy Four of the University Strategic Plan (Enrich the experience of university life for all our students) through the provision of “efficient and helpful student administration systems”. The SAS Project has undertaken a systematic review across the university’s student administration processes as part of a larger restructure of student administration. In particular, a series of improvements have been identified in the Higher Degree by Research (HDR) student environment that will significantly enhance both student and staff experience and enable the centralisation of a number of HDR student administration services.

The Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy and Procedures 2015 were developed in consultation with the Progression and Annual Progress Review (PAPR) Working Group chaired by Associate Professor Peter McCallum with representation from Science, FASS, Medicine, Business, Health Sciences, Education, Institute for Teaching and Learning, Graduate Studies Office and SUPRA.

The Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy and Procedures 2015 are attached. The following is a summary of the main features:

Progress Plans

1. Proposes mandating progress plans for all Higher Degree by Research (HDR) students
2. Aligns and manages student and university expectations around the nature and timing of all activity required to achieve the award of the HDR degree;
3. Establishes the requirement for progress plans to include all milestones and activities mandated by the university and/or faculty that are required to achieve the award of the degree. These include milestones and activities related to research idea formulation and approval, research projects, thesis development and examination, research training activity and compliance and risk management activities;
4. Provides for the ability to have plan templates at a university, faculty and department level to drive consistency of approach;
5. Identifies roles and responsibilities for creating progress plans including endorsement and approvals steps;
6. Delivers consistent expectations around the need to maintain progress plans;
7. Standardises the process for the maintenance of progress plans and allows students and supervisors flexibility so that the plan can be owned and used effectively while providing for academic review to ensure that plans are kept current and relevant;
8. Identifies roles and responsibilities for maintaining and varying of progress plans and establishes timeframes for review;
9. Proposes academic review beyond the supervisor which will enable proactive identification and remediation of progress issues;
10. Establishes the requirement for students to update progress plans and integrates progress plans with other HDR processes such as candidature changes; and
11. Distinguishes between material variations (changes that will impact timely completion) versus non-material variations and defines the approval process for each.

Progress Review

1. Establishes clear expectations for the purpose of the review;
2. Establishes the composition and roles/responsibilities of the review panel;
3. Provides guidance as to the timing and outcomes provided by the progress review process;
4. Provides clear definitions of progress review ratings and when to assign a particular rating (meets or exceeds objectives, marginal progress and unsatisfactory progress) and the implications for ongoing candidature or scholarships for each of these results; and
5. Articulates the panel membership and the roles/responsibilities of the HOD, PGC and review panel.

Milestones

1. Includes proposed university milestones for key events with flexibility for faculties and departments. It is proposed that the template will include all university level milestones and the required activities for these milestones to be achieved as defined by the faculty/school/department;
2. Provides for inclusion of specialist requirements for activities and timings specific to the department in which the research training is being undertaken; and
3. Articulates who can approve new milestones or activities within a template.

Recommendation

*That the Academic Board approves the new Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy and Procedures 2015 as set out in the report presented*
PROGRESS PLANNING AND REVIEW
FOR HIGHER DEGREE BY RESEARCH
STUDENTS POLICY 2015

[Name of determining authority] as delegate of the Senate of the University of Sydney,
adopts the following policy.
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PART 1 PRELIMINARY

1 Name of policy

This is the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students
Policy 2015.

28 October 2015
2 Commencement

This policy commences on [date].

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

(1) The University aspires for all higher degree by research students to have a quality research training experience and to produce research of the highest calibre. This includes the development of skills and knowledge necessary to be a successful researcher in the chosen discipline and the timely completion and successful examination of their research projects and theses.

The University will partner with students to plan their progression throughout their candidature and set clear expectations of satisfactory progress. The University will provide appropriate institutional support and resources, regular reviewing, including a written submission and meeting, and support students to maintain research integrity and quality.

(2) This policy details the elements of the higher degree by research progress planning and review process. It should be read in conjunction with the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (‘the Rule’), the Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions, and the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Procedures 2015 (‘the Procedures’).

5 Application

(1) Except to the extent that a contrary intention is expressed, this policy applies to higher degree by research students, staff and affiliates;

(2) It is a condition of each student’s admission to candidature that the student complies with his or her obligations under this policy.

6 Definitions

(1) In this policy:

activity means a specific requirement in a student’s candidature that contributes to the completion of a milestone.

Associate Dean means the Associate Dean responsible for overseeing higher degrees by research in the relevant faculty.

Dean means the Dean of the relevant faculty.

coordinating supervisor means the supervisor in a supervisory team who has designated academic delegations and responsibility for administrative
requirements.

degree means the relevant higher degree by research.

department means the academic unit responsible for a student’s higher degree by research candidature. It may be called a department, discipline or school within the University.

faculty means a faculty or a board of studies as established by Senate in each case by its constitution, and refers to the student’s faculty of enrolment.

head of department means the head of the relevant department.

Note: Functions performed by the head of department may be performed by the Head of School, Dean or Associate Dean, in accordance with paragraph 1.08(5) of the Rule, particularly in faculties that are not organised into departments or disciplines.

higher degree by research means a doctorate by research or master’s by research, as defined in the Rule.

milestone means a significant event in a student’s candidature that is useful in monitoring and guiding the student’s progress to successful completion. Milestones may comprise a number of activities.

postgraduate coordinator means the postgraduate coordinator for the relevant department.

progress means the student’s progress against the requirements specified in subclause 13(4).

progress plan means a progress plan developed in accordance with Part 2.

progress review means a progress review conducted in accordance with Part 3.

research period means a research period set by the University and published on its website.

Note: Research periods are published at: [insert]

Review Panel means a panel established to conduct a progress review in accordance with clause 11.

Rule means the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011.

student means a person who is currently admitted to candidature in a higher degree by research award course of the University.

supervisor means a person appointed to discharge the responsibilities set out in the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013, including research supervisors, coordinating supervisors and auxiliary supervisors.

supplementary progress review means a progress review conducted in accordance with clause 17.
PART 2 PROGRESS PLANNING

7 Progress plans

(1) Students and supervisors must begin progress planning at an early stage in each student’s higher degree by research candidature.

(2) All students must have a progress plan within six months from the date of commencement of candidature, or within 12 months for part-time students.

(3) The purpose of a progress plan is to align and manage student, University and faculty expectations about what is required to achieve the award of the degree.

(4) A student’s progress plan must include all activities and milestones required to achieve the award of the degree, including:
   (a) formulation and approval of research proposal;
   (b) formulation and approval of research projects;
   (c) thesis development and examination;
   (d) research training activities;
   (e) coursework requirements;
   (f) compliance and risk management activities.

Note: See Part 4 for information on activities and milestones.

8 Creating progress plans

(1) Students are responsible for creating their progress plan, based on current University templates, with the participation and support of their coordinating supervisor.

(2) Progress plans must be:
   (a) endorsed by the student’s coordinating supervisor; and
   (b) approved by the head of department or postgraduate coordinator.

Note: Progress plan templates are available on the University’s website at: [insert link].

9 Maintaining and varying progress plans

(1) Students are responsible for maintaining their progress plan, and for identifying any variations required, with the participation and support of their coordinating supervisor.

(2) Students must review their progress plan, in consultation with their coordinating supervisor, at least twice per year, with at least one review being conducted as part of the student’s preparation for a progress review.

(3) A variation to a progress plan may be required for many reasons, including:
   (a) where a student:
      (i) changes attendance mode;
(ii) requests a leave of absence or suspension of candidature;
(iii) transfers to another course or program;
(iv) achieves a milestone;
(v) fails to achieve or is delayed in achieving a milestone;
(vi) submits a request for an extension of candidature;
(vii) has encountered unanticipated barriers to progress; or
(b) where it becomes clear that the student’s research project needs improvement or is not viable.

(4) Variations to progress plans may be material or non-material.

(5) Material variations are variations that:
(a) extend the date for achievement of a University, faculty or department milestone by more than three months from the original date;
(b) require a change to the thesis submission date to:
   (i) a new research period; or
   (ii) a date that is beyond the latest date for submission, as defined in clause 2.20 of the Rule;
(c) substantially change the nature of the research.

Note: Clause 2.20 of the Rule authorises a Dean or Associate Dean to permit a student to submit his or her thesis after a period of time greater than the maximum periods specified in that clause.

(6) Material variations to progress plans must be:
(a) endorsed by the student’s coordinating supervisor; and
(b) approved by the head of department or postgraduate coordinator.

(7) Students should discuss non-material variations to progress plans with their coordinating supervisor.

PART 3  PROGRESS REVIEW

10 Progress reviews

(1) Progress reviews (including supplementary progress reviews) must be conducted in accordance with this policy and the procedures.

(2) The purpose of a progress review is to:
   (a) assess whether the student has adequate support and resources to complete his or her research project and thesis in accordance with the progress plan;
   (b) assess whether the current supervisory arrangements are satisfactory;
   (c) assess the feasibility of the progress plan; and
   (d) assess and rate the student’s progress.

(3) A copy of the student’s progress plan will be provided to all parties involved in the progress review.
A progress review must be conducted for each student as required by the head of department or postgraduate coordinator and at least once per year.

Students re-enrolling for a period of more than six months as a result of a requirement to revise and resubmit in a previous thesis examination, must participate in a progress review between three and six months from the date of re-enrolment.

Progress reviews should be supported by continuous evaluation of progress and regular meetings between students and supervisors.

11 Review Panel

The head of department or postgraduate coordinator must appoint two or more academic staff members to form a review panel for each student’s review, and nominate one of the panel members to act as chair.

Each Review Panel member must have one or more of:

(a) relevant disciplinary expertise;
(b) experience in supervising and managing higher degree by research candidatures; or
(c) other relevant specialist knowledge.

In appointing members of a Review Panel, the head of department or postgraduate coordinator:

(a) may appoint from outside the department or faculty;
(b) must not appoint any of a student’s supervisors; and
(c) must consider and manage any actual, potential or perceived conflicts of interests.

Note: For information on evaluating and managing conflicts of interest, see the External Interests Policy 2010.

12 Progress review meetings

Students must participate in a progress review meeting as required by the head of department or postgraduate coordinator and at least once per year.

Students may be accompanied at the progress review meeting by a support person, such as a colleague, friend, family member or student representative.

Progress review meetings will be conducted by the Review Panel.

The Review Panel:

(a) may invite any or all of the student’s supervisors to attend part of the progress review meeting;
(b) must discuss the progress plan, and any required variations to the progress plan, with the student and (when in attendance) his or her supervisors; and
(c) must provide the student with an opportunity to speak to the Review Panel without any of the student’s supervisors present.
13 Progress review outcomes

(1) The student’s progress will be measured against:
   (a) University, faculty, department and student milestones and activities that are within the student’s control;
   (b) action items identified in the student’s previous progress reviews; and
   (c) compliance with student responsibilities set out in relevant University policies and procedures.

(2) Students must meet the requirements specified in subclause 13(1) to the required standard or quality.

(3) The progress review ratings are:
   (a) meets or exceeds objectives;
   (b) marginal progress;
   (c) unsatisfactory progress.

(4) The Review Panel must prepare a written report for the head of department or postgraduate coordinator:
   (a) giving its assessment of the feasibility of the progress plan;
   (b) setting out any required variations to the progress plan;
   (c) identifying any actions to be taken as a result of the progress review, and who will be responsible for them;
   (d) recommending whether a supplementary progress review is required;
   (e) indicating, where relevant, whether the student’s scholarship is at risk, and the time frame for any potential termination of scholarship; and
   (f) recommending a progress review rating based upon its assessment of the student’s progress.

(5) The Review Panel may prepare a report and recommend a progress review rating in the student’s absence, if:
   (a) the student fails to attend the progress review meeting without notice or good cause; or
   (b) the student is unable to attend and the Review Panel forms the reasonable view that the progress review meeting can properly be conducted in the student’s absence.

(6) The student will have an opportunity to respond to the Review Panel’s report.

(7) The head of department or postgraduate coordinator must:
   (a) determine a progress review rating, taking into account:
      (i) the recommendation of the Review Panel;
      (ii) the student’s response; and
      (iii) any exceptional circumstances related to the candidature and beyond the reasonable control of the student;
   (b) specify any actions to be taken as a result of the progress review, including who will be responsible for them and timeframes for their completion;
   (c) state whether the proposed supervision arrangements are satisfactory;
   (d) determine whether a supplementary progress review is required; and
(e) monitor the implementation of any action items for the department, faculty or University identified by the Review Panel. Such items should be completed within three months of the date of the progress review.

14 ‘Meets or exceeds objectives’

(1) A rating of ‘meets or exceeds objectives’ means that the student’s progress since the last progress review, or since commencement of candidature, has been satisfactory or exceeded expectations.

(2) To achieve a rating of ‘meets or exceeds expectations’ the student must:

(a) have satisfactorily met all requirements (as specified in subclause 13(1)) since the last progress review; and

(a) be expected to submit the thesis for examination on time, or in a timely fashion, allowing for any previous delays.

15 ‘Marginal progress’

(1) A rating of ‘marginal progress’ indicates that:

(a) the student has not satisfactorily met all requirements (as specified in subclause 13(1)) since the last progress review; or

(b) there is some risk that the student’s thesis will not be submitted for examination on time, or in a timely fashion, allowing for any previous delays.

(2) If a student receives a rating of ‘marginal progress’, the head of department or postgraduate coordinator:

(a) must specify a set of required actions and due dates; and

(b) must set a date for a supplementary progress review; and

(c) may:

(i) refer the Review Panel’s report to the postgraduate coordinator or Associate Dean; and

(ii) take such other action as the head of department or postgraduate coordinator considers appropriate, consistent with the Rule and this policy.

(3) A student who receives a rating of ‘marginal progress’ at a supplementary progress review and does not achieve a rating of ‘meets or exceeds expectations’ at the next supplementary progress review will receive a progress review rating of ‘unsatisfactory progress’ for the second supplementary progress review.

(4) A rating of ‘marginal progress’ will be considered satisfactory for the purposes of a student’s scholarship, where the terms and conditions of the scholarship are under the University’s control.

(5) A rating of ‘marginal progress’ cannot be used as a trigger for the requirement for a student to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

(6) If a student is required to meet a required set of actions and due dates, the coordinating supervisor is responsible for overseeing their completion.
16 ‘Unsatisfactory progress’

(1) A rating of ‘unsatisfactory progress’ indicates that:
   (a) the student has not satisfactorily met all requirements (as specified in subclause 13(1)) since the last progress review; or
   (b) there is a significant risk that the thesis:
      (i) will not be submitted for examination on time, or in a timely fashion, allowing for any previous delays; or
      (ii) will not be completed at all.

(2) If a student receives a rating of ‘unsatisfactory progress’, the head of department or postgraduate coordinator:
   (a) must, except where the student is asked to show good cause:
      (i) specify a set of required actions and due dates;
      (ii) set a date for a supplementary progress review;
      (iii) refer the Review Panel’s report to the postgraduate coordinator or Associate Dean; and
      (iv) take such other action as the head of department or postgraduate coordinator considers appropriate, consistent with the Rule and this policy.
   (b) may:
      (i) where relevant, recommend to the University that the student’s research scholarship be terminated;
      (ii) recommend to the Associate Dean that the student be asked to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

(3) In determining what action to take in accordance with subclause (2), the head of department or postgraduate coordinator will take into account:
   (a) any injury, illness or misadventure experienced by the student that has had an impact on progress since the last progress review;
   (b) any difficulties caused by, or fault on the part of, the University; and
   (c) any exceptional circumstances related to the candidature and beyond the reasonable control of the student.

(4) If a student receives a rating of ‘unsatisfactory progress’ at two consecutive progress reviews, the head of department or postgraduate coordinator must recommend to the Associate Dean that the student be asked to show good cause why he or she should be permitted to continue the candidature.

(5) If a student must meet a required set of actions and due dates, the coordinating supervisor is responsible for overseeing their completion.

17 Supplementary progress reviews

(1) If the head of department or postgraduate coordinator requires a student to undertake a supplementary progress review, that supplementary progress review:
   (a) should take place in one of the scheduled review cycles;
(b) must take place no sooner than two months and no later than six months from the date of the original previous review; and
(c) must be conducted in accordance with this policy.

(2) Subject to sub-clause (3), if a student receives a rating of ‘marginal progress’ at a supplementary progress review, clause 15 of this policy will apply.

(3) If after two consecutive supplementary progress reviews the student fails to achieve a rating of ‘meets or exceeds expectations’, the student must receive a rating of ‘unsatisfactory progress’ for the second supplementary progress review, and clause 16 of this policy will apply.

PART 4 MILESTONES AND ACTIVITIES

18 Milestones and activities

(1) There are three types of milestones and activities:
(a) University;
(b) faculty and department;
(c) student.

(2) University milestones and activities are:
(a) set out in Schedule 1 of this policy;
(b) mandatory (including the items listed in bullet-points); and
(c) common for all candidates.

(3) Faculty and department milestones and activities:
(a) are additional to University milestones and activities;
(b) are mandatory specialist requirements specific to the faculty or department;
(c) are common for all candidates in the faculty or department;
(d) may include department specific activities required to achieve University milestones; and
(e) must be approved by the SEG Research Training Committee.

(4) Student milestones and activities are:
(a) specific to the student’s candidature;
(b) set in consultation with the student, and endorsed by the coordinating supervisor.

(5) Progress plans must include at least one faculty or department milestone between the University milestones ‘Confirmation’ and ‘Intent to Submit’.

19 Rescissions and replacements

This document replaces the following, which are rescinded as from the date of commencement of this document:
(1) Subclause 14(13) of the *Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy*, which commenced on 22 February 2013.

(2) *Progress Review of Higher Degree by Research Students Guidelines*, which commenced on 21 August 2014.

20 Transitional arrangements

(1) [Insert details of how the policy will apply to existing HDR students.]
## Schedule 1: University milestones and activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Research Project &amp; Thesis</th>
<th>Research Training</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Outcome Checklist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary appraisal</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>• Review research idea.</td>
<td>• Complete training needs analysis.</td>
<td>• Complete Responsible Research Practice module.</td>
<td>• Have all relevant action items been identified and included in the progress plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Draft research plan.</td>
<td>• Schedule relevant training activities.</td>
<td>• Complete induction(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Draft data management plan.</td>
<td>• Review communication skills (especially writing).</td>
<td>• Identify any need for ethics approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify subsequent actions in progress plan.</td>
<td>• Conduct intellectual property review, and consider need for IP agreements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct autonomous sanctions check.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider potential for restricted information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHS [Activity, within Preliminary Proposal Milestone]</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>• Complete WHS training</td>
<td>• WHS training completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone</td>
<td>Time frame</td>
<td>Research Project &amp; Thesis</td>
<td>Research Training</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Outcome Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>• Finalise research proposal/plan.</td>
<td>• Ensure student has adequate written English to write thesis, or that measures are in place to assist the student to meet this requirement within a specified timeframe.</td>
<td>• Confirm ethics plan and commence ethics application process (where relevant).</td>
<td>• Is the research project feasible? If not, consider next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Finalise data management plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct resources review, including information technology, hardware, software, space, funding, supervision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalise Research Proposal</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>• Agree a final research proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Activity, within Confirmation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent to submit</td>
<td>3 months from projected submission</td>
<td>• Check thesis draft.</td>
<td>• Ensure all training activities from training needs analysis are complete.</td>
<td>• Check compliance with ethics approvals, data management plan, IP agreements.</td>
<td>• Is the research proposal feasible? If not, considered by all parties?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Student to provide input on potential examiners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit for examination</td>
<td>Submission date</td>
<td>• Coordinating supervisor confirms thesis is in a form suitable for examination.</td>
<td>• Consider whether confidentiality agreements are required for examiners.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Is the thesis examinable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty decides to proceed with examination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Research Project &amp; Thesis</th>
<th>Research Training</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Outcome Checklist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>Complete within 4 months of submission</td>
<td>• Determine outcome of examination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the thesis satisfy the requirements for award?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If yes, are there any conditions that must be satisfied?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If no, can the student revise and resubmit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award</td>
<td>Within 4 months of award notification</td>
<td>• Complete requirements for award, including emendations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Comply with data management plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lodge final version of thesis.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Comply with any ethics approval and protocol.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can the degree be conferred?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confer degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Purpose and application

(1) These procedures are to give effect to the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy ("the policy").

(2) Except to the extent that a contrary intention is expressed, these procedures apply to higher degree by research students, staff and affiliates.

2 Commencement

These procedures commence on [date].

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.

4 Progress plan management

(1) All students must submit:
    (a) their approved progress plan:
        (i) within six months from the date of commencement of their candidature;
        (ii) within one month from the date of re-enrolment, where re-enrolling as a result of a requirement to revise and resubmit in a previous thesis examination; and
    (b) any material variations to their approved progress plan, within one month from the date of the variation.

(2) Progress plans must be stored on the student file.
5 Progress reviews

(1) Prior to each progress review, students must:
   (a) ensure that their progress plan is up to date;
   (b) complete all scheduled compliance activities, including work health and safety and research integrity requirements;

(c) comply with the requirement for a research data management plan; and

Note: See Research Data Management Policy 2014, Research Data Management Procedures 2015, and any faculty local provisions relating to research data management.
(d) provide a written submission in a form determined by the University (“the progress review form”).

(2) Students must provide their progress review form no less than 10 working days prior to the progress review meeting.

(3) Coordinating supervisors must comment on the progress review form no less than five working days prior to the progress review meeting.

(4) In their progress review form, students should:
   (a) describe their progress, with reference to milestones and any action items, since their last progress review;
   (b) describe milestones for the period up to the next progress review or completion of candidature;
   (c) assess the effectiveness of their supervisory arrangements;
   (d) identify whether they require any additional training or development;
   (e) outline any challenges to progress, including any technical, academic, infrastructure or resourcing difficulties; and
   (f) detail any issues that have adversely impacted on progress.

(5) During the progress review, Review Panel members, students and supervisors will consider:
   (a) the student’s current and, where relevant, previous progress review forms;
   (b) where relevant, the written record of the outcome of the student’s last progress review; and
   (c) any other relevant information provided by the student.

6 Progress review meetings

(1) Where possible, progress review meetings will be conducted in person.

(2) Where a student is unable to attend a meeting in person, the Review Panel will make reasonable arrangements to facilitate the student’s participation, including:
   (a) video conferencing or telephone;
   (b) rescheduling the meeting to a date within 10 working days of the original date for the meeting, or within such reasonable extended time as the Chair of the Review Panel approves, in his or her absolute discretion.
(3) The Review Panel will prepare its written report to the head of department or postgraduate coordinator within:
   (a) five working days from the date of the meeting; or
   (b) where the student is unable to attend the meeting, five working days from the original date for the meeting; or
   (c) such extended time as the head of department or postgraduate coordinator approves.

Note: The Review Panel may prepare a report and recommend a progress review rating in the student’s absence, in certain circumstances. See clause 13(5) of the policy.

(4) Progress review interview discussions should be constructive, and aimed at identifying pathways to successful completion of candidature.

(5) The Chair of the Review Panel may suspend a progress review meeting where he or she forms the view that:
   (a) an issue or concern raised during the meeting should be referred to another University process; and
   (b) it would be inappropriate to rate the student’s progress until the issue or concern has been addressed.

Note: Students are encouraged to take the initiative in raising problems or difficulties and seeking solutions to them as soon as possible. Problems may be raised during the progress review process or at any other time. See paragraph 15(7)(a) of the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013.

7 Progress review outcomes

(1) Students will have ten working days from receipt of the Review Panel’s report to:
   (a) respond to the report;
   (b) raise any issues concerning the conduct of the progress review meeting.

(2) Taking into account the Review Panel’s report and any response from the student, the head of department or postgraduate coordinator will prepare a written record of the outcome of a progress review:
   (a) stating the progress review rating;
   (b) specifying any actions to be taken as a result of the progress review, including who will be responsible for them and timeframes for their completion;
   (c) stating whether the proposed supervision arrangements are satisfactory and, where appropriate, advising the student on any recommended changes;
   (d) stating whether a supplementary review is required and, if so, the date of the supplementary progress review; and
   (e) listing any action items for the department, faculty or University, to be completed within three months of the date of the progress review.

(3) The final progress review report must be:
   (a) made available to the student and the supervisors; and
   (b) stored on the student file.

Note: See University Recordkeeping Policy and Recordkeeping Manual.
8  Suspension of candidature

(1) Students may, but are not required to, maintain and vary their progress plan during periods of suspension.

(2) Students returning from a suspension of candidature are required to review their progress plan within one month of return.
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Summary
The following updates to the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015 and Procedures 2015 are presented in order to address implementation issues and to allow for the creation of the HDR Administration Centre.

Background
The Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015 and Procedures 2015 were promulgated in January 2015. Some minor issues were identified in the implementation of the policy and procedures, which are addressed here. Some further changes are proposed to enable the efficient implementation of the HDR Administration Centre.

The proposed changes have been endorsed by SEG Research Training Committee and Graduate Studies Committee of Academic Board.

Highlights of the proposed changes include:
1- Administration of the Policy and Procedures will now be the responsibility of the HDR Administrative Centre. Kerrie Henderson at OGC also comments: “Procedures are made by the administrator of the policy, not the Board. I think we had the Board do these as part of a package at the time but it isn’t necessary.”
2- Policy 7(4). The policy now clarifies that there is no special consideration available in the examination process. This is described at greater length in proposed amendments to the University of Sydney (Higher Degrees by Research) Rule, to be delivered next meeting.
3- Policy, 13(1). The decision is accept a hard copy for examination is now an administrative decision. Note that, where examiners request a hard copy, this will be produced by the HDR Admin Centre from the electronic copy.
4- Policy 13(1). Note that text similarity detecting software will be applied to all submitted theses. Further detail will be included in the relevant Academic Honesty policy.
5- Policy, 13(8)&(9). Reasons for declining to examine a thesis are expanded, and subsequent actions are clarified.
6- Policy 15. Qualifications of examiners. Recent research students of the supervisors are now excluded. Restrictions on internal examiner from the same department are lifted. This had the unintended effect of precluding small faculties without departmental structures from using internal examiners at all. PhD Awards Subcommittee agreed that the primary concern was in fact, managing conflict of interest, which is now more explicit in the Procedures (see below).
7- Policy 23(2). Students are now required to ‘address’ requirements to make minor corrections or emendations, rather than ‘undertake’. This allows greater flexibility of approach to emendation requirements being addressed to the satisfaction of the HOD.
8- Procedures, Section 5. Approving Examiners. This section now includes a deadline for nomination of examiners by supervisors, and an escalation process if the supervisor fails to nominate in a timely manner. There is greater clarity about managing actual, potential or perceived conflicts of interest.
9- Procedures, 10(7). When students are consulted after an intention to not award, students must state their intention to respond within two weeks (instead of four), and the overall deadline for response is reduced to six weeks (instead of eight). This aims to speed turn-around times in these cases.

10- Procedures 10(10)(b). Faculties can now award degrees with emendations where all examiners recommend minor corrections or emendations in all cases without reference to PhDASC.

11- Procedures, Section 12. Language tidied to remove implication that examiners-as-assessor will produce two separate reports. While assessors do perform both tasks, they rarely present their findings as two separate reports.

12- Procedures, Section 13. This is a new section making explicit what happens in the case of award with minor corrections or emendations. Given that these are the most common outcome of examination, it was important to make clear what happens in these cases.

13- Procedures 14(3). This makes explicit that a student who does not exercise their option to re-enrol in a reasonable time after a result of ‘not award, with option to revise and resubmit’ may be discontinued. Requiring a student re-enrol at the next research period, but with the explicit option to request a period of suspension, allows the University to maintain contact with the student with suitable flexibility to allow for any individual circumstances.

14- Procedures, Section 16. Oral Examinations. This section is substantially reviewed and clarified based on feedback from faculties that undertake oral examinations and the process design team at SAS. Note that some superfluous steps are recommended for deletion.

A note on target times for examination: examination times have long been a concern for the Graduate Studies Committee. One of the steps taken in this policy is to reduce the standard target time for examiners to return their reports from eight weeks to six weeks (with the ability to extend to a total of 12 weeks). There have been a number of members of academic staff who have voiced concerns that this target time is too short, and there are anecdotal reports of some examiners not being willing to examine theses in this time frame. This issue was again debated at length at SEG RTC, who recommend that the target time should remain as a standard six weeks (extendable to 12 weeks) in order to give sufficient time to ascertain whether this target time (in conjunction with improvements in examination management through the HDR Administrative Centre) is having a positive effect on examination times. It would be appropriate to review the efficacy of this provision at the end of 2016, when more detailed data is available. It also recommended that the communications to examiners should emphasize that the target time is flexible and can make allowances for other commitments, especially in cases where the thesis submission has been delayed.

Recommendation:
THESIS AND EXAMINATION OF HIGHER DEGREES BY RESEARCH POLICY 2015

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

Dated: 12 November 2014

Last amended:
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Position: Chair, Academic Board
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1 Name of policy

This is the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015.

2 Commencement

This policy commences on 1 January 2015.

3 Policy is binding

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

This policy:

(a) describes the nature of the thesis for a higher degree by research; and
(b) prescribes the requirements for the examination of a higher degree by research.

5 Application

(1) This policy applies to the thesis for, and examination of, all higher degrees by research, including:

(a) masters degrees by research;
(b) the Doctor of Philosophy; and
(c) doctorates by research other than the Doctor of Philosophy.

(2) This policy does not apply to higher doctorates as defined in section 5 of the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011.

6 Definitions and interpretation

(1) In this policy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AQF</td>
<td>means the Australian Qualifications Framework (see <a href="http://www.aqf.edu.au/">http://www.aqf.edu.au/</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrative unit</td>
<td>means the central University administrative unit responsible for the processes of candidature management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>means the Associate Dean of a faculty with authority for matters relating to higher degrees by research within the faculty, or the Deputy Chairperson of a Board of Studies, or a person appointed by the Dean to have authority for matters relating to higher degrees by research within the faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cotutelle agreement</td>
<td>means an agreement between the University and another university or institution that permits joint candidature in the Doctor of Philosophy consistently with the Cotutelle Scheme Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course resolutions</td>
<td>means resolutions made by the Academic Board in accordance with sections 2.01 and 3.01 of the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>means the Dean of a faculty or the chairperson of a board of studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department</td>
<td>means the academic unit or disciplinary grouping (however named) within a faculty primarily responsible for the teaching and examining of higher degree by research students. If a faculty does not have an internal departmental structure, a reference to a department is a reference to the faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**doctorate by research**

includes the PhD and all faculty doctorates and has the meaning provided in the *University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (as amended)* which at the date of this policy is:

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

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

**examination**

means the examination of a thesis as the basis for the award of a higher degree by research.

**examiner**

means a person appointed to examine a higher degree by research thesis. An examiner may be an internal or an external examiner.

**external examiner**

means a suitably qualified person who is neither an employee or an honorary title holder (as defined by the *Honorary Titles Policy 2013*) of the University. Persons who have previously been employed by the University, and who have not been involved in the candidature, may be approved as external examiners.

**faculty**

means the faculty in which the student is enrolled.

**faculty committee**

means the committee that is responsible for the examination of a higher degree by research student for the faculty in which the student is enrolled. This may be a faculty, divisional or other relevant committee or board.

**head of department**

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

the head of the relevant department or discipline.

**Note:** see also “department”

**internal examiner**

means a suitably qualified person who is an employee of or honorary title holder (as defined by the *Honorary Titles Policy 2013*) of the University.

**joint award**

means an agreement between the University and another university or institution pursuant to an agreement that permits such awards.

**Note:** See also *Cotutelle Scheme Policy*

**masters degree by research**

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

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

**Note:** The Academic Board will not approve a masters degree by research unless it complies with the Australian Qualifications Framework at AQF Level 9.
outcome means the outcome of an examination for a higher degree by research as defined in clause 20 of this policy.

PhD Award Sub-Committee means the PhD Award Sub-Committee of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board.

Note: The terms of reference of these committees are available from the Graduate Studies Committee website.

plagiarism has the meaning provided in the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy 2012 which at the date of this policy is presenting another person’s work as one’s own work by presenting, copying or reproducing it without appropriate acknowledgement of the source. Plagiarism is a form of academic dishonesty.

postgraduate co-ordinator means the member of academic staff within a department with responsibility for matters relating to higher degrees by research.

student has the meaning provided in the University of Sydney By-law 1999 (as amended) which at the date of this policy is: a person who is currently admitted to candidature in an award course at the University.

supervisor has the meaning provided for co-ordinating supervisor in the Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013 which at the date of this policy is: the research supervisor in a supervisory team who has designated academic delegations and responsibility for administrative requirements.

thesis means the whole of the assessable work submitted for examination. This may include previously published material, creative or artistic components, software, codes, models, and appendices.

(2) Subject to the requirements of the applicable faculty constitution, an action to be undertaken by a faculty pursuant to this policy may be undertaken by a staff member, academic or professional, to whom the Dean has allocated responsibility for the relevant activity.

7 Roles of thesis and examination

(1) The thesis is the complete body of assessable work submitted by a student for examination for a higher degree by research.

(2) The examination of the thesis is the basis for the award of a higher degree by research (subject to the completion of coursework where required by degree resolutions).

Note: Some masters degrees by research and professional doctorates may include coursework requirements.

(3) The examination determines whether a higher degree by research is awarded or not awarded.
(3)(4) Students who have experienced illness, misadventure or other exceptional circumstances should apply for an extension of the latest date to submit their thesis for examination. Special consideration is not available in the examination of higher degrees by research for any reason.

(4)(5) Subject to Section 6 of the *University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research Rule) 2011*, a candidate for a higher degree by research will not be permitted to undertake a program of advanced study and research that is likely to result in the lodgement in the University Library of a thesis that cannot be made available for public use.

8 The thesis

(1) The thesis must:
(a) be the student’s own work;
(b) embody the results of the work undertaken by the student during candidature;
(c) form a substantially original contribution to the area of knowledge concerned;
(d) afford evidence of originality by the:
   (i) discovery of new knowledge; and
   (ii) exercise of independent critical ability;
(e) form a cohesive and unified whole;
(f) include a substantial amount of material that may be suitable for publication;
(g) satisfactorily demonstrate that the student is able to identify, access, organise and communicate new and established knowledge;
(h) be written to a standard generally acceptable to the discipline; and
(i) be written in English except where permitted under the *University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research Rule)* 2011.

(2) The thesis must document, generally in the preface, or in the notes, or elsewhere as appropriate:
(a) the animal and human ethics approval obtained;
(b) the sources from which the information in the thesis is derived;
(c) the nature of collaborations, or assistance, with the work described in the thesis, including:
   (i) any assistance provided during the research phase; and
   (ii) any editorial assistance in the writing of the thesis.

   **Note:** In relation to editorial assistance see clause 3 of the *Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015*.

(3) The thesis must contain a written component generally in the form of one or more critical hypotheses that investigate the subject of the thesis in the relevant body of knowledge.

(4) The thesis may contain:
(a) artistic or creative works, software, computer code, or models which must be documented or recorded in a way sufficient for the purpose of assessment;
(b) material that has been published during candidature with the student as either sole or joint author, provided that the supervisor or corresponding author submits evidence identifying the student’s contribution to the published material;

(c) appendices.

(5) The role of an appendix is to provide a place for the inclusion of supplementary material that is related to the research but not directly relevant to the argument of the thesis.

(a) Material in appendices is assessable except where written entirely by authors other than the candidate.

(b) Appendices may include:

(i) data sets; or

(ii) software code; or

(iii) examples of surveys or instruments used to gather research data; or

(iv) handbooks and manuals; or

(v) publications arising from the research but not directly relevant to the arguments included in the thesis; or

(vi) documentary recordings of exhibitions or installations mounted during the candidature but not part of the thesis; or

(vii) archival and primary texts; or

(viii) other material as deemed necessary by the student and supervisor.

(6) The required length of the thesis depends on the degree for which it is submitted.

(a) For doctoral degrees:

(i) the total upper limit is 80,000 words which may be exceeded by no more than 20,000 words with the written permission of the Dean, Associate Dean, or the Chair of the faculty committee;

(ii) subject to clause 8 (6) (a) (i), a shorter required length may be specified by course resolutions, or in the case of the PhD, by local provisions;

(iii) this word limit does not include appendices.

(b) For masters degrees by research:

(i) the total upper limit is 50,000 words which may be exceeded by no more than 10,000 words with the written permission of the Dean, Associate Dean, or the Chair of the faculty committee.

(ii) Subject to Clause 8 (6) (b) (i), a shorter required length may be specified in course resolutions.

(iii) The word limit does not include appendices.

9 The examination generally

(1) The examination is an assessment of the total thesis presented.

(2) The examination process proceeds on the basis that:

(a) the thesis consists of advanced research which makes an original contribution to knowledge; and
(b) the awarded thesis will be lodged in the University library in electronic format.

**Note:** See also *University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011* and *Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures*.

(3) The result of the examination is a University decision based on a body of evidence which includes:

(a) mandatory items:

   (i) the thesis;

   (ii) examiners' reports specified in clause 21 of this policy;

   (iii) a recommendation from the relevant head of department, which is based on the examiners' reports.

and

(b) as deemed necessary by the faculty committee or the PhD Award Subcommittee:

   (i) reports from supervisor(s), and the Associate Dean;

   (ii) comments from the student; or

   (iii) any other information deemed necessary.

**Note:** See also clauses 5 – 14 of the *Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015*.

10 Oral examinations

(1) Oral examinations may be:

(a) recommended by the head of department; or

(b) requested by a student, except in relation to a resubmitted thesis.

**Note:** See also clauses 15 – 16 of the *Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015*.

(2) Oral examinations will only be undertaken if approved by the head of department.

(3) Oral examinations may be conducted:

(a) as an integral part of the whole examination process; or

(b) as an in-person consultation with the student at the conclusion of the standard examination.

(4) The purpose of an oral examination is to:

(a) reduce the potential length of the examination process;

(b) fit the convention of the discipline;

(c) test the student's understanding of the knowledge described within the thesis;

(d) clarify points of principle or detail within the thesis; or

(e) assess the contribution made by the student to the content and presentation of the thesis.

(5) Oral examinations may only examine material that would be examined under a thesis-only examination i.e. the *thesis content and any appended material or*
creative or artistic component.

11 Examination of cotutelle and joint award degrees

(1) For joint degrees, including cotutelle degrees, the examination processes to be used must be specified in the individual student agreement at the beginning of the candidature.

(2) The examination of such degrees must be conducted:
   (a) by the University, in accordance with this policy; or
   (b) by the partner institution, consistently with the terms of the applicable individual student agreement.

(3) If the examination is to be conducted by the partner institution:
   (a) the proposed examination process must be approved before the agreement is executed, by one of:
       (i) the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board; or
       (ii) the PhD Award Sub-Committee of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board; and
   (b) the relevant individual student agreement should require consistency with the following clauses of this policy:
       (i) the qualifications of examiners (clause 15)
       (ii) the examiners' reports (clause 21); and
       (iii) the outcome of the award (clause 23).

Note: See also Cotutelle Scheme Policy and clause 17 of the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015.

12 Thesis with publications

(1) The University will accept for examination a thesis which contains previously published material provided that:
   (a) the thesis makes an original and substantial contribution to the field of knowledge;
   (b) the thesis forms a consistent, coherent and unified whole;
   (c) the previously published material relates to research undertaken during the candidature and was published during the candidature; and
   (d) in addition to the published material, the student provides, at the minimum:
       (i) an introduction which argues for the aim(s) of the thesis and contextualises the research problems it purports to address; and
       (ii) a conclusion which draws together the findings of the studies in the context of the stated aims of the thesis.

(2) The student may also provide other separate chapters to supplement the published papers such as a literature review, background information, or description of the methodology used.
(3) Acceptable publications (including material already published, accepted for publication, or submitted for publication) include:

(a) papers in a refereed journal;
(b) book chapters;
(c) conference papers;
(d) a documentary record of an exhibition or installation mounted during candidature which is not part of the creative or artistic component of a thesis.

(4) A blog is not an acceptable publication.

(5) A collection of disparate publications, no matter what their quality, must not be approved for the award of a higher degree by research if they do not meet the criteria for the award.

(6) A thesis containing published material must be examined using the same criteria, and by the same process, as one which does not.

13 Form of thesis for examination


(a) A thesis in paper format may be accepted in addition to the electronic document, with the prior approval of the Dean, Associate Dean or the Chair of the faculty committee, or the Chair of the administrative unit.

(b) If an examiner expresses a preference for examining a paper copy of the thesis, then this must be supplied by the administrative unit.

(b)(c) The administrative unit must apply similarity detecting software to all theses submitted for examination.

(c) Where submission in paper format is approved, the Dean, Associate Dean, or the Chair of the faculty committee, will specify the number of paper copies required.

(2) The following information must appear on the title page:

(a) the full title of the thesis;
(b) the student’s name;
(c) the words “A thesis submitted in fulfilment [or “partial fulfilment”, if determined by the degree resolutions] of the requirements for the degree of [degree name, e.g. Doctor of Philosophy];”;
(d) the faculty in which the student is enrolled;
(e) the name of the University of Sydney.

(3) If a thesis includes an artistic or creative component such as an exhibition, performance, model, software or data, a documentary record of this component of sufficient quality for assessment must be included as part of the submitted thesis.

(4) The thesis must be accompanied by an abstract in the format prescribed by the Academic Board. Some faculties may require the abstract in advance of submission of the thesis for examination.

Note: See the Library and Sydney eScholarship Repository Final Thesis Lodgement Guidelines for Students for information about the prescribed format. See also clause 23 of the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures.
(5) Students must submit a statement with the thesis certifying their understanding that, if their candidature is successful, their thesis will be lodged with the Director of University Libraries and made available for immediate public use.

Note: See also University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 for requirements for lodging theses.

(6) The thesis must be accompanied by a statement from the supervisor stating whether, in the supervisor’s opinion, the thesis:

(a) is sufficiently well presented to be examined; and

(b) does not exceed the prescribed word limit or any extended word limit for which prior approval has been granted.

(i) If a thesis is submitted for examination without the supervisor’s statement, the faculty committee or DVC Education will decide whether it will be accepted for examination.

(7) The faculty committee or DVC Education may decline to examine a thesis if:

(a) the supervisor does not certify that it is ready for examination;

(b) it exceeds the prescribed word limits without prior approval to do so;

(c) suitable examiners, as determined by the faculty committee, cannot be found; or

(d) the student requests withdrawal from the examination and the faculty committee determines there is good reason to do so;

(e) there is a suspicion of possible breach of the Research Code of Conduct 2013; or

(f) the student has not successfully completed required research training activities, including any required units of study; or

(g) the student has not successfully completed required research training activities, including any required units of study.

(8) When a faculty committee or DVC Education declines to examine a thesis, they must:

(a) report the circumstances and reasons for the decision to the PhD Award Sub-Committee;

(b) if there is a suspicion of research misconduct or academic dishonesty, refer the thesis for consideration and, if appropriate, investigation under either or both of the Research Code of Conduct 2013 or the University of Sydney (By-Law) 1999 (as amended);

(c) inform the student in writing of:

(i) the reasons for declining to examine the thesis;

(ii) any changes necessary to make the thesis acceptable for examination; and

(iii) any other actions required to be completed prior to examination.

(d) recommend to the Dean that the student be either:

(i) permitted to re-enrol in order to complete the necessary actions and changes and resubmit the thesis; or
(ii) asked to show good cause why they should be permitted to re-enrol.

(d)(e) The Dean will decide whether the student will be permitted to re-enrol or required to show good cause.

Note: The show good cause process is specified in the *University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011*

14 Notice of intention to submit

(1) The student must indicate their intention to submit a thesis for examination prior to the final submission date.

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

(2) Notice should be given at least three months prior to the intended submission date to allow sufficient time for:

(a) the appointment of examiners; and

(b) the organisation of other examination requirements such as oral examinations, exhibitions or performances.

(3) The supervisor, head of department, or postgraduate coordinator should discuss with the student:

(a) the possibility of an oral examination; and

(b) the selection of possible examiners, noting that students:
   (i) may advise the supervisor, in writing, of the names of individuals that they consider appropriate to be appointed as examiners; and
   (ii) may advise the supervisor, in writing, of the names of individuals that they would prefer not to be appointed as examiners; and
   (iii) are not permitted to communicate with examiners regarding the examination during the examination.

15 Qualifications of examiners

(1) Nominated examiners must be approved:

(a) for doctoral degrees, by the PhD Award Sub-Committee;

(b) for masters degrees, by research by the faculty committee.

(2) Examiners should be active in research or scholarship. A research active examiner is understood to be someone who pursues research on an ongoing basis, as a major focus of their academic activity.

(3) Examiners should have the following qualifications appropriate to the discipline, and as determined by the faculty committee:

(a) a qualification equivalent to the level being examined; or

(b) equivalent professional or research experience.

(4) Examiners should have experience of, or be familiar with, the supervision and examination of research theses for the University or other local and international educational institutions, as determined by the faculty committee.

(5) The faculty should take all reasonable steps to ensure that examiners are:

(a) free from bias for or against the student or the supervisor;
(b) free from actual, potential or perceived conflicts of interests.

(6) A person must not be an examiner if they:
(a) have been involved in the student’s research;
(b) are a co-author on any part of the work;
(c) have a past or current close personal relationship with the student or supervisor;
(d) have had substantial contact with the student or supervisor in any other circumstances which might jeopardise the independence, or the perceived independence, of the examination; or
(e) have not been a research student of the supervisor within the last ten years; or
(f) have supervised the student at any time.

Note: See also External Interests Policy 2010

(7) Subject to this clause 15, a person from another institution, who has held the role of supervisor for other higher degree by research students at the University of Sydney, may be appointed as an external examiner.

(8) An internal examiner should not be from the same department as the supervisor, except with the approval of:
(a) for doctorates by research, the PhD Award Subcommittee; or
(b) for masters degrees by research, the faculty committee.

(9) Former research students of the supervisor must not be appointed as examiners for at least ten years after graduation, except with the specific approval of the PhD Award Sub-Committee and in exceptional circumstances.

16 Approving examiners

(1) The supervisor must make recommendations regarding the appointment of examiners to the faculty committee, as follows:
(a) for a doctorate by research, a minimum three examiners; and
(b) for a masters degrees by research, a minimum of two examiners.

(2) The supervisor should inform the faculty committee of any preferences regarding examiners received from the student.

(3) Each group of examiners approved to examine a thesis should include:
(a) no more than one from any given university or institution; and
(b) at least one examiner affiliated with a university or degree granting institution; and
(c) no more than one internal examiner.

(4) The supervisor may recommend one or more additional individuals who are qualified to examine to be held in reserve and commissioned, consistently with clause 17 of this policy, as required.

(5) Once the faculty committee has received recommendations from the supervisor regarding the examiners it may consult with the supervisor or head of department as required.

(6) The faculty committee may:
(a) proceed with the nomination of examiners as recommended; or
(b) nominate different examiners after consultation with the supervisor or head of department.

(7) The supervisor and the faculty committee should ensure that examiners are nominated at least four weeks before the submission of the thesis.

(8) If the student does not submit the thesis for examination within three months following the approval of examiners, the faculty must:
(a) request a revised submission date from the student and the supervisor; and
(b) write to each examiner:
   (i) to inform them of the delay; and
   (ii) ask if they are still willing to conduct the examination of the thesis at a future date.

17 Commissioning of examiners

(1) Once approved examiners must be commissioned by the faculty in the manner provided in the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015.

   Note: See Clause 6 of those procedures.

(2) At least the minimum number of approved examiners for the degree must be commissioned.

(3) Approved examiners who are not initially commissioned may be used at a later stage as replacement or additional examiners.

(4) At the time of commissioning, the faculty must ensure that examiners are informed that:
   (a) the contents of the thesis, including any intellectual property rights contained in the thesis, remain strictly confidential;
   (b) the thesis can only be used for the purposes of performing the examination;
   (c) their names may be released to the student during or after the examination; and
   (d) their reports may be released to the student during or after the examination.

   Note: Students have the right to access information about themselves, including their examinations. See the Privacy Policy 2013 and the Privacy Management Plan.

18 Approving and commissioning of additional examiners

(1) Additional approved examiners may be commissioned to examine a thesis if:
   (a) an original examiner is unable to examine subsequent to appointment; or
   (b) an original examiner does not complete their examination within the required time frame

      Note: see clause 20 below

or

(c) as required by the faculty committee or the PhD Award Sub-Committee.

(2) An internal examiner may only replace an original internal examiner.
(3) Any additional examiners must be approved consistently with clause 16 of this policy. This may include examiners approved, but not commissioned, at the time of submission.

19 Appointing examiner-as-assessor

(1) Where the faculty committee or the PhD Award Sub-Committee is unable to form an intention regarding the award, the faculty committee may appoint an examiner-as-assessor to examine the thesis and act as an assessor of the original examiners' reports.

(2) Previous approval as an examiner is not sufficient to act as examiner-as-assessor.

(3) Examiners appointed as assessors must:
   (a) be an external appointment;
   (b) have the qualifications required in Clause 15 of the policy;
   (c) possess very high standing in the subject of the thesis; and
   (d) be approved by the PhD Award Sub-Committee.

20 Replacing examiners

(1) Replacement examiners must be appointed when:
   (a) a report has not been received from an original examiner within ten weeks of the twelve weeks of the receipt of the thesis; or
   (b) an examiner is unable to examine subsequent to appointment.

(2) The faculty committee must:
   (a) inform the original examiner that their services are no longer required; and
   (b) commission a previously approved examiner; or
   (c) approve a new examiner in accordance with clause 16 of this policy.

(3) Once commissioned, the new examiner must examine the thesis consistently with clause 8 of this policy.

(4) If the original examiner returns a report after the replacement examiner has been sent a copy of the thesis, the original examiner's report will not form part of the body of evidence used to determine the award of the degree.

21 Examiners reports

(1) Within six weeks of the receipt of the thesis, each examiner must:
   (a) complete the examination; and
   (b) submit a report to the faculty.

(2) Each examiner must submit an independent report, which will remain confidential until:
   (a) all reports have been received; or
   (b) the Dean or Associate Dean considers that special circumstances exist which warrant its earlier release.
(3) Examiner’s reports must be in English, except where the language of the thesis is in a language other than English.

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

(a) If the thesis is in a language other than English, the preferred language of the examiner’s report is English, but the examiner’s report may be provided in the same language as the thesis.

(b) An examiner who provides a report in a language other than English must also submit a summary of their report in English. This summary must be sufficient for:
   (i) the faculty committee and the PhD Award Sub-Committee to review the examination as necessary; and
   (ii) reviewers to understand the key aspects of the report.

(4) Examiners’ reports must

(a) state whether, in the opinion of the examiner, the thesis fulfils the criteria in clause 8 of this policy; and

(b) include any other material required by the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures.

22 Communication during examination process

(1) Between examiners

(a) The names of examiners must not be disclosed to other examiners until a determination has been made about the awarding of the degree, except if required:
   (i) by the use of an oral examination; or
   (ii) during the examination of a creative or artistic component of a thesis.

(b) Examiners must not correspond or communicate with other examiners regarding the examination or the thesis, except in discussion:
   (i) at an oral examination; or
   (ii) at the examination of a creative or artistic component of a thesis.

(2) Between examiners and students

(a) The names of examiners may be disclosed to students, on request, after the thesis has been submitted for examination.

(b) Students, or persons acting on their behalf, must not communicate with the examiners regarding their thesis or examination during the examination process (i.e. from submission to award of degree).

(c) If a student, or a person acting on their behalf, communicates with an examiner during the examination process:
   (i) the examination must be discontinued; and
   (ii) a new examination process must commence with newly commissioned examiners.

Note: Breaches of the Code of Conduct for Students may result in disciplinary action.

(3) Between the University and examiners
(a) University staff, including academic and professional staff, may contact examiners:
   (i) to arrange for an oral examination or the examination of a creative or artistic component of a thesis; or
   (ii) to ascertain if progress of the report is delayed.

(b) If University staff, including academic and professional staff, communicate with an examiner they should not make any comment which could be seen as influencing, or having the potential to influence, the examination outcome.

(c) The faculty will inform the examiners of the outcome of the examination at the conclusion of the examination.

(4) Between the faculty and the student

(a) Students may be provided with status updates on the examination process, at the stages specified in the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015.

   Note: See clause 14 of those procedures.

(b) The faculty should provide the student with the names of the examiners at the conclusion of the examination process.

(c) The faculty must also contact any student who is required to:
   (i) comment on the examination; or
   (ii) fulfil conditions related to the outcome of the examination.

23 Outcome of the examination

(1) The outcome of the examination will be decided:

(a) for masters degrees by research, by the relevant faculty committee.

(b) for doctorate by research degrees, by the PhD Award Sub-Committee or by the relevant faculty committee.

(2) The outcome of the examination must be one of the following:

(a) Award without qualification: the degree can be awarded without any further action by the student.

(b) Award with minor corrections: the degree can be awarded once minor corrections to the thesis have been undertaken addressed by the student to the satisfaction of the head of department.

(c) Award with emendations: the degree can be awarded once all required emendations to the thesis have been undertaken addressed by the student to the satisfaction of the head of department.

(d) Non-award - revision and re-examination: the degree is not awarded; and the option is provided for the student to revise and resubmit the thesis for a new examination subject to the following:

   (i) the revision and re-examination process must be conducted consistently with the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2015.

   Note: See clause 13 of those procedures.

   (ii) no further opportunity to revise and resubmit the whole thesis may be permitted.
(e) Non-award - option to award another degree: the thesis is not considered satisfactory for the award of the degree for which it was submitted, but another degree for which the student is eligible may be awarded instead.

(f) Non-award: the thesis is unsatisfactory for the award of the degree for which it was submitted and for any other another degree for which the student is eligible, and does not demonstrate sufficient ability to achieve this standard through resubmission.

(3) The student and supervisor will be notified when the decision has been made.

(4) When the decision to award the degree has been made, the faculty may certify that the student is eligible to graduate subject to the student:
   (a) fulfilling any conditions of award to the satisfaction of the head of department; and
   (b) lodging a final copy of the thesis in the University Library.

24 Rescissions and replacements

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

(1) Postgraduate: Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
(2) Higher degree theses policy
(3) Oral examinations of PhD Theses at the University of Sydney
(4) PhD: Appointment of Additional Examiner as Assessor
(5) PhD: Submission of Doctor of Philosophy Theses containing published work
(6) Proof reading and editing of theses and dissertations
(7) Submission of treatise containing published work
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1 Purpose and application

(1) These procedures are to give effect to the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015 (“the policy”).

(2) These procedures apply to any persons involved in research higher degree theses and examination.

2 Commencement

These procedures commence on 1 January 2015.

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.

case means any material sent to the PhD Award Sub-Committee for consideration and review during a student’s examination.

copy-editing and proof reading means identifying errors in, and correcting, the presentation of the text so as to conform with standard usage and conventions, including:

- spelling
- quotations
- use of italics
- lists
- word usage
- punctuation
- graphs
- charts
- citations
- references
- heading hierarchies
- symbols and equations
- headers and footers
- style of numbers

editor means any person providing paid or unpaid assistance to students in the preparation of the thesis. This also includes University and faculty writing advisors.
local availability means in relation to a thesis lodged with the University library, the thesis will be able to accessed, viewed, re-used and cited by current staff and students of the University by means of Unikey authentication.

open access means, in relation to a thesis lodged with the University library, unrestricted and free online access to the University’s scholarly research output.

PART 1: PROOF-READING AND EDITING THESES

4 Proof-reading and editing of theses

(1) Students are permitted to use editors in preparing their thesis for submission.
   
   Note: See clause 8(2)(c)(ii) of the policy

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

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

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

(4) When an editor has been used:
   
   (a) the name of the editor and a brief description of the service rendered must be printed as part of the list of acknowledgements or other prefatory matter near the front of the work when it is presented for examination; and
   (b) if the editor’s current or former area of academic specialisation is similar to that of the student, this must also be stated.
PART 2: THESIS EXAMINATION PROCESS AND OUTCOME

5 Approving examiners

(1) The supervisor must provide nominations for examiners to the faculty committee at least four weeks prior to the intended submission date of the thesis.

(2) The supervisor should consult potential examiners prior to their nomination to ensure that:

(a) they are willing and able to act within the timeframe expected; and

(b) they agree to their names and comments being released to the student.

Note: In exceptional circumstances this information may be withheld. See clause 14 of these procedures.

(3) The supervisor must:

(a) nominate examiners using the form prescribed for that purpose by the PhD Award Sub-Committee, which is available on the Sub-Committee website (http://sydney.edu.au/ab/committees/grad_studies/grad_studies_forms.shtml) and

(b) submit the nomination form within four weeks of the earlier of:

(i) the receipt of the intention to submit form, or

(ii) the submission of thesis for examination.

(3)(4) If the supervisor has not nominated examiners within two weeks of the date required in subclause 5(3), the associate dean must nominate examiners consistently with these procedures.

(4)(5) The following information must be provided for each nominated examiner:

(a) whether they are currently active in research;

(b) their previous experience as an examiner;

(c) their relevant expertise;

(d) whether they have agreed to act as examiner;

(e) whether they are willing to conduct an oral examination;

(f) whether they are willing to examine the thesis in electronic form; and

(g) the language (if not English) in which they would submit their report; and

(h) a conflict of interests declaration signed by the nominated examiner.

(5)(6) The supervisor should provide written justification for the nomination of any of the following:

(a) an individual who does not come from a university or degree-granting institution;

(b) an emeritus or honorary professor, or other retired academic; or

(c) an individual with no previous experience examining research higher degree theses; or
any other exceptional circumstances.

An individual with an actual, potential or perceived conflict of interests, how that conflict will be managed.

Where applicable, appropriate, such written justification should include:

(a) information regarding research activity in the past 5 years; and
(b) how any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interests will be managed.

6 Commissioning examiners

(1) The faculty will commission approved examiners by sending each examiner:

(a) a copy of the thesis in the requested format;
(b) a copy of any required form for the examiner’s report;

Note: See clause 7 of these procedures

(c) a copy of the policy, these procedures and all applicable guidelines;
(d) the resolutions relating to the degree;
(e) proposed arrangements for an oral examination, if applicable;
(f) proposed arrangements for examination of the creative or artistic component, if applicable;
(g) any specific conditions relating to the examination process; and
(h) the name and contact details of the relevant faculty staff member for communication regarding the process.

7 Examiners’ reports on the thesis

(1) The PhD Award Sub-Committee may prescribe a form for the presentation of examiners’ reports.

(2) Examiners must return their reports within six weeks of the despatch of the thesis.

(3) Examiners must:

(a) use the form prescribed by the University; and
(b) return a signed copy of the form by electronic mail, fax or post at the end of their examination.

(4) Each examiner’s report must include a statement as to whether the examiner is satisfied that the thesis meets the criteria prescribed in clause 8 of the policy.

(5) Each examiner must include a recommendation about the outcome of the award consistent with clause 23 of the policy.

(6) Each examiner’s report must specify:

(a) the grounds on which their recommendation is based; and
(b) the strengths and weaknesses of the thesis and the particular contributions made by the student; and
(c) a description of the type of minor corrections required; or
(d) a detailed list of emendations required; or
(e) the basis for revise and resubmit; or
(f) the basis for non-award.

(7) Examiners who are submitting a report in a language other than English must provide a summary of their report in English.

(8) Examiners may include suggestions for the next steps in research or improvements for publication that are not required for the award of the degree.

8 Monitoring examiners’ reports

(1) When an examiner submits a report, the faculty will:
(a) acknowledge receipt of the report; and
(b) arrange for payment of the appropriate honoraria to external examiners.

(2) If an examiner has not returned the report within four weeks, the faculty will contact the examiner with a reminder of the due date.

(3) If an examiner has not returned a report within six weeks, the faculty will make contact to:
(a) remind the examiner of the conditions of examination; and
(b) ask when the report can be expected.

(4) If an examiner has not returned a report within ten weeks, the faculty will inform the examiner that if the report is not received within a further two weeks:
(a) it will not be accepted;
(b) if an external examiner, the examiner will not be eligible for payment; and
(c) a replacement examiner will be appointed.

(5) If the report is not received within the further two week period, the faculty will appoint a replacement examiner.

9 Replacing examiners

(1) If an additional examiner has already been approved then this person may be used as a replacement examiner.

(2) If an additional examiner has not already been approved, one will be nominated and commissioned consistently with clause 6 of these procedures.

(3) If the original examiner returns a report after a replacement examiner has been commissioned:
(a) the original examiner's report will not form part of the body of evidence considered in awarding the degree;
(b) the original examiner will be informed that no further information is required; and
(c) if the original examiner was an external appointment no payment will be made.
10 Considering examiners’ reports

(1) The faculty will release the examiners’ reports to the supervisor and head of department after all examiners’ reports have been received. The Associate Dean or Chair of the faculty committee may release reports to the supervisor and head of department at an earlier date in exceptional circumstances.

(2) Once all the examiners’ reports have been received, the head of department will:
   (a) consider the reports; and
   (b) consult the supervisor, who may provide a written report.

(3) The head of department will then make a recommendation regarding the outcome of the award to the faculty committee. This report must include:
   (a) details of the nature and extent of any consultation; and
   (b) a copy of any supervisor’s written report received.

(4) The head of department’s report must specifically refer to all concerns expressed by the examiners:
   (a) specifying which concerns must be addressed and which need not be addressed; and
   (b) including instructions to the student where the recommendation is:
      (i) award with minor corrections; or
      (ii) award with emendations; or
      (iii) non-award with provision to revise and resubmit.

(5) After considering the examiners’ reports and the head of department’s recommendation, the faculty committee will determine whether:
   (a) there is sufficient information to form an intention on the award of the degree consistently with clause 23 of the policy; or
   (b) further action is required, such as:
      (i) appointing an additional examiner;
      (ii) appointing an examiner-as-assessor;
      (iii) referring for further investigation e.g. in the instance of an allegation of plagiarism or research misconduct;
      (iv) consulting with the student (in person or in writing);
      (v) requesting additional information from the supervisor or head of department;
      (vi) for masters degrees by research consulting the PhD Award Sub-Committee; or
      (vii) obtaining any further information deemed necessary.

(6) When the faculty committee determines it has sufficient information to do so, it will form an intention on the award of the degree consistently with clause 23 of the policy.

(7) If the intention is not to award (whether with or without an option to revise and resubmit or to award to another degree) the faculty committee must notify the student in writing of the intention, and:
   (a) provide the student with de-identified copies of the examiners’ reports; and
(b) inform the student that they have
   (i) four\text{two} weeks from the date of notification to provide notice of state their intention to reply; and
   (ii) eight\text{six} weeks from the date of notification to provide written comments to the faculty committee.

(8) If the student provides comments within the specified time, the faculty committee will:
   (a) further consider the examiners’ reports, the head of department’s report, and any comments provided by:
       (i) the student;
       (ii) the supervisor; and
       (iii) the head of department;
   and
   (b) confirm or revise its conclusion on the award of the degree, consistently with clause 23 of the policy.

(9) For masters degrees by research, the Dean may approve the outcome of examination based on the conclusion of the faculty committee.

(10) For doctorates by research, the Dean may approve the outcome of the examination based on the conclusion of the faculty committee, if:
   (a) the faculty committee’s conclusion is to award the degree without qualification, or subject to minor corrections, and the examiners have each recommended either that:
       (i) the degree be awarded without qualification; or
       (ii) the degree can be awarded subject to minor corrections;
   or
   (b) the faculty committee’s conclusion is that the degree be awarded subject to emendations, and the examiners have each recommended one of the following:
       (i) all of the examiners recommend that the degree be awarded without qualifications;
       (ii) that the degree be awarded subject to minor corrections; or
       (ii) all the examiners’ recommended emendations or corrections are required to be addressed by the student.

(11) Except where permitted in subclause 10 (10), for all other doctorates by research the intention of the faculty committee must be referred to the PhD Award Sub-Committee for review.

(12) When a faculty committee intention is referred to the PhD Award Sub-Committee the faculty committee must provide the following material for consideration and review:
   (a) the intention of the faculty committee;
   (b) all examiners’ reports;
   (c) the head of department’s recommendation;
(d) any comments which have been provided consistently with subclause 10(8) of these procedures;

and

(e) if the intention is award with minor corrections or emendations, the explicit instructions proposed to be provided to the student;

or

(f) if the intention is non-award - revise and resubmit, the list of concerns that must be addressed by the student.

(13) The PhD Award Sub-Committee may:

(a) request further information, including but not limited to an in-person consultation with the student, or further information from the head of department or the supervisor;

(b) recommend the commissioning of an additional examiner;

(c) recommend the appointment of an examiner-as-assessor

Note: see clause 12 of these procedures

(d) refer for further investigation e.g. in the instance of an allegation of plagiarism or research misconduct;

(e) endorse the faculty committee’s intention on the outcome; or

(f) refer the case back to the faculty committee with an alternate recommended outcome.

(14) If the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee decides that there is an irreconcilable difference between the faculty committee and the PhD Award Sub-Committee:

(a) PhD awards are determined by the PhD Award Sub-Committee; and

(b) other doctorates are determined by the Dean of the faculty in accordance with their resolutions.

11 Additional examiner

(1) If an additional examiner is to be used, the procedures for approval set out in clause 5 and the procedures for commissioning set out in clause 6 of these procedures should be followed.

(2) Once an additional examiner has been approved, these procedures apply to the provision and consideration of examiners’ reports.

12 Examiner-as-assessor

(1) An examiner-as-assessor must complete an initial independent examination of, and report on, the thesis based on the same criteria as all examiners. If a thesis contains a creative or artistic component, this will be provided as either a documentary recording or as an exhibition, installation or performance.

(2) Having completed the initial report examination of the thesis, the examiner-as-assessor must then consider:

(a) de-identified copies of the all examiners’ reports;
(b) comments from the head of department;
(c) comments from the supervisor, if received;
(d) comments from the student, if received;
and assess the validity of the expressed concerns with the work under examination.

(3) The examiner-as-assessor must provide a written report containing:
(a) an examiner’s report, including a recommendation about the outcome of the examination; and

(b) a report consideration on a response to the comments of the other parties.

(4) The head of department will consider the reports of the examiner-as-assessor and provide a further report, including a recommendation regarding the outcome of the examination to the faculty committee.

(5) The faculty committee will then consider the examiner-as-assessor’s report and the head of department’s report in the manner required by clause 10 of these procedures.

13 **Outcome of examination: award with corrections or emendations**

(6) If the outcome of an examination is that the degree be awarded subject to minor corrections or awarded subject to emendations, the Dean, Associate Dean or faculty committee must:
(a) detail the minor corrections or emendations required to be made to the final version of the thesis;
(b) set the latest date by which the final version of the thesis, including the corrections or emendations, must be lodged with the University. The latest date will normally be three months from the date of notification of outcome of examination; and
(c) notify the student in writing.

(7) The Head of Department will review the final version of the thesis and either:
(a) verify that the required corrections or emendations have been addressed to their satisfaction; or
(b) notify the student in writing of the corrections or emendations required to be made and set the latest date by which the final version of the thesis must be lodged with the University.

(8) Where the student does not lodge the final version of the thesis by the set-date, the Dean, Associate Dean or faculty committee must either:
(a) set a new latest date by which the final version must be lodged and notify the student in writing; or
(b) determine the result to be ‘not awarded’. 
14 Outcome of examination: revision and re-examination

(1) If the outcome of an examination is that the degree not be awarded, but the student be permitted to revise and resubmit the thesis for re-examination, the Dean, Associate Dean or faculty committee must:

(a) prescribe a maximum period of further candidature, normally one or two semesters;

(b) set the latest date for the student to resubmit their thesis for examination;

(b)(c) set the date by which the student must re-enrol or apply for suspension of candidature consistently with subclause 14(3) of these procedures;

(c) detail the additional work or changes required; and

(d) prescribe any other conditions that must be met by the student.

(2) The student must re-enrol for the degree whilst the thesis is being revised.

(3) The student must re-enrol or apply for a suspension of candidature no later than census date of the next research period following the notification of permission to revise and resubmit.

(a) If the student does not do so, the faculty must determine the result to be 'not awarded'.

(1)(4) The original examiners should be invited to re-examine the thesis if they are available and willing to do so unless, in the opinion of the faculty committee:

(a) they have previously required modifications to the thesis that are considered unnecessary or undesirable; or

(b) there are academic reasons for not recommissioning any or all of the original examiners.

(2)(5) The examination of a revised and resubmitted thesis is a new examination of the whole thesis, which must be carried out in accordance with the policy and these procedures.

(3)(6) The PhD Award Sub-Committee may prescribe a form for presentation of reports by examiners of a revised and resubmitted thesis and examiners must use any such form.

(4)(7) No further opportunity to revise and resubmit the thesis is permitted as an outcome of the new examination.

1415 Communication with the student during examination process

(1) The faculty may provide the student with notice of the completion of each of the following stages of the examination process:

(a) appointment of examiners pending;

(b) thesis submitted for examination;

(c) thesis sent to examiners and reports pending;

(d) all examiners have submitted reports;

(e) faculty committee is considering recommendations from examiners;
(f) PhD Award Sub-Committee is considering recommendations from faculty committee and examiners;

(g) notification of the result of the examination;

(h) awaiting comment from student regarding the result of the examination;

(i) student to fulfil the conditions of the award, including lodgement in the University library;

(j) student to re-enrol if required for a revise and resubmit outcome;

(k) conditions of award fulfilled and degree may be awarded.

(2) If consultation with the student is required under the policy or these procedures such consultation must be undertaken in writing.

(3) Unless, in exceptional circumstances, the Dean or Associate Dean determines otherwise, the faculty should provide the student with de-identified examiners reports:

(a) as part of any consultation process; and

(b) at the notification of the result of the examination.

(4) Unless, in exceptional circumstances, the Dean or Associate Dean determine otherwise, the faculty will provide the student with the names of the examiners at the conclusion of the examination process.

PART 3: ORAL EXAMINATIONS

Conduct of oral examinations generally

(1) If an oral examination is to be held, the faculty must:

(a) the supervisor must notify the examiners; and

(b) the associate dean must appoint a convenor from the faculty in which the student is enrolled, but not from the same department who meets the qualifications for an examiner set out in clause 15 of the policy, noting that the convenor is not an examiner.

(2) All parties to an oral examination must participate in person, or by telephone, video, web or teleconference. In-person participation is preferable.

(3) The student may elect to have a supervisor attend the oral examination. In this case, the supervisor must also participate in person, or by telephone, video, web or teleconference. In-person participation is preferable.

(4) The faculty will set the date of the oral examination.

(a) Where an oral examination is planned from the outset of the examination process, this date should be set before the thesis is submitted, and should be between five and ten weeks after the date of submission of the thesis.

(b) Where an oral examination is required after commencement of the examination process, the student must be notified of the date for the oral examination at least fourteen days prior to the oral examination.

(5) Each examiner will be sent the thesis or, where the thesis includes a live performance, exhibition or installation that is yet to occur, the written component of the thesis within seven days of the date of submission.
(5) Each examiner must submit an interim report at least seven days prior to the scheduled date for the oral examination, including interim recommendations for the outcome.

(6) The convenor must examine the interim examiners’ reports and recommend to the head of department whether an oral examination should proceed.

(7) The head of department must then determine whether or not the oral examination is required.

(8) If the head of department determines that an oral examination is not required:

(a) the examination will proceed as a thesis-only examination;

(b) the faculty will inform the examiners, supervisor and student; and

(c) the interim recommendations will become final recommendations.

(7) If one or more examiners do not submit their interim reports by the date required by subclause 16(6), the convenor must:

(a) contact them to determine whether an interim report will be received prior to the scheduled date for the oral examination; and

(b) determine whether:

   (i) the oral examination will proceed on the scheduled date, with or without all of the interim reports; or

   (ii) the oral examination should be re-scheduled; and

(c) notify the student of the decision in writing.

(9) Unless local provisions prescribe otherwise, oral examinations should be between two to four hours duration.

(10) An oral examination of a thesis which includes a creative or artistic component must:

(a) test the comprehension of the student of the field of study described by the thesis and presented in the creative or artistic component;

(b) clarify points either of principle or of detail in the creative or artistic component; and

(c) assess the contribution made by the student to the content and presentation of the creative or artistic component and the written component of the thesis.

(11) An oral examination of a creative or artistic work may also include any of:

(a) contextualisation of the student’s work, where the student presents the development of the thesis to the examination panel;

(b) discussion of the creative or artistic component of the thesis at the site of the exhibition with the student; or

(c) discussion of the written component and related matters with the student.

(12) At the close of the oral examination, the convenor and examiners must meet in private to prepare a report and recommendation of the examination outcome.

(a) Only the convenors and examiners may attend this meeting. The head of department and supervisor must not be present.

(b) The report must be a single report, containing a consensus recommendation of the outcome of the examination.

(c) The report must be prepared by the convenor and must specify:
(i) the recommended outcome of the examination, consistent with clause 23 of the policy;
(ii) the process undertaken by the conduct of the oral examination;
(iii) the information provided to the candidate; and
(iv) recommendations for any corrections, emendations or other conditions necessary for an award.

The oral examination report will be considered together with and in the same manner as the examiners’ reports.

Note: See clause 10 and following of these procedures.

If the examiners fail to reach consensus:
(a) each examiner must confirm or revise their interim reports within two weeks of the private meeting; and
(b) the examiners’ final reports and the convenor’s report must then be considered in the same manner as examiners’ reports in a thesis-only examination.

Note: See clause 21 of the policy and clause 10 of these procedures.

Role of the convenor

(1) The convenor is a representative of the faculty and has the following duties:
(a) to discuss with the student, prior to the examination, the nature of an oral examination, noting that students are expected to prepare their own responses;
(b) to advise the student of the main issues that may be raised by the examiners, noting that the examiners have the right to raise additional questions;
(c) to assure the student that the examination is intended to be constructive and helpful;
(d) to explain the proceedings to the examiners and to the student;
(e) to chair the oral examination of the thesis, and any subsequent meeting of examiners;
(f) to provide a report to the faculty committee;
(g) to provide the head of department with the opportunity to append comments to the convenor’s report on the oral examination; and
(h) to inform the student about the examiners recommendations.

(2) The convenor’s report must also be provided to the PhD Award Sub-Committee if required.

PART 4: JOINT AND COTUTELLE DEGREES

Examination of joint degrees and cotutelle degrees

(1) Where the examination is to be conducted by the partner institution:
(a) The faculty must notify the PhD Award Sub-Committee when the examination commences. This notification must include:
   (i) confirmation that the examination meets the conditions of the individual student agreement; and
   (ii) the names and affiliations of all the examiners.
(b) The faculty must notify the PhD Award Sub-Committee of the completion of the examination. This notification must include:
   (i) a summary of the examination process;
   (ii) a statement of the outcome of the award from the partner institution; and
   (iii) copies of the examiners reports and English summaries, where the language of the reports is in a language other than English.

Note: see subclause 7 (7) of these procedures.
(c) The outcome of the degree will be decided by the PhD Award Sub-Committee, in accordance with the policy, based on the notification from the partner institution.

(2) Where a student is enrolled in a joint or cotutelle degree subsequently transfers to a degree solely awarded by the University, examination will be conducted according the policy and these procedures, but the PhD Award Sub-Committee may approve the use of any existing examiners’ reports in fulfilment of the applicable requirements.

PART 5: THESIS WITH PUBLICATIONS

1819 Method of inclusion of published material in a thesis

(1) Sections of the thesis that have been published previously must be clearly identified as such.
(2) Published material may also be included as an appendix.
(3) Published papers may be offprints bound into the original thesis, or reformatted containing identical text as long as it is clear that the text in the thesis is identical to that in the published paper.
(4) If the text of the thesis differs substantially from the published material then inclusion should be by citation and quotation rather than inclusion of the material.

1920 Number of papers

(1) A thesis containing previously published material should be of comparable substance, length and significance, and show a level of contribution by the student comparable to that of a thesis not containing previously published material.
(2) The specific number of papers required to constitute a thesis depends on:
   (a) the expectations of the discipline; and
   (b) the extent to which the student contributed to these papers.
2021 Authorship of papers included in a thesis with publications

(1) Previously published material should only be included in the thesis where the student's contribution is substantial.

(2) Where a student is an author of a work but had a lesser contribution to the published work, the paper may be included as an appendix.

(3) Students must clearly indicate their role and the extent of their contribution to the paper either in the introduction to the thesis or the introduction to the chapter. Provided that this is done, where more than one of the authors of a work is a higher degree by research student, each student may include the work as part of their thesis.

(4) Works with multiple authors should only be included with the permission of the corresponding author.

(5) Where a student is a joint author of a previously published work, the supervisor or corresponding author must submit a supporting statement identifying the student's contribution to the work covered in the article.

(6) The convention for author placement in the list of contributing authors within the discipline should be stated e.g. alphabetical, corresponding author first.

2422 Examination of a thesis with publications

(1) The examination process is the assessment of the thesis against the criteria set out in clause 8 of the policy. This examination is a different process than the refereed assessment of material for publication.

(2) Examiners must address:
   
   (a) whether the thesis including previously published material indicates that the student has made a substantially original contribution to the knowledge of the subject concerned; and
   
   (b) for publications where there are multiple authors, whether the quality and extent of the student's contribution merits the award of the degree.

(3) As the included publications are examined as part of a larger work, reviewers of individual papers may be nominated to act as examiners if they meet the criteria set out in clause 15 of the policy.

PART 6: THESES CONTAINING CREATIVE OR ARTISTIC COMPONENTS

2223 Examination of a thesis containing creative or artistic components

(1) The creative work and the written component will be examined as an integrated whole.

(2) The creative work may be presented in the context of an exhibition, installation, performance or other in-person context.
(3) Where the creative component is an exhibition or installation, the documentary record may take the form of a catalogue with images of sufficient quality for examination.

(4) The student is responsible for creating the documentary record of the creative work.

(5) The Dean, Associate Dean, or the faculty committee must decide whether the examination of a creative work should include any of:
   (a) a performance, installation or exhibition; or
   (b) an oral examination.

(6) The written component of the thesis should be provided to the examiners prior to the examination of the creative component.

(7) Where the creative work component includes a performance, installation or exhibition, examiners should attend in person.

(8) Where there is no performance, installation or exhibition, or where an examiner cannot attend in person the examiner(s) shall conduct their examination using the documentary record of the creative work.

(9) Except as otherwise stated in faculty resolutions, the examination of a thesis with a creative component must comply with procedures, including (where appropriate) those relating to oral examinations.

(10) The outcomes of the examination for a thesis submitted with a creative or artistic component must relate to the whole thesis, including the artistic or creative work.

Note: See clause 23 of the policy.

PART 7: LODGEMENT OF THESES IN LIBRARY

2324 Lodgement of theses in the University library

(1) The final copy of the thesis lodged in the University library must be in electronic format except as permitted by the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board.

(2) The copy must be complete, including:
   (a) any appendices submitted for examination;
   (b) any published material included in the thesis;
   (c) documentary recording of any artistic or creative works; and
   (d) any corrections or emendations required by the University addressed to the satisfaction of the head of department;

(3) The student must provide the title and an abstract of the thesis by the time of lodgement to be included in the Library catalogue meta-data and on the Australian Higher Education Graduate Statement (AHEGS).

(4) The student may specify at the time of lodgement whether they prefer for their thesis to be locally available or published to open access. Where a student does not indicate a preference, the thesis will be lodged in the Library for local access.

Note: Information about these choices is at http://sydney.edu.au/graduate_studies_office/students/thesis.shtml

(5) Where a student has been permitted to include an appendix of material that is not to be available for public inspection as provided by the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research Rule) 2011, the appendix must be lodged separately to the remainder of the thesis in a form prescribed by the Director of University Libraries.

Note: A student may also apply for a period of delay in lodging with the library. See University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research Rule) 2011.

(6) The Library catalogue meta-data, including the student's name, thesis title, and abstract, must be publicly available.

(7) A student may also opt to publish sections of their thesis as part of their faculty's open research collection. For example, this may be used:

(a) where copyright restrictions on published material prevent the open access publication of the whole thesis; or

(b) where the student opts to publish the written component of the thesis but not a creative work.

(8) The final copy of the thesis lodged in the Library cannot be altered.

(9) The Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee may approve that an errata notice be appended to a lodged thesis. The errata notice must:

(a) be clearly distinguishable from the thesis as originally lodged;

(b) be labelled as “errata notice”;

(c) identify the author of the notice;

(d) clearly state the date of the notice; and

(e) list each erratum separately with a page reference, and in page reference order.
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Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Architecture, Design and Planning

Contact person: Assoc Prof Roderick Simpson

1. Name of award course
   Master of Urban Design

2. Purpose of proposal
   To amend the resolutions of the Master of Urban Design to remove the streams from the course following the approval of the Master of Urbanism for the 2015 intake.

   The Master of Urbanism provides a new pathway for students wishing to combine studies in urban design and urban and regional planning. Options in these resolutions intended to facilitate the transfer of Urban and Regional Planning students to the Master of Urban Design (Urban Design and Planning) stream are also removed. From this year any future student was directed to the Master of Urbanism (Urban and Regional Planning) instead.

3. Details of amendment

   Graduate Certificate in Urban Design
   Graduate Diploma in Urban Design
   Master of Urban Design

1 Course codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course and stream title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCURBDES-01</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Urban Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNURBDES-04</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Urban Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAURBDES-04</td>
<td>Master of Urban Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAURDAUD-01</td>
<td>Master of Urban Design (Architectural and Urban Design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAURDUDP-01</td>
<td>Master of Urban Design (Urban Design and Planning)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

5 Streams
   (1) The Master of Urban Design is also available in the following streams:
       (a) Architectural and Urban Design
       (b) Urban Design and Planning
   (2) Completion of a stream is not a requirement of the course; applicants are required to nominate whether they will complete the degree with or without a stream at the point of application.
   (3) Candidates wishing to transfer between streams should contact the Faculty student office.

5 Admission to candidature
   (1) Available places will be offered to qualified applicants based on merit, according to the following admission criteria.
   (2) Admission to the Graduate Certificate in Urban Design requires and undergraduate degree and/or relevant work experience.
(3) Admission to the Graduate Diploma in Urban Design and Master of Urban Design requires an undergraduate degree in architecture, landscape architecture, urban planning or related field with a WAM of at least 65 or completion of the requirements of the embedded Graduate Certificate with a WAM of at least 65.

(4) Admission to the Graduate Diploma, Masters and Masters with specialisation also requires:

(a) a portfolio of work indicating relevant design interests and capacities to the satisfaction of the program director; and

(b) evidence of professional experience in urban design, architecture, planning, landscape architecture or related industry; or

(c) completion of a field of study relating to urban design, appropriately documented to the satisfaction of the program director.

(5) In exceptional circumstances the Dean may admit applicants without these qualifications but whose evidence of experience and achievement is deemed by the Dean to be equivalent.

6 Requirements of the award

(1) The units that may be taken for these awards are set out in table G.

(2) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Certificate in Urban Design, a candidate must complete 24 credit points, including:

(a) minimum 18 credit points of core 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 Urban Design, a candidate must complete must complete 48 credit points, including:

(a) minimum 36 credit points of core units of study, which must include ARCH9001 Urban Design Studio A; and

(b) maximum 12 credit points of elective units of study.

(4) To qualify for award of the Master of Urban Design, a candidate must complete 72 credit points, including:

(a) minimum 54 credit points of core unit of study; and

(b) maximum 18 credit points of elective.

(5) To qualify for the award of the Master of Urban Design with streams, a candidate must complete 96 credit points, including:

(a) minimum 78 credit points of core units of study; and

(b) maximum 18 credit points of elective units of study.

(6) Core units competed in excess of the minimum requirements may count as elective units of study.

7 Course transfer

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

(2) Candidates enrolled in the Master of Urban and Regional Planning may apply to transfer to the Master of Urban Design (Urban Design and Planning) subject to meeting the requirements for admission as set out in part 6 (2) of the admission to candidature section.

(3) Candidature enrolled in the Master of Urban and Regional Planning may apply for credit for units completed as part of the Master of Urban and Regional studies towards the award of the Master of Urban Design, noting they still need to meet or have met core unit requirements of the Urban Design and Planning Stream.

(4) Only the longest award completed will be awarded.

4. Transitional arrangements

(1) These course resolutions apply to students who commence their candidature after 1 January, 2014 2016 and students who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2012 2016 who elect to proceed under these resolutions.

(2) Candidates who commenced prior to 1 January, 2014 2016 may complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions in force at the time of commencement, provided that requirements are completed by 1 January 2017 2019. The Faculty may specify a later date for a completion or specify alternative requirements for completion of candidatures that extend beyond this time.

5. Other relevant information

6. Signature of Dean

28 October 2015
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>RHSARCHI-01</td>
<td>Doctor of Science in Architecture</td>
<td>DScArch</td>
<td>Published Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPPHDARC-01</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPMHLARC-01</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>MAARCHIT-02</td>
<td>Master of Architecture</td>
<td>MArch</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAHERICO-03</td>
<td>Master of Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>MHeritCons</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINDEAR-01</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>MAURREPL-04</td>
<td>Master of Urban and Regional Planning</td>
<td>MURP</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAURREPL-04</td>
<td>Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>MURP(HERITCONS)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAURBDES-04</td>
<td>Master of Urban Design</td>
<td>MURBDes</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAURDAUD-04</td>
<td>Architectural and Urban Design</td>
<td>MURBDes(Arch&amp;UrbDes)</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAURDUPLD-01</td>
<td>Urban Design and Planning</td>
<td>MURBDes(UrbDes&amp;Plan)</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAURBNSM-01</td>
<td>Master of Urbanism</td>
<td>MUrbanism</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDARCHI-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Design in Architecture*</td>
<td>BDesArch</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPARCENV-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Architecture &amp; Environments*</td>
<td>BArchEnv</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPDESCMP-02</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>BPDARLAW-01</td>
<td>Bachelor of Design in Architecture* / Bachelor of Laws*</td>
<td>BDesArch/LLB</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPENGDAR-01</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>GNHERICO-03</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>GradDipHeritCons</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNINDEAR-01</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Interaction Design and Electronic Arts</td>
<td>GradDipIDEA</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNURREPL-04</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Urban and Regional Planning</td>
<td>GradDipURP</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNURBDES-04</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Urban Design</td>
<td>GradDipUrbDes</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNURBNSM-01</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>GCARCHSC-01</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Architectural Science</td>
<td>GradCertArchSci</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCHERICO-01</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>GradCertHeritCons</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCINDEAR-01</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Interaction Design and Electronic Arts</td>
<td>GradCertIDEA</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCURREPL-01</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Urban and Regional Planning</td>
<td>GradCertURP</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCURBDES-01</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Urban Design</td>
<td>GradCertUrbDes</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Architecture, Design and Planning

Contact person: Dr Cameron Logan

1. Name of award course
   Graduate Diploma in Heritage Conservation
   Master of Heritage Conservation

2. Purpose of proposal
   To advise the Graduate Studies Committee of the adoption of elective units of study in the Heritage Conservation degrees.

3. Details of amendment
   Details are outlined in the attached table.

4. Transitional arrangements
   The revised table of units of study will take effect from 2016.

5. Other relevant information

6. Signature of Dean

---

### COURSE DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE NAME</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
<th>Duration (full time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.5 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CORE UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit code</th>
<th>Unit name</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
<th>Semester offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH9028</td>
<td>Conservation Methods and Practices</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH9075</td>
<td>New Design in Old Settings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH9081</td>
<td>Heritage Law and Policy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH9031</td>
<td>Research Report</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH9074</td>
<td>Principles of Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Optional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit code</th>
<th>Unit name</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
<th>Semester offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARC4201</td>
<td>Modern Architectural History</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH9082</td>
<td>Conservation of Traditional Methods</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 1 (even years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH9084</td>
<td>Conservation Design Studio</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH9083</td>
<td>Conservation of Modern Materials</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 1 (odd years)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Electives**

*Electives may be taken from this list or across Table G.*

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MHST6901</td>
<td>Museum and Heritage: History and Theory</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHST6902</td>
<td>Museum and Heritage: Engaging Audiences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHST6903</td>
<td>Managing Collections and Heritage Sites</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHST6904</td>
<td>Museum and Heritage: Objects and Places</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSM7035</td>
<td>Ethics of Cultural Property</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHST6913</td>
<td>Indigenous Museums and Heritage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHST6914</td>
<td>Heritage Studies in Practice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSM7030</td>
<td>Exhibition Development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1a,1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSM7032</td>
<td>Museum and Gallery Administration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSM7036</td>
<td>Museums and Digital</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRTG6901</td>
<td>The Idea of Heritage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Architecture, Design and Planning

Contact person: Assoc Prof Paul Jones

1. Name of award course
   Master of Philosophy (RMPHLARC-01)

2. Purpose of proposal
   To amend the Resolutions of the Faculty for the Master of Philosophy Degree to:
   Change the admissions to candidature requirements. Effective 1 January 2016.

3. Details of amendment

   Master of Philosophy
   Part 2 – Admission requirements
   2. Eligibility for admission to candidature
      (1) To be eligible to be admitted to candidature by the Dean or Associate Dean, and applicant
          must hold or have completed the requirements for:
          (a) a bachelor’s degree with first or second class honours from the University of Sydney in a
              relevant discipline;
          (b) or a master’s degree from the University of Sydney in a relevant discipline.
      (2) The Dean or Associate Dean may admit to candidature an applicant who does not meet the
          requirements of sub-clause (1), provided that the applicant:
          (a) holds a qualification or qualifications that, in the opinion of the Faculty Research Graduate
              Studies (RGS) Committee, are equivalent to those prescribed in sub-clause (1); or
          (b) a portfolio of work demonstrating innovative practice, that in the opinion of Dean or
              Associate Dean (Graduate Studies), is equivalent to the above awards.

4. Transitional arrangements
   (1) These course resolutions apply to students who commence their candidature after 1
       January, 2012 2016 and students who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2012 2016
       who elect to proceed under these resolutions.
   (2) Candidates who commenced prior to 1 January, 2012 2016 may complete the
       requirements in accordance with the resolutions in force at the time of commencement,
       provided that requirements are completed within the time limits specified in those
       resolutions. The Dean or Associate Dean may specify a later date for completion or
       specify alternative requirements for completion of candidatures that extend beyond this
       time.

5. Other relevant information

6. Signature of Dean
12.2.4.2 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: Master of Creative Writing

Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

Contact person: A/Prof Kate Lilley/Emma Doyle     27 August 2015

1. Name of award course
   Master of Creative Writing

2. Purpose of proposal
   To amend the resolutions of the Master of Creative Writing so that the required credit points are equal to 72.

   When the course resolutions were approved during the AQF process and put into place this year, the credit requirements for completion of the MCW program (72cp) were incorrect.

   At present, the MCW resolutions state that students must complete 72 credit points including:
   (i) a minimum 18cp of core units,
   (ii) 30cp of electives and
   (iii) a minimum of 12cp of capstone.

   This implies that an additional 12cp of load must come from cores or capstones which was not the original intention. The extra 12cp of load should come from the electives. Therefore, the new MCW resolutions should say that students must complete 72 credit points including:
   (i) 18cp of core units,
   (ii) 42cp of electives and
   (iii) 12cp of capstone.

   Please note that the amendment as provided in the agenda is slightly incorrect; 4(a) should say “18 credit points from core units of study”, there should be no mention of “minimum” where core units are concerned.

3. Details of amendment

   6 Requirements for award

   (4) To qualify for the award of the Master of Creative Writing a candidate must complete 72 credit points, comprising including:
   (a) a minimum of 18 credit points from core units of study;
   (b) a maximum of 30 42 credit points from elective units of study including:
       (i) at least one Introductory Workshop unit of study,
       (ii) at least one Writers at Work unit of study, and
       (iii) at least one Advanced Workshop unit; and
   (c) a minimum of 12 credit points from capstone units of study.

4. Transitional arrangements

5. Other relevant information

6. Signature of Dean
12.2.4.4 Faculty of Dentistry: Doctor of Clinical Dentistry

Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Dentistry

Contact person: Ky-Anh Nguyen

1. **Name of award course**
   Doctor of Clinical Dentistry

2. **Purpose of proposal**
   Following consultation with the Australian Dental Council, to more clearly describe the assessment of the research component of the degree.

3. **Details of amendment**
   **Change from:**
   
   5 **Requirements for award**
   
   (1) The units of study that may be taken for the courses are set out in the table of units for Graduate Coursework Degrees.
   
   (2) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Certificate in Clinical Dentistry a candidate must complete the prescribed 24 credit points of units of study listed for the relevant stream.
   
   (3) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Diploma in Clinical Dentistry a candidate must complete the prescribed 48 credit points of units of study listed for the relevant stream.
   
   (4) To qualify for the award of the Doctor of Clinical Dentistry a candidate must complete the prescribed 144 credit points of units of study listed for the relevant stream.

   **Change to:**
   
   5 **Requirements for award**
   
   (1) The units of study that may be taken for the courses are set out in the table of units for Graduate Coursework Degrees.
   
   (2) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Certificate in Clinical Dentistry a candidate must complete the prescribed 24 credit points of units of study listed for the relevant stream.
   
   (3) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Diploma in Clinical Dentistry a candidate must complete the prescribed 48 credit points of units of study listed for the relevant stream.
   
   (4) To qualify for the award of the Doctor of Clinical Dentistry a candidate must complete the prescribed 144 credit points of units of study listed for the relevant stream, and the Research requirements must be completed within one year of completion of final semester. The Research requirements shall be:
   
   (a) topic of the research and supervisor shall be approved by the research committee of the faculty;
   
   (b) candidates shall present at research seminars as required;
   
   (c) obtain a pass mark in the Research Methods unit of study;
   
   (d) submit an electronic copy of the thesis to the Research Committee comprising a literature review and a paper. The thesis shall embody the results of the research, and shall:
   
   (i) be an original contribution to the subject concerned;
   
   (ii) the paper component should be presented in the format of a scientific research manuscript;
   
   (iii) afford evidence of originality by the exercising of independent critical ability;
   
   (iv) be a satisfactory literary presentation;
   
   (e) The candidate shall provide evidence to identify satisfactorily the sections of work for which the candidate is responsible, such as a signed, written statement from all authors attesting to the contribution of the candidate;
   
   (f) submit a final copy of literature review and body of work to the Research Committee;
   
   (g) A candidate may not present, as the paper, a work which has been presented for a degree in this or another university, but will not be precluded from incorporating such in the paper provided that in presenting the paper the candidate indicates the part of the work which has been so incorporated.
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(5) Examination of a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Clinical Dentistry shall follow closely the examination process as stipulated in the University’s *Thesis And Examination Of Higher Degrees By Research Policy* except for the following variations:

   (a) the head of discipline shall recommend the appointment of two examiners of the thesis;
   
   (b) at least one examiner shall be external to the Faculty, not being a member of staff or a clinical academic title holder of the Faculty;

4. **Transitional arrangements**

   No effect to current students as this process is already in place, however, this information is currently in the local provision and will be removed from there and placed in the resolutions.

5. **Other relevant information**

6. **Signature of Dean**
Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Dentistry

Contact person: Ky-Anh Nguyen

1. Name of award course
   Doctor of Clinical Dentistry

2. Purpose of proposal
   To align the English language requirements of this program with those of the Australian Health Practitioners Regulation Agency so that International postgraduate candidates are able to undertake clinical education.

3. Details of amendment
   Change from:
   - IELTS: A minimum result of 7.0 overall and a minimum result of 6.5 in each band
   - TOEFL paper-based: A minimum result of 600 overall including a minimum result of 5.0 in Writing
   - TOEFL IBT: A minimum result of 100 overall including a minimum result of 23 in Reading, Listening and Speaking and 24 in Writing

   Change to: The minimum English requirement at IELTS (academic module) 7.0 overall and a minimum result of 7 in each band.

4. Transitional arrangements
   No. This change will only affect new candidates from 2016 onwards.

5. Other relevant information

6. Signature of Dean
Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Health Sciences

Contact person: Corinne Caillaud / Clare Higgins

1. Name of award course
   Master of Physiotherapy
   Master of Occupational Therapy

2. Purpose of proposal
   To amend the Postgraduate English Language Requirements for the Master of Physiotherapy and Master of Occupational Therapy.
   
   This proposal seeks to raise the minimum level of English proficiency required for admission to 7.0 in each of the components of the IELTS (or equivalent in the TOEFL and TOEFL iBT), as part of the Faculty's approach to ensuring students have the English language proficiency required to carry out the Inherent Requirements of their course – particularly in the context of communication on professional and clinical placements. This amendment will also bring the English Requirements for admission in line with the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency registration standards for English language skills, now in force for Physiotherapy and Occupational Therapy professional registration.

2. Details of amendment
   Amend the schedule of approved Faculty variations above the University minimum requirements in the Postgraduate English Language Requirements (as referenced in clause 23(3) of the Coursework Policy 2014), as follows, with effect from 2017:

   Postgraduate English Language Requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Requirements (above the University minimum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Health Sciences</td>
<td>Master of Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with at least 7 for Speaking and 7.0 in each of the components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All postgraduate Master of Physiotherapy courses</td>
<td>IELTS – Overall band score of 7.0 or better, with at least 7 for Speaking and 7.0 in each of the components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Transitional arrangements
   N/A

5. Other relevant information
   N/A

6. Signature of Dean
   28 October 2015
12.2.4.6 Faculty of Law: Changes to units of study

Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Law

Contact person: Peter Lead, Executive Officer (x10411)

1. Name of award course
   A. Juris Doctor
   B. Master of Laws, Graduate Diploma in Law, Master of Jurisprudence, Graduate Diploma of Jurisprudence, Master of Global Law
   C. Master of Laws, Master of Criminology, Graduate Diploma of Law, Graduate Diploma of Criminology, Master of Global Law
   D. Master of Laws, Master of Business Law, Master of Global Law, Master of Health Law, Graduate Diploma of Law, Graduate Diploma in Health Law, Graduate Diploma in Public Health Law, Master of Law and International Development

2. Purpose of proposal
   To amend the names of existing units of study.

3. Details of amendment
   A. LAWS5131 ‘External Placement Program’ to become ‘Social Justice Legal Clinic B’.
   LAWS5161 ‘Social Justice Clinical Program’ to become ‘Social Justice Legal Clinic A’.

   B. JURS6004 ‘Aspects of Law and Justice’ to become ‘Morals and the Analysis of Legal Doctrine’.

   C. LAWS6194 ‘Explaining Punishment’ to become ‘Punishment’.

   D. LAWS6848 ‘Law and Healthy Lifestyles’ to become ‘Law, Business and Healthy Lifestyles’.

4. Transitional arrangements
   N/A

5. Other relevant information

6. Signature of Dean
   Approved by Faculty Board.

   [Signature]

   Professor Joellen Riley
   Dean
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Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Sydney Medical School

Contact person: Liz Cooper x16080; email: elizabeth.cooper@sydney.edu.au

1. Name of award course
   Master of Medicine (Sleep Medicine)
   Master of Science in Medicine (Sleep Medicine)

2. Purpose of proposal
   To request that the Graduate Studies Committee approve a new unit of study SLEE5030 – Sleep Medicine in Practice – as an additional core unit of study for the Master courses (Sleep Medicine Stream). All students will be expected to complete this unit as the capstone requirement of the Master of Medicine (Sleep Medicine) and Master of Medicine (Sleep Medicine).

   SLEE5030 Sleep Medicine in Practice (6 crp)

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

4. Transitional arrangements
   N/A

5. Other relevant information

6. Signature of Dean

Bruce Robinson
Dean
Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Sydney Nursing School

Contact person: Dr Andrea McCloughen

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

2. Purpose of proposal
   To amend the Course Resolutions for the postgraduate degrees listed above in order to correct errors regarding the number of core and elective units of study. These are incorrectly listed in the 2015 resolutions. Section 6 Requirements for award.

3. Details of amendment

   Advanced Nursing Practice
   6 Requirements for award
   (3) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Diploma in Advanced Nursing Practice a candidate must complete 48 credit points, including:
   (a) 36 credit points of core units of study; and
   (b) 12 credit points of elective units of study
   (4) To qualify for the award of the Master of Advanced Nursing Practice a candidate must complete 60 credit points, including:
   (a) 48 credit points of core units of study; and 36 credit points of core units of study; and
   (b) 12 credit points of elective units of study; and
   (c) a 12 credit point capstone core unit of study
   (b) a 12 credit point capstone unit of study.

   Cancer and Haematology Nursing
   6 Requirements for award
   (3) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Diploma in Cancer and Haematology Nursing a candidate must complete 48 credit points, including:
   (a) 36 credit points of core units of study; and
   (b) 12 credit points of elective units of study
   (4) To qualify for the award of the Master of Cancer and Haematology Nursing a candidate must complete 60 credit points, including:
   (a) 48 credit points of core units of study; and 36 credit points of core units of study; and
   (b) 12 credit points of elective units of study; and
   (c) a 12 credit point capstone core unit of study
   (b) a 12 credit point capstone unit of study.

   Emergency Nursing
   6 Requirements for award
   (3) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Diploma in Emergency Nursing a candidate must complete 48 credit points, including:
   (a) 36 credit points of core units of study; and
   (b) 12 credit points of elective units of study
   (4) To qualify for the award of the Master of Emergency Nursing a candidate must complete 60 credit points, including:
(a) 48 credit points of core units of study; and 36 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) 12 credit points of elective units of study; and
(c) a 12 credit point capstone core unit of study
(b) a 12 credit point capstone unit of study.

Intensive Care Nursing
6 Requirements for award
(3) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Diploma in Intensive Care Nursing a candidate must complete 48 credit points, including:
(a) 36 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) 12 credit points of elective units of study
(4) To qualify for the award of the Master of Intensive Care Nursing a candidate must complete 60 credit points, including:
(a) 48 credit points of core units of study; and 36 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) 12 credit points of elective units of study; and
(c) a 12 credit point capstone core unit of study
(b) a 12 credit point capstone unit of study.

Mental Health Nursing
6 Requirements for award
(3) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Diploma in Mental Health Nursing a candidate must complete 48 credit points, including:
(a) 36 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) 12 credit points of elective units of study
(4) To qualify for the award of the Master of Mental Health Nursing a candidate must complete 60 credit points, including:
(a) 48 credit points of core units of study; and 36 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) 12 credit points of elective units of study; and
(c) a 12 credit point capstone core unit of study
(b) a 12 credit point capstone unit of study.

Primary Health Care Nursing
6 Requirements for award
(3) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Diploma in Primary Health Care Nursing a candidate must complete 48 credit points, including:
(a) 36 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) 12 credit points of elective units of study
(4) To qualify for the award of the Master of Primary Health Care Nursing a candidate must complete 60 credit points, including:
(a) 48 credit points of core units of study; and 36 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) 12 credit points of elective units of study; and
(c) a 12 credit point capstone core unit of study
(b) a 12 credit point capstone unit of study.

4. Transitional arrangements

5. Other relevant information

6. Signature of Dean
12.2.4.9 Sydney College of the Arts: Master of Fine Arts

Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Sydney College of the Arts

Contact person: Justin Trendall

1. Name of award course
Master of Fine Arts

2. Purpose of proposal
To amend Master of Fine Arts resolutions to remove duplicate sections and align with the University HDR Rule and the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015.

3. Details of amendment

Master of Fine 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 (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (the ‘HDR Rule’), the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015, the Academic Board resolutions relating to the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy and the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended).

Course resolutions

1 Course codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course and stream title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RMFINART-01</td>
<td>Master of Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2: Admission requirements

2 Eligibility for admission to candidature
(1) To be eligible to be admitted to candidature by the Dean or Associate Dean, an applicant must:
   (a) hold or have completed the requirements for:
       (i) the degree of Bachelor of Visual Arts (Honours) from the University of Sydney; or
       (ii) the degree of Bachelor of Visual Arts and the Graduate Diploma of Visual Arts from the University of Sydney; and
   (b) present evidence of having the aptitude required for undertaking the course, by the method nominated, through a research proposal and a portfolio of creative work, and/or interview.
(2) The 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 Graduate School Committee, are equivalent to those prescribed in sub-clause (1).

3 Application for admission to candidature
(1) In addition to requirements prescribed in the HDR Rule, an applicant for admission to candidature must submit to the Faculty:
   (a) satisfactory evidence of the applicant’s eligibility for admission;
   (b) the proposed method of candidature: by research and thesis; or by studio practice and research by thesis comprising a body of creative work for exhibition and a written component; or by written thesis only;
   (c) a proposed course of research and advanced study;
   (d) for applicants wishing to proceed by creative work and research paper by thesis comprising a body of creative work for exhibition and a written component, a portfolio of creative work reflecting the applicant’s recent art practice; and a statement certifying the applicant’s understanding that, subject to the HDR Rule, if the candidature is successful, his or her thesis will be lodged with the University Librarian and made available for immediate public use;
   (f) evidence of minimum English language requirements, where not demonstrated by academic qualifications;
   (g) the contact details of two academic referees;
   (h) evidence of scholarly publications including journals and conferences; and
   (i) evidence of public exhibitions or performances.
(2) (d) In addition, an applicant for admission to part-time candidature, must submit a statement that he or she the applicant will have sufficient time available to complete the requirements of the degree in accordance with these resolutions.

4 Credit transfer
The HDR Rule specifies the conditions for the granting of credit for previous studies, including the effect on completion times.

Part 3: Candidature
5 Appointment of supervisor
The Head of Department will appoint a supervisor and auxiliary supervisor for each candidate in accordance with the HDR Rule and Academic Board policies for postgraduate research higher degree supervision.

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

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

Part 4: Requirements
8 Degree requirements
(1) To satisfy the requirements of the degree all candidates must:
   (a) (a) complete any specified probationary requirements;
   (b) complete any prescribed units of study;
   (c) (b) attend any prescribed weekly seminars and Graduate School fora; and
   (d) (c) conduct research on the approved topic.
(2) Candidates proceeding by written thesis only must also write a thesis embodying the results of the research.
(3) Candidates proceeding by creative work and research paper by thesis comprising a body of creative work for exhibition and a written component must also:
   (a) submit for examination, at an joint exhibition by candidates, a substantial exhibition, screening, performance or installation of works; and
   (b) submit a research paper on an area relevant to the creative work.

9 The thesis and the research paper
(1) A candidate proceeding by written thesis only shall produce a thesis that:
   (a) meets the requirements specified in the HDR Rule; and
   (b) is in the range of 35,000 to 50,000 words.
(2) A candidate proceeding by creative work and research paper by thesis comprising a body of creative work for exhibition and a written component shall produce a research paper that:
   (a) meets the requirements specified in the HDR Rule; and
   (b) is in the range of 10,000 to 12,000 words.

Part 5: Enrolment and progression
10 Probation
(1) A candidate is normally accepted for candidature on a probationary basis for a period not exceeding one year according to the provisions of the HDR Rule.
(2) In the probationary period each candidate must:
   (a) complete a specified research methods unit of study any specified seminar programs;
   (b) develop and present a refined research proposal to the satisfaction of the Supervisor and Head of Department; and
   (c) demonstrate adequate English language competency for the completion of the degree.

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

12 Mode of attendance
(1) The attendance pattern for this course is normally full-time in the first year of candidature.
(2) Candidates may apply to change to part-time candidature thereafter. Visa requirements commonly restrict international students to full-time study only.

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

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

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

Part 6: Examination
17 Examination of the thesis and the creative work and research paper will be conducted according to the requirements for the examination of a higher degree by research prescribed in the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015.

(1) Examination of both the thesis and the creative work and research paper will be conducted in general accordance with standards prescribed by Academic Board for the Doctor of Philosophy, except that:
(a) three copies of the thesis or research paper shall be submitted by the candidate;
(b) two examiners will be appointed by the Faculty, at least one of whom shall be external to the University;
(c) in the case of a candidate proceeding by creative work and research paper, the examiners will examine the creative work and the research paper at an oral examination chaired, in a non-voting capacity, by the Director of the Faculty's Graduate School or his/her nominee.

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

Part 7: Other
19 Transitional provisions
(1) These course resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature after 1 January, 2014 and students who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2014 who elect to proceed under these resolutions.
(2) Candidates who commenced prior to 1 January, 2014 may complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions in force at the time of their commencement, provided that requirements are completed within the time limits specified in those resolutions. The Dean or Associate Dean may specify a later date for completion or specify alternative requirements for completion of candidatures that extend beyond this time.

4. Transitional arrangements
N/A

5. Other relevant information
N/A

6. Signature of Dean
13.2 Report of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee meeting of 30 September 2015

The Academic Standards and Policy Committee met at 2 pm on Wednesday, 30 September 2015. There were present: Associate Professor D Traini (Chair), presiding, Associate Professor J Barrett, Mr K Blakeney, Dr I Gelissen, Associate Professor P Gibbens, Dr R Gibson, Mr T Greenwell, Ms K Henderson, Dr P Knight, Associate Professor P McCallum, Associate Professor J O’Byrne (for Dr C Owens) and Ms P Rozenberg. In attendance were: Ms S Brown, Professor T Carlin, Ms M Kemmis and Ms M Koureas.

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

13.2.1 Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce 2nd report

The Academic Standards and Policy Committee commends this report and its recommendations to the Academic Board.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board:

1. note the second report of the Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce;
2. endorse in principle all four further Taskforce recommendations with a view to implementation by the start of 2017;
3. approve for implementation:
   a. the introduction of integrity checks for HDR student work at the first milestone during candidacy, to be part of the development of processes around the Progress Planning and Review Policy, and as part of the centralised submission process
   b. removal of the student discipline procedures from the University of Sydney By-law and development of a new Rule of Senate; and
   c. expansion of the TRIM workflow system to handle all student misconduct matters;
4. join the Taskforce in recommending immediate action by faculties on the development of local provisions to give effect to the Research Data Management Policy; and
5. note the next steps in relation to the other recommendations of the Taskforce.

13.2.2 Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2016

Following on from the first report of the Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce, a working party has reviewed the University’s policy on academic misconduct and plagiarism and developed a new policy, the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2016, which will replace the existing policy (Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy).

Some of the key points in the proposed policy are:

1. Each faculty will have an Academic Integrity Coordinator who will have the same delegated authority as nominated academics have currently, but also have an oversight and reporting role for the Faculty Board and the Academic Board. Faculties may, if they wish, have additional nominated academics to deal with cases within schools, or, where deemed appropriate, to have separate decision makers for the preliminary view stage (Stage 3 on the attached flowchart) and the Interview (Stages 4 and 5).

2. Provision has been made for the Academic Integrity Coordinator or Nominated Academic to require a student to attend further developmental education rather than an interview. This may be done both in the preliminary appraisal (Stage 3) and after the interview (Stage 4-5). If the student does not attend this they would be required to attend the interview or receive a penalty.

3. A list of responsibilities for students, teachers, unit of study coordinators, nominated academics, teams, faculty boards, the Academic Board, and the Deputy Vice Chancellors has been included (section 11), in line with the recommendations of the Taskforce. In particular, unit of study coordinators are required to assess the academic integrity of the assessment of each unit of study each time it is offered and to act on any breaches that have occurred to ensure that opportunities for academic dishonesty are eliminated.

4. The category of negligent plagiarism has been removed. All plagiarism is academically unacceptable. If it can be ascertained that it is dishonest it may be referred to the Registrar. The penalties and actions available to the Academic Integrity Coordinator or Nominated Academic are the same for dishonest plagiarism and plagiarism, the most serious being failure in the unit.
5. There are further policy requirements on assessment and examinations as recommended by the Taskforce.
6. It is now clarified that the student record should be looked at when the penalty is decided but after the interview.
7. There is a requirement for Academic Integrity Coordinator to report allegations and findings to the Faculty Board annually as well as to the Academic Board.
8. Recommendations from faculties the SUPRA have been included following discussion at ASPC in connection with 21 (6) and 23 (11) (as renumbered) and with the appropriate name of the Academic Integrity Coordinator.

A flowchart summarising the decision making process outlined in the policy is also included.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2016 in principle for introduction in 2016, noting that the final version of the policy together with the associated procedures will be submitted to the December 2015 meeting of the Academic Board.

13.2.3 Student Placement Policy
The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), in partnership with the Chair of the Academic Board, has developed the enclosed policy to provide a university-wide framework covering student placements.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board endorse the draft Student Placement Policy 2015.

13.2.4 Academic Board/SEG Faculty Reviews: Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery
The Committee discussed the report on the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery Review and the Faculty's response. As this was part of the Phase 4 process, the report is not for distribution beyond the University, and so the report is not included in publically available agenda and minutes. The Committee agreed the report be recommended to the Board. For a copy of the report please contact either the Executive Officer to the Academic Board.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery Review and advise SEG of its decision.

13.2.5 Proceedings of the Committee
The Committee also:
• discussed a proposed amendment to the Coursework Policy to address concerns regarding the removal of informal or simple extensions from the policy;
• considered a revised Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism policy;
• noted the reports of the Academic Board meetings of 19 August and 16 September 2015;
• noted an update on the work of the Learning and Teaching Policy Framework Working Group;
• noted the discussion paper on A Culture Built on Our Values;
• endorsed the formation of a Special Consideration Decisions Matrix Working Group by the Student Administrative Services Project; and
• noted the schedule of meeting dates for 2016.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board note the report on the Committee’s proceedings.
13.2.2 Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2016

Notes:
1. Faculties must have an Academic Integrity Coordinator appointed by the Dean who is a nominated academic with delegated authority to make decisions on cases of alleged
plagiarism or academic dishonesty and who also has oversight and reporting responsibilities for the whole faculty.

2. Faculties may also have other nominated academics appointed by the Dean with delegated authority to deal with cases within schools or to provide a separate decision maker at the interview stage.

3. The decision maker at step 3 (Preliminary View) and steps 4-5 (Interview and outcome) may be the same person or may be a different person as determined by the Dean (for all cases generally) or by an Academic Integrity Coordinator or Nominated Academic (in connection with a specific case where there is good reason to have a separate decision maker).
ACADEMIC HONESTY IN COURSEWORK POLICY 2016

The Vice-Chancellor and Principal, as delegate of the Senate of the University of Sydney, adopts the following policy.

Dated:

Last amended:

Signature:

Position: Dr Michael Spence, Vice-Chancellor
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PART 1 - PRELIMINARY

1 Name of policy

This is the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2016.
2 Commencement

This policy commences on 1 January 2016

3 Policy is binding

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

4 Statement of intent

This policy:

(a) states the University’s unequivocal opposition to, and intolerance of, plagiarism and academic dishonesty;
(b) sets out the principles underpinning the University’s approach to plagiarism and academic honesty;
(c) identifies individual responsibilities for promoting the principles of academic honesty; and
(d) provides for a transparent process for handling allegations of plagiarism and academic dishonesty by students enrolled in coursework award courses.

5 Application

(1) This policy applies to:
(a) staff and affiliates;
(b) all students enrolled in a coursework award course or undertaking coursework while enrolled in a research degree; and
(c) non-award students, exchange students and study abroad students in a unit of study at the University.

(2) It is a condition of each student’s admission to candidature that the student complies with this policy.

PART 2 - DEFINITIONS

6 Definitions

In this document:

academic dishonesty has the meaning given in subclauses 8 (1) and 8 (2).

academic integrity has the meaning given in subclause 10 (2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Integrity Coordinator</strong></td>
<td>means the nominated academic to whom the relevant dean has given responsibility for coordinating and reporting on allegations of plagiarism and academic dishonesty within the faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>acknowledgement of the source</strong></td>
<td>means identifying, in accordance with the conventions of the discipline, at least:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the author(s) of the work; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the place from which the work or part of the work was sourced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>assessment</strong></td>
<td>means evaluation of a student's demonstration of specified learning outcomes, including by written or oral examination, assignments, presentation, and thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By-law</strong></td>
<td>means the <em>University of Sydney By-law 1999</em> (as amended) or any University Rule or policy which may replace it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>coursework</strong></td>
<td>means a program of learning in which the dominant mode of instruction is through a program of classes, lectures, tutorials practical session, online tasks and other modes of instruction that are not supervised research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>coursework award course</strong></td>
<td>means a formally approved program of study which can lead to an academic award granted by the University and which is not designated as a research award course. While the program of study in a coursework award course may include a component of original, supervised research, other forms of instruction and learning will generally be dominant. All undergraduate award courses are coursework award courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dean</strong></td>
<td>means the dean of a faculty or chairperson of a board of studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dishonest plagiarism</strong></td>
<td>means knowingly presenting another person's ideas, findings or work as one's own by copying or reproducing them without due acknowledgement of the source, with intent to deceive the examiner into believing that the content is original to the student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>examiner</strong></td>
<td>means the person responsible for assessing a student's work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>faculty</strong></td>
<td>means a faculty or college board, as established in each case by its constitution or, where applicable, a board of studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>group work</strong></td>
<td>has the same meaning as provided in the <em>Coursework Policy 2014</em>, which at the date of this policy is: a formally established project to be carried out by a number of students working together that results in a single piece of assessment or a number of associated pieces of assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>investigation</strong></td>
<td>means an investigation conducted by the Registrar under Chapter 8 of the <em>By-law</em> or the equivalent provisions of any University Rule or policy which may replace it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>legitimate co-operation</strong></td>
<td>means any constructive educational and intellectual practice that aims to facilitate optimal learning outcomes through interaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between students, including:

- researching, writing or presenting joint work;
- discussing general themes and concepts;
- interpreting assessment criteria;
- informal study or discussion groups; and
- strengthening and developing academic writing skills through peer assistance.

Co-operation is not legitimate if it unfairly advantages a student or group of students over others.

**nominated academic** means an academic staff member responsible for handling plagiarism and academic dishonesty as nominated by the relevant dean in accordance with the University's Delegations of Authority.

**Office of Educational Integrity** means the office established within the portfolio of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) to provide university-wide oversight of academic integrity and the implementation of this policy.

**procedures** means the Academic Honesty Procedures 2016 [INSERT LINK]

**student misconduct** means conduct which, if proven, would constitute student misconduct under the By-law.

**text-based written assignments** means assignments that use prose as the main, or as a significant, method of presenting an answer.

**work** means any or all of ideas, findings, or written or published material.

## PART 3 – ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM

### 8 Academic dishonesty

(1) For the purpose of this policy, academic dishonesty means seeking to obtain or obtaining academic advantage for oneself or for others (including in the assessment or publication of work) by dishonest or unfair means.

(2) Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to:

(a) recycling – that is, the resubmission for assessment of work that is the same, or substantially the same, as work previously submitted for assessment in the same or in a different unit of study (except in the case of legitimate resubmission with the approval of the examiner);

   **Note:** Work which builds on work previously submitted in the same, or a previous, unit of study will not constitute recycling provided that such resubmission is allowed by the examiner and the previous work and the extent and nature of its use is acknowledged.

(b) dishonest plagiarism;
(c) fabricating data;
(d) engaging another person to complete or contribute to an assessment in place of the student;
(e) submitting work for assessment which has been completed by another person in place of the student or to which the other person has made a contribution, whether for payment or otherwise;
(f) accepting an engagement from another student to complete or contribute to an assessment in the place of that student;
(g) communicating, by any means, with another candidate during an examination;
(h) bringing into an examination forbidden material such as textbooks, notes, calculators or computers;
(i) attempting to read another student’s work during an examination;
(j) writing an examination paper, or consulting with another person about the examination, outside the confines of the examination room without permission;
(k) copying from another student during an examination; and
(l) inappropriately using electronic devices to access information during an examination.

9 Plagiarism

(1) For the purpose of this policy, plagiarism means presenting another person’s work as one’s own work by presenting, copying or reproducing it without appropriate acknowledgement of the source.

(2) Plagiarism includes presenting work for assessment, publication, or otherwise, that includes:
   (a) phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs or longer extracts from published or unpublished work (including from the internet) without appropriate acknowledgement of the source; or
   (b) the work of another person, without appropriate acknowledgement of the source and in a way that exceeds the boundaries of legitimate co-operation.

(3) Presenting work which contains any of the elements in subclause 9 (2) constitutes plagiarism, regardless of the author’s intentions.

(4) Plagiarism is unacceptable in academic work, even where it is not intended to deceive the examiner into believing that the work is original to the student, but instead arises from, for example:
   (a) poor referencing;
   (b) error;
   (c) inability to paraphrase; or
   (d) inhibition about writing in the student’s own words.

(5) Where plagiarism exists but intention to deceive cannot be established, the matter must still be handled in the manner specified in this policy and the procedures.
PART 4 – ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

10 General principles

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

(2) The academic integrity of the University and its programs requires:
   (a) scrupulous ethical behaviour from individuals;
   (b) a collective culture that champions academic honesty fostered by all staff, affiliates and students;
   (c) effective education and authentic assessment; and
   (d) an effective framework of education, prevention, detection and record keeping that enables the University to monitor and respond to threats to academic integrity.

(3) The University is opposed to, and will not tolerate, plagiarism or academic dishonesty by staff, affiliates or students.

(4) It is the responsibility of all students to:
   (a) ensure that they do not commit or collude with another person to commit plagiarism or academic dishonesty; and
   (b) comply with this policy and the procedures.

(5) The University will treat all allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty seriously, in accordance with this policy, the procedures and, where appropriate, misconduct proceedings under the By-law.

11 Fostering academic integrity

(1) Fostering academic integrity within the University is an essential element of an ethical education and culture.

(2) The University’s approach to academic integrity is based on the following strategies.
   (a) **Clear expectations.** University policies, procedures and faculty local provisions should clearly document what is expected of students and set out fair processes for dealing with allegations of academic dishonesty.
   (b) **Education in academic honesty and discipline specific requirements.** Students should be educated in the academic writing and referencing conventions of their discipline at an early stage in the first semester of the award course in which they are enrolled.
   (c) **Support in understanding the importance and value of academic honesty.** Students should be supported in learning the value and importance of academic honesty as a basis for university scholarship and research enriched learning.
   (d) **Well-designed assessment which encourages demonstrated academic achievement, including academic integrity.** Assessment should
encourage scholarship, creativity and originality in ways consistent with research-enriched learning.

(e) **Effective detection.** Assessment processes should detect plagiarism, correct errors and poor referencing, and deter dishonesty.

(f) **Systematic record keeping** to monitor the University's goal to maintain a high standard of academic integrity.

(g) **An open culture** in which academic integrity is championed by staff, affiliates and students and in which information is shared appropriately and acted upon.

Note: See also Privacy Policy 2013 and Privacy Management Plan.

12 Requirements for assessment

(1) Faculties and unit of study co-ordinators must design the assessment for each award course and each unit of study to eliminate or minimise opportunities for students to gain unfair advantage through plagiarism or academic dishonesty.

(2) Faculties and unit of study co-ordinators must review and renew the assessment for each unit of study each time the unit is offered, including redesigning assessment tasks to prevent on any breaches of academic integrity that may have occurred previously from recurring.

(3) Assessment tasks must not be reused in a way that enables students with knowledge or, or prior experience of those tasks to gain an unfair advantage for themselves or others.

(4) Examination questions and assignment questions must not be reused within the normal time frame it takes for one full-time cohort to complete the award course. If questions are reused within this timeframe, the unit of study co-ordinator must be satisfied that such reuse does not jeopardise the academic integrity of the assessment.

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

(a) requiring an oral presentation of the work as part of the assessment;

(b) assessing outlines, drafts and other iterations of the written work as it is developed;

(c) requiring that students demonstrate their ability to produce unaided work in a supervised examination, where the student is required to pass, or reach a reasonable threshold in, the examination in order to pass the unit of study;

(d) conducting an oral examination.

(6) If a quiz or online assessment contributes significantly to the assessment mark for the unit, the unit of study co-ordinator must take appropriate steps to assure its academic integrity, consistently with this policy and the procedures.

(7) If a quiz or online assessment contributes a small percentage of the overall unit mark, academic integrity should still be considered as part of its design but assurance of the overall integrity of assessment for the unit may be through consideration of the complete assessment approach.
(8) If class tests and mid-semester examinations contribute to the assessment mark, the unit of study co-ordinator must take active measures to provide seating arrangements which prevent copying. Where it is not possible to ensure students cannot see another student's paper one of the following techniques should be used:

(a) sorted seating where students sitting with adjacent students taking different exams;

(b) scrambling multiple choice answers between candidates; or

(c) another appropriate method.

Note: See the procedures for further information.

13 Compliance statements

(1) Students must submit a signed statement of compliance with each piece of work submitted to the University for assessment, presentation or publication.

(2) Where students are required to submit frequent assignments, the relevant unit of study co-ordinator may permit a single compliance statement covering an entire unit, or an entire group of assessment tasks to be used.

14 Detecting plagiarism

(1) The principles of fair and transparent assessment (as set out in the Coursework Policy 2014) dictate that plagiarised work not be given credit.

Note: See Part 14 of the Coursework Policy 2014.

(2) Detecting and identifying plagiarism is fundamentally a judgement made by an examiner who is aware of the responsibilities involved in the task of academic assessment. Web search and similarity detecting software, and other such means, should be regarded only as tools assisting an examiner to make that judgement.

(3) The University has authorised and mandated the use of text-based similarity detecting software for all text-based written assignments. Faculties must inform students of this in introductory courses, unit of study outlines and informational material provided to them.

(4) Similarity detecting software may also be used for work that is not a text-based written assignment if the faculty or unit of study co-ordinator determines that it is of value in ensuring the academic integrity of assignments. Where such software is used, faculties must inform students in introductory courses, unit of study outlines and informational material provided to them.

(5) The unit of study co-ordinator must require all text-based written assignments to be submitted electronically and checked with the applicable similarity detecting software during the assessment process.

(6) For work that is not a text-based written assignment, unit of study co-ordinators must take all reasonable steps to design an assessment matrix that:

(a) eliminates or minimises the possibility of breaches of academic honesty; and

(b) as far as possible ensures that:

(i) the assignment is the student's own original work;

(ii) the work of others is appropriately acknowledged;
(iii) the assignment has not been previously submitted; and
(iv) the input of others does not exceed the bounds of legitimate cooperation.

(7) Where plagiarism is suspected by an examiner, or the possibility of plagiarism is detected by similarity detecting software, the examiner should employ all reasonable means to clarify whether the relevant work contains plagiarism.

(8) Where, as the result of a student’s performance in another assessment task within a unit of study, an examiner forms the reasonable suspicion that an assessment may not be a student’s own unaided work (excepting reasonable co-operation), the examiner must report the matter consistently with this policy and the procedures.

PART 5 – DEALING WITH ALLEGATIONS OF PLAGIARISM OR ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

15 Procedural fairness

(1) The process for enquiring into and determining allegations of plagiarism or academic dishonesty by coursework students is set out in the procedures.

(2) A faculty may only impose a penalty for plagiarism or academic dishonesty on a coursework student in accordance with this policy and the procedures.

(3) The University is committed to dealing with allegations of academic dishonesty by students in accordance with the principles of procedural fairness, including the rights of students to:

(a) be informed of the allegations against them in sufficient detail to enable them to understand the precise nature of the allegations and properly to consider and respond to them;

(b) have a reasonable period of time within which to respond to the allegations;

(c) have the matter resolved in a timely manner;

(d) be informed of their rights under this policy and these procedures and under the By-law;

(e) invite a support person or student representative to any meeting regarding alleged academic dishonesty;

(f) be treated impartially in any enquiry or investigation process; and

(g) be treated with an absence of bias by the decision-maker.

16 Reporting concerns

An examiner who suspects plagiarism or academic dishonesty by a student must report it to the relevant Academic Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic in the manner prescribed in the procedures.
17 Preliminary assessment

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

(a) formulate a clear expression of the alleged conduct; and

(b) form a preliminary view of whether, if proven, it would constitute plagiarism or academic dishonesty.

(2) If the Academic Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic’s preliminary view is that the matter could not amount to plagiarism or academic dishonesty, he or she must record the decision as set out in 17 (8) and take no further steps.

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

(4) If, after checking the student’s record, the Academic Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic still considers that the plagiarism is likely to have been caused by a failure fully to understand referencing requirements, the Academic Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must:

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

(b) permit the student to resubmit the work for assessment:

(i) within a specified time limit; and

(ii) if appropriate, for a specified maximum mark or with appropriate penalty.

(5) The Office of Educational Integrity must:

(a) record the student’s completion of, and success or otherwise at, the additional development course; and

(b) inform the relevant Academic Integrity Coordinator, nominated academic, examiner and unit of study co-ordinator of the outcome.

Note: See the University Recordkeeping Policy and Recordkeeping Manual.

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

(7) If the Academic Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic’s preliminary view is that the plagiarism or other alleged academic dishonesty is not likely to have been caused by a failure fully to understand referencing requirements, the Academic Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must then determine whether the matter should be dealt with by the faculty, as provided in clause 18 of this policy, or referred to the Registrar for action under the By-law.

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

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

(8) The Academic Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must inform the examiner and the unit of study co-ordinator and the examiner of the outcome of the preliminary consideration process, and record that outcome on the student’s file.

Note: See the University Recordkeeping Policy and Recordkeeping Manual.

18 Determining allegations of plagiarism and academic dishonesty

(1) If the outcome of the Academic Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic’s preliminary assessment is that the matter is not one in which the student should be dealt with under subclauses 17(3), 17(4) or 17(7)(a) or 17(7)(b), the Academic Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic will:

(a) inform the student in writing of the allegation as formulated;
(b) appoint a time and place for the student to attend an interview, which must conducted in the manner specified in the procedures; and
(c) provide the student with:
   (i) any further information and materials required by the procedures; and
   (ii) a copy of this policy and the procedures.

(2) Where allegations concern group work, the steps required by this policy must be undertaken separately in relation to each student involved. In particular:

(a) separate allegations must be formulated for each student;
(b) separate notifications must be provided to each student;
(c) each student must be the subject of separate consideration;
(d) students must not be interviewed together; and
(e) a determination made about one student must not be taken into consideration when determining allegations against another.

(3) The decision maker must be the Academic Integrity Coordinator or a nominated academic, and may be, but need not be, the same person who formed a preliminary view of the case as set out in 17(1).

(4) The decision maker must consider:

(a) the allegation as formulated;
(b) any supporting material (copies of which must be provided to the student); and
(c) any submissions made by or on behalf of the student.

19 Available determinations

(1) The decision maker must determine whether the student has engaged in:

(a) no impropriety;
(b) plagiarism; or
(c) academic dishonesty.

(2) If a student who has been given reasonable notice does not attend an interview without good reason, the decision maker may determine the matter in the student’s absence.

20 Conclusion of no impropriety

If the decision maker concludes that the student has engaged in no impropriety:

(a) the decision maker must inform:
   (i) the student;
   (ii) the examiner;
   (iii) the unit of study co-ordinator; and
   (iv) if not the decision maker, Academic Integrity Coordinator;

(b) the work must be returned to the examiner for assessment on its academic merit.

21 Conclusion of plagiarism or academic dishonesty

(1) If, after further consideration, the decision maker determines that the allegation of plagiarism or academic dishonesty is substantiated, he or she must inform the following of the conclusion reached:

(a) the student;
(b) the examiner;
(c) the unit of study coordinator; and
(d) if not the decision maker, the Academic Integrity Coordinator.

(2) If the decision maker concludes:

(a) that the work contains plagiarism but not dishonest plagiarism; and
(b) after consulting the student record, is satisfied that the plagiarism is due to a failure to fully understand referencing requirements

the decision maker must:

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

(d) inform the unit of study co-ordinator and, if not the decision maker, the Academic Integrity Coordinator, of the outcome; and

(e) permit the student to resubmit the work for reassessment, within a specified period of time and for a specified maximum possible mark.

(3) The Office of Academic Integrity must record the student’s completion of, and success or otherwise in, the required additional development and communicate the results communicated:

(a) the student;
(b) the decision maker;
(c) the Academic Integrity Coordinator, if not the decision maker;
(d) the examiner; and
(e) the unit of study coordinator.

(4) If a student who has been required to undertake and successfully complete an additional development course fails to do so the decision maker must then:
(a) apply one or more of the penalties specified in subclauses 20(5); and
(b) inform the following of this decision:
   (i) the student;
   (ii) the Academic Integrity Coordinator, if not the decision maker;
   (iii) the examiner; and
   (iv) the unit of study co-ordinator.

(5) If the decision maker concludes that the work contains dishonest plagiarism or that the student has engaged in academic dishonesty, the decision maker must apply one or more of the following outcomes:
(a) require the student to resubmit the work for assessment, for which a maximum possible result may be specified;
(b) require the student to undertake another form of assessment;
(c) require the student to undertake other remedial action;
(d) apply a fail grade, a mark penalty or a mark to the work which reflects its unsatisfactory standard;
(e) apply a fail grade or a mark penalty to the unit of study; or
(f) if the decision maker considers the conduct to be sufficiently serious, refer the matter to the Registrar to be dealt with under the By-law.

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

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

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

22 Appeals

Students may appeal against academic decisions made under this policy in the manner provided in the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended).
PART 6 RESPONSIBILITIES

23 Responsibilities

(1) Demonstrating and embedding academic integrity is the responsibility of all members of the University community.

(2) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) through the Office of Educational Integrity is responsible for:
   (a) overseeing the maintenance of academic integrity in all courses across the University;
   (b) co-ordinating the work of faculties, Academic Integrity Coordinators and other decision makers to ensure consistency of practice and standards in education, detection and penalties;
   (c) developing and regularly updating one or more online academic integrity modules to be taken by all students in the early stages of the first semester of the award course in which they are enrolled;
   (d) maintaining University-wide systems and practices for prevention, detection and recordkeeping in relation to the maintenance of academic integrity;
   (e) making development courses available to all students in the University which:
      (i) build on education provided by faculties and any online modules; and
      (ii) provide additional education where problems are detected in student work that fall short of academic dishonesty.
   (f) reporting to the relevant Academic Integrity Coordinator the results of any student required to undertake further development courses under this policy;
   (g) providing information from the centralised record-keeping system about allegations and findings of plagiarism and academic dishonesty to the Academic Integrity Coordinators for reporting to faculties and the Academic Board.

(3) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) is responsible for:
   (a) conducting investigations under the By-law; and
   (b) making arrangements for University-administered examinations that eliminate or minimise the possibility of breaches of academic honesty.

(4) The Academic Board is responsible for:
   (a) monitoring academic integrity throughout the University;
   (b) scrutinising annual reports from faculties on breaches of academic integrity in coursework and research award courses; and
   (c) making recommendations to faculties, the Vice-Chancellor and Deputy Vice-Chancellors.

(5) Faculties are responsible for:
   (a) monitoring and overseeing the implementation of this policy and the procedures within the faculty;
   (b) promoting good practice for all units of study and award courses which they administer;
(c) responding to requests information from the Deputy Vice-Chancellors, the Office of Educational Integrity and the Academic Board;

(d) providing to all students, during the early stages of the first year of all undergraduate and postgraduate award courses, formal education (including tutorial exercises and scaffolded writing tasks) about:
   (i) principles and practices of academic integrity;
   (ii) appropriate acknowledgement;
   (iii) paraphrasing;
   (iv) developing effective written communication; and
   (v) avoiding plagiarism and academic dishonesty.

(e) establishing and maintaining processes to require and monitor that all students successfully complete any online academic integrity modules endorsed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) through the Office of Educational Integrity;

(f) monitoring and overseeing unit of study co-ordinators’ development and review of assessment requirements within each unit of study to provide academic integrity processes within the faculty that are consistent, aligned and effective;

(g) reporting annually to the Academic Board on steps taken to support academic integrity within the faculty, based on reports of breaches provided by the Office of Educational Integrity from the centralised record-keeping system.

(6) **Deans** are responsible for:
   (a) developing and supporting academic integrity within their faculty;
   (b) monitoring and overseeing the implementation of this policy and the procedures within their faculty;
   (c) appointing an Academic Integrity Coordinator within their faculty;
   (d) assigning appropriate duties to professional staff to implement this policy; and
   (e) appointing, as deemed appropriate, one or more additional nominated academics as decision makers in appropriate cases.

(7) **Academic Integrity Coordinators** are responsible for:
   (a) monitoring and reporting on instances of plagiarism and academic dishonesty within their faculties consistently with this policy and the procedures;
   (b) maintaining consistent decision making and high standards of academic integrity within their faculty, in line with guidelines from the Office of Educational Integrity;
   (c) complying with the requirements of this policy and the procedures; and
   (d) presenting a report, based on information from the Office of Educational Integrity, on all allegations of plagiarism and academic dishonesty each year to the faculty board and to the Academic Board as required by this policy.

(8) **Nominated Academics** are responsible for
(a) working with the Academic Integrity coordinator to maintain consistent
decision making and high standards of academic integrity within their faculty,
in line with guidelines from the Office of Educational Integrity; and
(b) complying with the requirements of this policy and the procedures.

(9) **Unit of study co-ordinators** are responsible for:

(a) developing and supporting the academic integrity of assessment within the
units of study for which they are responsible;
(b) designing and reviewing the assessment matrix of a unit of study each time
it is offered to:
   (i) embed academic integrity; and
   (ii) eliminate or minimise opportunities for plagiarism or academic
dishonesty, in light of any breaches of academic integrity that
occurred when the unit was previously offered.
(c) providing unit of study outlines, or sites on the University’s Learning
Management System, for each unit of study which:
   (i) give clear information about the University’s policies and procedures
on plagiarism and academic dishonesty; and
   (ii) where appropriate, provide discipline or subject specific examples;
(d) reporting instances of suspected plagiarism and academic dishonesty; and
(e) implementing the requirements for assessment specified in this policy and
the procedures, including the use of similarity detection software.

(10) **Teachers, including examiners**, are responsible for:

(a) educating students about academic integrity consistently with the plans of
faculties and unit of study co-ordinators;
(b) advising students on academic integrity;
(c) maintaining academic integrity in all activities relating to learning and
assessment;
(d) distinguishing original from plagiarised work; and
(e) reporting breaches of academic integrity consistently with this policy.

(11) **Students** are responsible for ensuring academic integrity in all learning and work
completed by them.

(a) Students undertaking group work who become aware of plagiarism or other
academic dishonesty in their group’s work should make all reasonable
attempts either:
   (i) ensure the work is correctly referenced prior to submission; or
   (ii) report the plagiarism or academic dishonesty to the unit of study co-
ordinator.
(b) Failure to do so may amount to collusion in unacceptable conduct.
PART 7 – ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

24 Reporting to the faculty and the Academic Board

(1) Each Academic Integrity Coordinator must provide an annual report to the Faculty Board and other appropriate committees containing:

(a) the number of allegations of plagiarism and academic dishonesty received by the faculty during the previous year organised according to:

(i) enrolment type (part time/full time);
(ii) International or domestic status;
(iii) gender;
(iv) award course; and
(v) year of award course;

(b) a de-identified summary table of the outcomes of the allegations following investigation.

(2) In March each year, faculties must report information specified in subclause 24 (1) to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee of the Academic Board, along with a commentary on any further steps taken by the faculty to promote compliance with this policy and to ensure the academic integrity of its programs.

25 Rescissions and replacements

This document replaces the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy 2012 which is rescinded as from the date of commencement of this document.
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1 Name of policy

This is the Student Placement Policy 2015.

2 Commencement

This policy commences on 1 January 2016.

3 Policy is binding

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

This policy:

(a) provides for students to be properly supported while undertaking professional placement programs; and

(b) sets out the University’s requirements for the development and management of such programs.

5 Application

(1) This policy applies to placement undertaken by students as a required part of a coursework award course.

(2) This policy does not apply to other placements, but may be used as a guide to practice in relation to such placements.

6 Definitions

coursework award course has the meaning given in the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014, which at the date of this policy is:

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

placement means assigning a student to undertake supervised learning at a workplace that is controlled by a placement provider, for the purpose of the student’s practical education. A placement is a vocational placement as provided in the Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth).

placement co-coordinator means a member of staff of a Faculty with responsibilities as set out in this policy. The placement co-coordinator may be the unit of study coordinator.

placement provider means an individual or organisation with whom a student is undertaking a placement under this policy.

placement supervisor means the placement provider (if an individual) or an employee of the placement provider who is responsible for the work based supervision of a student on placement. The University may also employ supervisors who visit the workplace. In this policy the placement supervisor refers to the person employed by the placement provider.
7 Principles for placements

(1) Placements are intended to provide students with authentic experiential learning.

(2) In order to maximise their learning, students on placement should:
   (a) be given a clear explanation of the professional and academic expectations and learning outcomes of the placement;
   (b) have access to quality supervision;
   (c) be given work related responsibilities relevant to the intended learning outcomes; and
   (d) have structured opportunities for critical reflection.

(3) The requirements for assessment of a placement must be set out in the unit of study outline.
   (a) The final assessment mark for each student on placement must be determined by the relevant member of the faculty’s academic staff, consistently with the requirements of the Coursework Policy 2014 and the Assessment Procedures 2011.

(4) For each student placement there must be an identified placement co-ordinator.

8 Engagement with placement providers

Placement co-ordinators are responsible for:

(a) informing placement providers of the objectives and learning outcome including the attendance requirements, of the placement;

(b) establishing appropriate plans for managing any conflict of interests which may arise from any pre-existing relationships between the placement provider (or relevant member of the placement provider’s staff) and any student proposed for placement with that provider.

Note: The details of any such plan will depend on the particular circumstances of each case. If no appropriate plan can be developed, the student should be placed with another placement provider.

9 Placement agreements

(1) Students must not be assigned to a placement provider without an overarching written agreement between the University and the placement provider which sets out:
   (a) the responsibilities of each of the University and the placement provider;
   (b) the insurance requirements for each of the University and the placement provider;
   (c) the level of supervision which will be provided to students on placement; and
   (d) intellectual property, confidentiality and privacy obligations applicable to placement.

(2) Placement co-ordinators are responsible for ensuring placement providers are aware of any reasonable adjustments agreed between the University and the placement provider to accommodate a student with a disability.
Note: The University will only be able to make or agree to any such adjustments if the student has disclosed the disability and consented to the release of necessary information to the placement provider. See clause 12 of this policy.

(3) Before approving an agreement between the University and a placement provider, the relevant placement co-ordinator must consider:

(a) the placement provider’s ability to meet objectives of placements;
(b) the appropriateness of the learning environment and the proposed learning experience.

10 Communication with students prior to placement

(1) Placement co-ordinators must inform students of the following before the student commences a placement:

(a) the objectives of the placement, including:
   (i) learning outcomes;
   (ii) assessment requirements; and
   (iii) attendance requirements.
(b) how to apply for special consideration or special arrangements in relation to the placement;
   Note: See Coursework Policy 2014 and Assessment Procedures 2011.
(c) what other University policies or procedures apply to a particular placement;
   Note: For example, the Travel Policy and Travel Procedures will apply to international placements.
(d) whom to contact in the Faculty if the student should have any concerns while on placement, and how contact may be made; and
(e) the circumstances under which a placement may be terminated by either the placement supervisor or the placement co-ordinator or when a student would be considered to have failed any assessment relating to the placement.
   Note: Requirements to complete placements are specified in the relevant course resolutions.

(2) If a placement is terminated early for reasons beyond a student’s control, the placement co-ordinator must:

(a) arrange for the student to be assessed on the basis of the completed component of the placement; and
(b) inform the student as soon as possible of any remaining requirements to be met in order to complete the placement requirement of their course.
   (i) If a placement is terminated because the placement provider or facilities provided are determined to be unsuitable, the placement co-ordinator must work with the student to provide options for the student to meet the placement requirements of their course without penalty.

(3) Placement co-ordinators must request from students details of any pre-existing relationships between the placement provider (or relevant member of the placement provider’s staff) and any student proposed for placement with that provider.
Faculty should develop and register local provisions setting out any requirements for placements in addition to those specified in University policy and procedures.

**Note:** All University policies and procedures, and registered local provisions, are available from the Policy Register.

### 11 Communication with students while on placement

1. Placement co-ordinators must establish and maintain mechanisms for communication between the faculty and students on placement, including in relation to:
   - (a) the quality of the placement experience;
   - (b) the student’s progress; and
   - (c) potential or actual problems with the placement.

2. Communication mechanisms must be available to students at all time while on placement.

### 12 Work health and safety of students on placement

1. Placement co-ordinators must:
   - (a) take all reasonable steps to identify and record where students are undertaking placements at any given time;
   - (b) inform placement providers of the requirement to provide a work health and safety induction to all students on placement;
   - (c) notify placement providers that the placement co-ordinator needs to be informed of any work health or safety concern during a placement;
   - (d) inform students of relevant work health and safety issues before they go on placement; and
   - (e) notify students of the contact details for relevant faculty staff who should be informed of any work health or safety concern during a placement.

2. Placement co-ordinators are responsible for recording reported work health and safety incidents occurring during placements on the University’s work health and safety reporting system, Riskware.

3. Placement co-ordinators must request students to disclose health issues that have a work health and safety significance for placement before going on placement, so that student safety can be optimised.

**Note:** Such information must be handled consistently with the Privacy Policy 2013, Privacy Management Plan, University Recordkeeping Policy and Recordkeeping Manual.
13 Feedback after placements

(1) Placement co-ordinators must establish and maintain robust mechanisms to obtain feedback from:

(a) students, particularly in relation to:
   (i) the quality of the supervision; and
   (ii) the overall value of the placement; and

(b) placement providers, particularly in relation to:
   (i) the educational design of the placement;
   (ii) the preparedness of students on placement; and
   (iii) the performance of students on placement.
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